



Faculty Senate Meeting

MINUTES

January 29th, 2025 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 134

Present: Charles Bell, April Niemela, Rodney Farrington, Jennifer Uptmor, Kelly FitzSimmons, Peter Remien, Gina Lott, Jennifer Cromer, Jenna Chambers, Rikki Ober, Eric Stoffregen, Jessica Savage, Rachelle Genthôs, Angela Wartel, Debra Lybyer, Thomas Hill, Christina Brando-Subis, Bowie Rose, Marc Riendeau, Kim Tuschhoff

A. **Call to Order at 3:15 pm by Faculty Senate Chair Charles Bell.**

B. Approval of Faculty Senate meeting minutes from November 20th, 2025

Motion to approve Faculty Senate meeting minutes from November 20th, 2025, by Rodney Farrington. Motion seconded by Marc Riendeau. 19 in favor. 0 opposed. One abstention. Motion carries.

C. **Old Business**

A. Chair's Report

Faculty Senate Chair reported that the President is heading back from Boise today with information from the most recent legislative session. We have not heard any updates regarding whether further holdbacks will occur. The President will hold an executive cabinet meeting to discuss the legislative session. As soon as the executive cabinet is updated on what is occurring, faculty will be updated.

Call for questions.

Faculty Senator question: How will the news of any potential holdbacks be communicated to faculty?

Faculty Senate Chair response: Information will most likely be communicated via the Monday message. If he hears any news prior to the Monday message rollout, he will notify Faculty Senate via email.

No further questions.

B. SPRC Committee Policy

*Review of Policy 1.102 Operational Guidelines for Faculty Governance
Section 6 – Standing Promotion Review Committee (SPRC) for Career and
Technical Faculty.*

*Two items brought forward for discussion and potential vote today after
review of policy markup with the Provost:*

*In Section 6.A.iii “meet with new hires and discuss promotion process” - For
those who have been hired or promoted recently, were your STPRC or SPRC
committee members meeting with new hires and discussing the promotion
process? The language in our policy will no longer apply if we are no longer
hiring new members who are eligible for promotion. Recommendation is to
strike this from current language. What is the process in your divisions?*

*Faculty Senator question: At one point, there were individuals who were
hired that could obtain tenure but were also non-promotable. Is that still
the same?*

Response: Overall consensus was yes from Faculty Senate.

*Faculty Senate Chair response: Per the policy, it is part of the responsibility
of the SPRC (and STPRC) committees to meet with new hires and discuss
the process for promotion (and tenure). We are looking directly at the
language for SPRC. If we are taking this language out of one committee
(SPRC), should we take it out of both (SPRC and STPRC).*

*Faculty Senate leadership holds professional development training in the
CTL for new hires to review the promotion and tenure process. Would it
make sense to bring the chair or a member of these committees to present
this process?*

*Faculty Senator response: Different divisions may have differences in their
promotion criteria, which makes it hard for one committee or area to hold
the responsibility for mentoring new hires in the promotion process.*

*Faculty Senator question: In addition, would we have an issue since several
members of CTE are spread out with different divisions, which may hold
different criteria.*

*Faculty Senator response: It seems that keeping mentoring as local or as
close to the division as possible (i.e. division chair) makes the most sense
for our divisions. It also may be hard to have a lot of information shared
upon hire regarding the promotion and tenure process, if they have 4 years
prior to being eligible for tenure/promotion from their new hire date. In
addition, new hires in CTE are not being hired on a promotion track.*

*Faculty Senate Chair response: Consider that members of the committee
are close to the process of evaluating promotion and tenure, so it may
make sense to have them attend the new hire training or new faculty
orientation to present about the process.*

Overall faculty consensus for members of the committees to attend new hire orientation to present about Promotion/Tenure Process to new faculty.

The second item, Section 6.A.vi, describes “plan annual recognition for newly promoted faculty.” When this was brought up with the Provost, response was favorable for Faculty Senate to review and support striking this item from the policy, to remove responsibility from the committee.

Faculty Senator response: I would support striking Section 5.A.vi and 6.A.vi from the policy since both committees are not involved in annual recognition faculty.

Last item regarding changes is structure of the committee and terms of service located in Item 6.B and 6.C. Proposed changes in language are listed below based on clean sheet version shown to faculty:

- A. Structure. The five-member SPRC will be constituted as follows: 4 faculty members from at least 3 different CTE program areas, and a chair. All members will be elected by the Faculty Association at its spring meeting. At least 50% of the SPRC faculty members must hold full professor rank.
- B. Term of Service. All members will serve three-year terms. A full professor faculty member, elected by the Faculty Association, will serve as chair for a one-year term and will vote in the event of a tie. No faculty member may serve on the SPRC during an academic year when her or his own application is being considered.

Initial language of the SPRC committee regarding committee make-up was modeled after the STRPC committee. Language was simplified after review, edits and past discussion.

Call for discussion:

Faculty Senator question: If the SPRC chair serves as one-year term, do they still serve their three-year term as a committee member. Does that one year count as one of their three years of service?

Faculty Senate Chair Response: Their one-year term would count as one of their three-year terms. Technically, the policy is broad and does not state that the chair needs to be a member of the SPRC committee or even a CTE faculty member, which allows for some flexibility for that role.

Call for a motion to strike or remove Section 5.A.vi, 6.A.iii and 6.A.vi from Policy 1.102 Operational Guidelines for Faculty Governance and to amend the language as presented in clean sheet version above in Section 6.B and 6.C. regarding committee structure and terms of service.

Motion in favor of changes above made by Marc Riendeau. Motion seconded by Thomas Hill. No further discussion. Call for vote. 19 in favor. 0 opposed. 1 abstention. Motion carries.

Faculty Senator question: Are we able to receive a copy of the mark up and the clean sheet versions of the policy changes made today on Policy 1.102.

Faculty Senate Chair response: Will send both the mark-up and clean sheet versions out via email to Faculty Senators.

A. New Business

A. SCE Portal engagement and response rates

Faculty Senate Chair question: Have faculty noticed the student response rates decreasing in their courses. Could the decrease in response rates be due to multiple comment boxes which make filling out the survey more daunting.

Call for discussion:

Faculty Senator comment: I noticed they allow less time to complete the SCEs online than when we distributed them via paper.

Faculty Senate Chair response: The time frame for SCEs is short, as they are only open for 10-14 days.

Faculty Senator response: This past semester, it opened the Monday of Thanksgiving break and closed the end of No Finals week.

Faculty Senate response: It would be useful to have SCEs open until the Thursday/Friday of finals week. Students are busy during finals week, but once they turn in their finals, they would have more time to submit, and we would see better response rates.

Faculty Senate response: Having them open until end of finals week may make our results highly skewed since it is a highly emotional week. We may see more negative feedback dependent on student performance on their finals, which is probably why SCEs close prior to finals week.

Faculty Senator response/question: Feel the big issue with SCE response rate is that we do not do it via paper anymore. Faculty are receiving lower response rates with the push to Qualtrics/electronic. Because of this, we are not getting a full picture of evaluation of our courses. Is the issue with paper SCEs because it requires more personnel to process it?

Faculty Senator question: Why can't we ask the students to complete the Qualtrics surveys in class?

Faculty Senator response: Provost participated in prior discussion on SCE response rates and stated we were able to have students complete it in class.

Faculty Senator response: One change with the Qualtrics platform is that we can get a real time update regarding students filling out the SCEs. We can log in and check on our percentages of students who have completed their SCEs.

Faculty Senator response: An idea to consider is that our society has moved to a system where we are asked to rate or evaluate anything we do online. How

do we set the SCEs apart from other rating systems that we all ignore or stress the importance?

Faculty Senate Chair response: Students may not be aware of what the benefit is for the student course evaluations regarding making changes to our courses. Faculty need to be intentional in explaining this to them.

Faculty Senator response: One of the sections on campus only had one student enrolled in the course section, so it wouldn't allow the student to fill out their SCEs for the course since anonymity of response couldn't occur.

Faculty Senator question: Recall when we distributed SCEs via paper, faculty were not supposed to be present in the classroom during completion. Is it the same for the Qualtrics survey?

Faculty Senator response: Provost recommended in the past that you step out while the students complete the online SCEs.

Faculty Senator response: Student Affairs Committee has previously discussed incentives to the survey, such as tying it to release of grades, etc. It came down to faculty can incentivize with points, but we couldn't hold back grades, etc. The make-up of the committee at that time was interested in continuing the conversation if Faculty Senate is interested as well.

Faculty Senate Chair response: We previously discussed in Faculty Association the difficulties in getting to the portal to review SCEs. A suggestion was made to place during Faculty Association of placing access to the portal on WarriorHub. IR&E is working with IT to create this link on WarriorHub as quickly as possible. Also, information was shared that the emails regarding opening and closing of the SCEs went to junk mail for a majority of faculty, similar to the CTL email issues we had in the past. IT is working on addressing this issue.

Faculty Senator question: Is it possible to offer a link in Canvas for the students for easy access.

Faculty Senator response: The links are offered to students on Canvas.

Faculty Senator response: Faculty may access their results more if it was easier to export a report.

Faculty Senator response: One of the division chairs downloaded all the individual faculty SCEs and put the downloaded reports into individual folders for the faculty.

Faculty Senate Chair response: This is helpful information and may be one reason why our rates of faculty reviewing SCEs are low due to alternatives such as the division chair downloading the information instead of individual faculty access. Reminder that access to our SCEs is part of the Single Sign On process as well.

Faculty Senator question: When it comes to promotion, do you create a link to the SCEs for our portfolio, and they can print it off?

Faculty Senator response: You would need to find and filter each course in the timeframe for your promotion and export the PDFs for both instructor and course feedback. Several faculty reported that it is difficult to use the filter. There has to be a simpler way to separate results.

Faculty Senator response: Is it possible when SCEs close, for the dashboard or course/instructor data to be automatically emailed to faculty for ease of use?

Faculty Senate Chair response: Will Inquire if it is possible for IR&E to automate having the SCE results emailed out to faculty when the survey closes.

No further discussion.

B. MSN Direct Entry Accreditation updates

Curriculum Committee Chair Thomas Hill reported that on April 24, 2025 Faculty Senate approved the new program plan for the Direct Entry (DE)-MSN program. Program Proposal made it through all the steps up to NWCCU and return to us back in September with some changes to the curriculum to ensure it is a hybrid of undergraduate and graduate courses. This was reviewed during winter break by the NHS Division and rolled back to Curriculum Committee in early January for review and discussed in the curriculum meeting that occurred on January 27th. After Curriculum Committee, it needs to go through review by Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate Chair, the Provost, and SBOE again prior to being sent back to NWCCU for final approvals. An emergency vote was held on the January 27th meeting by the Curriculum Committee and was unanimously approved. Currently, it sits with Faculty Senate/Faculty Senate Chair approval before it can be forwarded to the Provost. Faculty Senate Chair will now approve and sign off on the DE-MSN new program proposal and send off to Provost. Faculty Senate in consensus to move program proposal along.

C. Early Alert Software

Debra Lybyer presented information on updates to our Faculty Referral Program and new programs/changes called Retention Alert and SeeTellNow.

Faculty Referral Program – you will see an email from Kim Wolf each semester regarding faculty referral program through The Advising Center at the beginning of each semester. For Fall 2025 semester, The Advising Center received around 180 referrals. Before you submit a referral, we encourage faculty to reach out and meet with the students prior to having them meet with The Advising Center. This program is primarily academic performance-focused, but also can address other issues seen such as non-attendance, students falling asleep a lot, etc.

SeeTellNow app – Managed through Public Safety and available for use for faculty, staff, and students. Dustin Gunther presented several PDT sessions in the fall on the new application SeeTellNow. LC State was asked by the SBOE to pilot this app at the collegiate level. With the test run of the pilot last fall, campus users (faculty, staff, and students) were able to give feedback that some of the questions do not fit the college environment, as the app was initially geared towards elementary, middle and high school students. We have been submitting feedback with the goal of helping tailor the app to fit the collegiate population. This application is primarily crisis-focused reporting. All of the submissions this past fall have been related to mental illness, suicidal ideation, or behavioral issues. The app provides availability of a 24/7 dispatch center. Every case is triaged through dispatch, who then identifies who to contact or refer. Both Dustin Gunther and Andy Hanson are notified of every report as well.

Retention Alert – This a product that is available with our Colleague software. We are completing pilot testing to identify how it works and best use. Currently, we are still in the testing phase, with the goal to be live in the fall. This will replace the Faculty Referral Program in the future and will be housed within the WarriorWeb menu. Faculty/staff/advisors are able to refer any student via this link, and it will source the referral depending on the need (i.e. food pantry for food insecurity, on campus housing for housing issues, etc.). If an instructor puts a concern in, the advisor will be sent a message to stay in the loop. This will help to provide more insight into information that is happening to your advisees/students.

Regarding these items, they are requesting feedback on if information/training should be presented to the individual divisions, included in advisor trainings or in both settings. Are faculty aware of these resources already?

Faculty Senator response: It would make sense to demonstrate the new product in the upcoming advisor trainings and also at division meetings.

Faculty Senator question: Regarding referrals being monitored in the new Retention Alert software, how can faculty/advisors communicate or make notes regarding their student referrals.

Debra Lybyer response: We can look at adding a comment box.

Faculty Senator question: It may be ideal to have the training closer to the deployment or go-live date instead of months in the future. Also, at the very least, the information needs to be filtered down from division chairs, and information shared on trainings offered in case not everyone attends Advisor training.

Faculty Senator response: Can we add a question in the Retention Alert Program of “Have you contacted the student yourself?” or at least include an area to describe the actions we have taken with the student referral.

Debra Lybyer response: Made note of these items. This would be beneficial as The Advising Center always asks referred students first if they have spoken with your instructors prior to meeting with an advisor in The Advising Center.

Faculty Senator question: For clarification on the SeeTellNow process – did it replace the student concerns email we used to use? I wasn't aware that the SeeTellNow app was available and do not want to download an extra app to my phone.

Faculty Senator response: It did replace the student concerns email. You can access the SeeTellNow app on your laptop, you do not have to download the app.

Faculty Senator question: As these applications have a crisis and academic performance focus, where are we able to report disruptive students as we work on building a new policy?

Faculty Senator response: It more than likely will need to be reported through the SeeTellNow app. You could also call Public Safety.

No further questions.

B. Committee Reports

A. Budget, Planning & Assessment (Charles Bell)

BPAC has met and completed all observations for FAC. Waiting on one more observation report before generating the cumulative report. BPAC changed observation process this year regarding classification of observations. Moved to use of two faculty members of the committee completing observations in one category to provide a wider view and more faculty input. This allowed for less meetings, and more refined proposals. We will be able to present more tailored recommendations for the BPAC committee.

B. Curriculum (Thomas Hill)

During the last Faculty Association meeting, we identified there were new forms coming out regarding program proposals, changes and discontinuations. The new forms will be combined to no longer separate academic and CTE programs (one form for both). There may be some sections you skip if it does not align with your program. This includes with budget information. For clarification on deadlines for the forms, based on state feedback, any program proposals, changes, and discontinuations can be submitted using the old form until June 1st. After June 1st, we will require use of the new form.

Faculty Senator question: On the state budget forms, if there is no financial impact, will we be able to skip the form or fill it out with zeroes?

Curriculum Chair response: Regarding clarification on skip sections – you are able to skip certain attachments related to program. All programs will still fill out the budget section. Will inquire more on if the program reports no financial impact if you will need to fill out the budget forms.

Faculty Senator question: For clarification, does it mean the initial program proposal, change or discontinuation needs to be submitted initially by June 1st or does it need to be in certain level in the pipeline by the June 1st deadline?

Curriculum Chair response: The recommendation is that the program change, proposal or discontinuation needs to be able to be submitted to the state by June 1st deadline.

No further questions.

C. Faculty Affairs (April Niemela)

Faculty Affairs Chair was able to meet with Provost to discuss inconsistencies in Sabbatical policy. She has made and tracked changes to the policy and submitted it to the Provost for initial review. Will bring back to Faculty Affairs Committee to review and approve changes made by Provost before bringing it back to Faculty Senate.

A. Student Affairs (Peter Remien)

First meeting of the semester will occur on Tuesday. Goal for the next meeting is to complete a review of the policy on disruptive students. The new policy will contain mechanisms on temporary or permanent dismissal in class and mechanisms of student appeal. The committee has spent a lot of time crafting this policy. The goal is to present the Disruptive Student Policy at the next Faculty Senate meeting for review.

C. **Good of the Order**

- *Hospitality Management Program is hosting a new fundraiser called “Spring Hospitality Showcase.” There will be hors d’oeuvres and live entertainment during the fundraiser. The goal is to hopefully help alleviate course fees for our hospitality management students for the future. The event will be occurring in May so watch for details. There will only be a certain number of tickets available to purchase.*
- *Rodney Farrington wanted to recognize the fabulous work completed by LC State’s welding and millwright programs. Students created a major fulcrum piece (8-foot platform) for an upcoming show for the Lewiston Civic Theater, that will be able to be used by the Lewiston Civic Theater for many other shows. Great job by our welding and millwright programs!*
- *Awards Ceremony – Several faculty members reported hearing initial rumors that the faculty awards ceremony will be scheduled for the Thursday before Spring Break from 2-4 pm at the Center for Arts and History. Faculty Senate*

members requested more information on details of the event and when notifications will be sent out to faculty regarding the awards ceremony.

- Faculty Senate Chair response: There will be an email forthcoming to faculty soon regarding the awards reception and details. This event has moved to a drop-in reception at the Center for Arts and History instead of a sit-down ceremony. This will allow for flexible timing for faculty to drop in for the award event, instead of a large ceremony/presentation.*
- Questions posed to Faculty Senate Chair to follow up on for clarification is if award winners will be able to receive or view their nomination letters in advance and how award winners should address conflicts with the event time and their course timeframe.*
- Faculty Senate Chair will send out approximate dates to Faculty Senators for Faculty Senate and Faculty Association meetings for rest of the semester.*

Motion to adjourn from Bowie Rose. Motion seconded by Thomas Hill. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at 4:38 pm.