



## Faculty Senate Meeting

### Minutes

November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 134

Present: Charles Bell, April Niemela, Jennifer Uptmor, Peter Remien, Gina Lott, Jennifer Cromer, Jenna Chambers, Rikki Ober, Eric Stoffregen, Jessica Savage, Rachelle Genthôs, Angela Wartel, Debra Lybyer, Christina Brando-Subis, Jennifer Alexander

Guest: Chelsea Cronin

I. **Call to Order by Faculty Senate Chair Charles Bell at 3:16 pm.**

II. Approval of Faculty Senate meeting minutes from November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2025

*Approval of November 6<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes postponed until next Faculty Senate meeting on December 4<sup>th</sup>.*

---

III. **Old Business**

I. Chairs Report

*Over the next few weeks, there will be a questionnaire sent out from the Provost's office in the next couple of weeks regarding restructuring in the academic divisions as we shift from a college to a university. We will also be receiving some directions on what the SBOE and accrediting bodies will let us do regarding restructuring in the divisions. The Provost's Office is seeking our input.*

*This topic of restructuring will be discussed further in Faculty Senate once we have feedback regarding what this will look like and to get Faculty Senate input.*

*When you see the questionnaire deployed, please encourage all faculty to fill it out.*

*Concerns shared by Faculty Senate was timing of the survey, as sending it out during finals week or during winter break may see minimal response.*

*Faculty Senator question: Is it more about changing name of the schools or divisions or changing how the divisions would be structured i.e. breaking apart different programs within the divisions.*

*Faculty Senate Chair response: Assume this is more about changing the names.*

*Faculty Senator question: To clarify, it is about changing from School of Liberal Arts and Sciences to College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.*

*Faculty Senate Chair response: Yes, that would be correct clarification. Unsure if this will change the administration structure on our end.*

*No further discussion. Look for the survey in the next few weeks. The Faculty Senate Chair will bring back to Faculty Senate the answer of "Why" we would be renaming internal academic divisions on campus.*

---

#### **IV. New Business**

##### **A. Faculty and Staff Appreciation/ awards event attendance – discussion**

*This topic of the Faculty and Staff Appreciation/Awards event came up as administration would like to know how to take this spring event and make it more meaningful event for faculty and to boost attendance.*

*General consensus of the Faculty Senate is that faculty want to be recognized and appreciated. We want to keep the award ceremony but recognize there could be different approaches to the ceremony itself.*

*Faculty Senators shared comments from their individual divisions. Common concerns regarding the prior event among divisions included:*

- *Poor scheduling/timing of the event (many faculty taught Thursday afternoon classes).*
- *Downgrading or downplaying significance of event with the move from dinner to ice cream/cookies.*
- *Lack of communication regarding award recipients or nominations which impacts faculty morale. Examples included lack of notification to award recipients regarding being nominated or receiving an award, and inconsistency in communications from the divisions regarding notification of being a potential recipient. One faculty member expressed they received notification regarding being a recipient of an award, which they did end up not receiving, which was expressed as a humiliating experience.*
  - *There are conflicting statements from divisions about how notification occurs or if it is left a surprise. Faculty would like consistent notification across the board. In addition, faculty would appreciate a heads up in case they are teaching a class during that timeframe to be able to attend the ceremony to receive the award.*
- *Faculty also shared they would like to see the nomination letters being given to all those who were nominated or those who received an award, to help contribute to their portfolio.*

- *Concerns were shared regarding those individuals presenting the awards commonly mispronouncing award recipient's names when giving the awards and speaking about the recipient.*
- *Several Senators felt the sentiment of administration asking for feedback about this event is not how to make it more important but if we even want it.*
- *Disparities were shared in that last year, some people who weren't able to attend were able to make a video acceptance speech, while those present were not given opportunity to make a speech. Not all award recipients who were unable to be present due to class conflicts, etc. were given the same opportunity.*
- *It was also expressed there were conflicting messages shared regarding attendance at this event. Faculty are told consistently not to cancel class, even if we are ill; however, for this event, the expectation was to cancel class or reschedule class so that we can attend.*
- *Some faculty shared that there are a few common divisions who never end up with any awards recipients, which decreases attendance from their divisions.*

#### *Ideas for Future Employee Recognition Event:*

- *General consensus was that a luncheon event would be more meaningful to faculty. This would include a nicer sit-down lunch. Not just ice cream and cookies. Timing of the event is crucial.*
- *Regarding timing of event, one suggestion included holding the awards luncheon on a Friday at noon to accommodate most faculty. It is clear to faculty that there is no one common time to hold any event to ensure 100% faculty attendance. Friday at noon would allow most faculty to attend. Luncheons are also easier for faculty who do not live in the LC Valley to attend, instead of an after-hours event.*
- *Another suggestion was that if costs of holding a Faculty Recognition event are a concern, it may be helpful to shift the cost of hosting hors d'oeuvres, etc. at the President's house at the beginning of the year to the Faculty Recognition event in order to have a nicer luncheon.*
- *There was discussion involving the potential to have a more formal event with alcohol being available (tickets for complementary drinks) and fancier or heavier hors d'oeuvres (similar to Winter Revels). Holding an event after normal business hours wouldn't impact most faculty teaching schedules; however, it was also shared that holding it on an evening or weekend would not guarantee increased attendance by faculty, especially those who do not live in the valley.*
- *During discussion, several divisions recommend adding new award criteria. This is with the understanding that faculty recognize some award criteria may be dictated by donors. The potential to add new awards, even without financial backing, would help to boost morale and be culture-building for individuals to attend the ceremony. Faculty would appreciate them even if the new awards are goofy (best dressed*

faculty, etc.). These award nominations could come from a student or division vote.

- Other ideas shared is instead of the event, the President or Provost came to the division of the award winners to recognize those individuals, as we can guarantee that the majority of faculty would attend their division meetings. In the same aspect, the staff awards could be given during PSO and CSO meetings. With the money saved from moving to recognizing them at division meetings, you can carve out the funds for an extra award.
  - Cons shared regarding this idea is that recognition of the faculty/staff members would end up staying within the division, and colleagues across campus would be unaware of who has received awards. Sharing of the award recipients just in the Monday Message would take away a lot of the recognition. Over time, the award process has diminished, such as sharing the letter of nomination at the ceremony. The awards ceremony is an opportunity to have cohesion and a sense of community on campus, which would be taken away by having these awards at the divisions.
- Another idea was that if administration wanted to publicize the institution valuing faculty, faculty award recipients' names and type of award could be placed in the graduation booklet for recognition. The President or the Provost at each graduation could just state briefly, "Faculty who received an award please stand and recognize them". This wouldn't add a lot of time to the graduation ceremonies.
- Another idea was to have the division chairs present the awards during the recognition ceremony, as they would be able to provide more meaning when sharing about the award winners at the ceremony and would resolve issues with mispronounced names.
- Another idea was to have the Faculty Recognition Ceremony in between graduation ceremonies in May. This would ensure good faculty attendance while also holding a luncheon.
- It was expressed by the Library that it is important for accurate records regarding awards and Faculty Emeriti are kept ensuring accurate data collection. We would need to identify a good documentation of awards if the awards shift from a campus ceremony to a division ceremony. In the past, Faculty Emeriti were difficult to track. One potential idea is to create a pamphlet to hand out at end of ceremony to award recipients and to keep in our library archive.
- Another idea was to integrate the ceremony during Research Symposium week to garner better faculty attendance.

*Faculty Senator question: Regarding conversations with the Provost, what will change look like or how will it be implemented?*

*Faculty Senate Chair response: Part of the conversation is that there will need to be some changes in the upcoming year. The current proposal involved location change as the Williams Conference Center is offline for renovations.*

*There is a potential to host the event in the Center for Arts and History this year. If we moved the ceremony to CAH, we would most likely have a presentation poster board for each of the award winners containing quotes from people that nominated them and from students, etc. Attendees would be able to physically interact with the award winners. Concerns were the small space and parking constraints in downtown Lewiston.*

*Response from our award donors mentioned that something about the ceremony needs to change about the ceremony, as there were concerns about having multiple award recipients for some of the awards. Intent behind these awards was to have only one award winner, not to have multiple award winners (2-3 faculty).*

*Librarian response: Regarding records, not all faculty emeriti are noted in Colleague. What makes it difficult is also when faculty emeriti come back and teach as adjunct, which changes status in Colleague. We need a better method of tracking this.*

*Faculty Senate Chair response: Faculty Senate Chair has compiled a list since 1993 of faculty emeriti that they have worked on to be able to list all of the faculty emeriti on the webpage to have public record of who left as emeriti.*

*Faculty Senator discussion RE: Location: One option could be to hold it in the Aux Gym, which is more convenient over the CAH, as it is on campus and can be decorated. Other suggestions included the SUB, the Lewiston Public Library and SJRMC conference rooms. Location ideas will be taken back to divisions for input, but general recommendation is to keep it on campus to obtain better input and not have to address concerns regarding max occupation capacity and parking issues. It was encouraged to have a conversation with Angel Huddleston on campus to identify spaces/potential locations on campus.*

*Faculty Senate Chair response: Faculty Senate Chair will put information in an email, for us to bring back to divisions to obtain more feedback. At our first Faculty Senate meeting at the end of January, we can have one more conversation.*

*Please bring back items from conversation including location ideas back to divisions to obtain final input. Will be discussed at future January Faculty Senate meeting.*

*No further discussion.*

---

## **V. Committee Reports**

### **A. Budget, Planning & Assessment (Charles Bell)**

*Has not met. Putting together list of who is meeting with what division for RRF observations in spring.*

### **B. Curriculum (Thomas Hill)**

*Faculty Senate Chair report: Curriculum last met Tuesday. Things are moving along smoothly. Kudos to Thomas for doing a wonderful job in making things run well in curriculum.*

*C. Faculty Affairs (April Niemela)*

*Has not met since last meeting. Will not be meeting with Provost until 2<sup>nd</sup> week in December.*

*Faculty Senator question: Were there sabbaticals awarded?*

*Faculty Affairs Chair response: Yes, four sabbaticals were awarded and funded. Two were awarded full year and two were awarded semester long sabbaticals. Patterns were that people who have submitted sabbatical applications for multiple years were awarded. You get points for number of years of service, so those with longevity get more points, according to the policy. Encourage fellow colleagues to continue to apply for sabbatical.*

*Faculty Senator question: Will faculty be started to be notified of eligibility?*

*Faculty Senate Chair response: This will be part of the conversation with the Provost in December. When first addressed, we were told they were following policy. Policy states that faculty will be notified of eligibility for sabbatical. It more than likely may come across as a blanket statement to Deans with a reminder of deadline for submission. Notification of eligibility also depended on deans and chairs in the past. There were a lot of shifts in positions this past year, which changed notifications. More than likely, we will see initial notification of when faculty are now eligible, but faculty will not see notification sent for every year of eligibility.*

*Faculty Senator question: Was there any more conversation about the mini sabbatical idea?*

*Faculty Senate Chair response: There has not been further discussion about this. They didn't get a lot of feedback from divisions that mini sabbaticals would impact regarding use.*

*No further discussion.*

*D. Student Affairs (Peter Remien)*

*Student Affairs committee met again to work on the new Disruptive Students in the Classroom policy. Committee is currently halfway through the policy and holding productive conversations. Early next semester, Student Affairs committee will bring the full policy to Faculty Senate to review and discuss. Point of Contact will be Andy Hanson, VP of Student Affairs. Faculty are listed under impact. Faculty Senate will get a chance to look at it, with the goal for implementation in the next academic year.*

*Student Affairs requested that if you have had disruptive students and had to make decisions, it would be helpful to have actual instances where a student was disruptive to see how it goes through the decision tree in the policy regarding handling of the event to put the policy to the test and identify common themes. Goal is clear policy language and to be able to be all encompassing to cover most*

*situations. We have received good direction from VP Andy Hansen to ensure we continue to have control of what happens in our classroom.*

*Faculty Senator question: Is there language being developed in the policy on records kept for disruptive students with regard to their permanent record?*

*Student Affairs Committee Chair response: The policy is big on mechanisms for removing a disruptive student from class. It is on the instructor if you are dismissing a student in keeping good records of the incidence. It doesn't speak to ongoing, permanent records.*

---

## **VI. Good of the Order**

### **A. SCE Policy Discussion:**

*Faculty Senator question: We held a discussion of SCE policy a few meetings ago. Are we going to revisit the SCE discussion regarding comments after every question?*

*Faculty Senator Chair response: Comments after every section went live when SCEs came out. Cautioned by IR&E to not make changes with only one segment of data, which would lead to disaggregated data that wouldn't help to provide a trend. If we would like to revisit this conversation to come up with a different recommendation, we can certainly do so.*

*Faculty Senator response: Feedback is that in general, it is not the problem that they can comment after each section. The issue we are having is if you have one disgruntled student who stated that "instructor was the worst teacher" after every question, you can't identify if the multiple comments came from one student or multiple students. Instructors, Deans, etc. who evaluate us may not know the difference between one dissatisfied student or multiple dissatisfied students. IR&E did not want to include which student is commenting to keep anonymity with the SCE process.*

*Faculty Senator comment: This is a beta version of the SCEs. Now that we have gone live, how do we make changes with errors or issues, because we are getting bad data, if the concern is any changes made would lead to disaggregated data. What can we do about making this change?*

*General faculty consensus and discussion is that there needs to be a move to only one comment box at the bottom. This recommendation was brought up previously in a Faculty Senate Meeting as a suggestion, but it was not formally voted on in Faculty Senate.*

*Motion made by Rachelle Genthos that Faculty Senate would like to request a change to SCEs by moving away from comment boxes after each survey question to one comment box at the end of SCEs. Motion seconded by Jennifer Uptmor. Call for vote: Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion passes.*

### **B. Registrar's Office Updates:**

*Registrar's office put together a list of the different sections on campus. Some*

*students are confused about the different sections. There is a great online resource to send students on the website, which includes video. This is located on the Registrar's webpage, under the Register for Classes link. Link: <https://www.lcsc.edu/registrar/student-information/register-for-classes/section-descriptions>*

*Faculty Senator question: If someone is in WarriorWeb looking at the course catalog, will it link back to the Registrar's webpage?*

*Registrar response: Registrar will work with IT to figure out how to link it. They are moving away from adding customizations on the website but will look on how to link it in WarriorWeb. If a student tries to register for a particular class, they may get a pop up when they try to register.*

*Dual credit sections will be moved to Dual Enroll program for the high school students to enroll, to help avoid our students from enrolling in dual credit courses. We cannot move or hide prison sections in WarriorWeb.*

*Textbook information is also posted on that page via Warrior Instant Access. There are icons added to courses impacted by Warrior Instant Access that say "IA" to help give advanced warning that the cost of required textbooks and materials will be automatically added to your student account. Reminder that the "D" designates DEI-related courses.*

*Bookstore still has LCmail contact listed for some students. Some students may not be getting their textbook information. If this occurs, students can contact the bookstore to have them send to the @students.lcstate.edu email.*

*Regarding Warrior Instant Access, if the student drops from the course the first 10 days, they get refunded. After 10 days, IA is not refunded.*

*Motion to adjourn by Peter Remien. Motion seconded. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at 4:47 pm.*