



Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes

March 12th, 2026 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 136

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, Christina Brando-Subis, Jennifer Alexander, Bowie Rose, Marc Riendeau, April Niemela, Kim Tuschhoff, Vice President Andy Hanson

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

II. Approval of Faculty Senate meeting minutes from February 12th, 2026

Correction to the agenda – the February 12th, 2026, meeting was cancelled. Last Faculty Senate minutes were from January 29th, 2026, and are posted on the website.

Motion to approve minutes from January 29th, 2026, by Peter Remien. Motion second by Marc Riendau. Call for vote. Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion passes.

III. **Old Business**

A. Chairs Report

Thank you all for your flexibility in shifting Faculty Senate meeting dates. No further items for the Chair's report.

IV. **New Business**

A. Policy on Disruptive Students

Discussion and review of the new policy on Disruptive Students led by Student Affairs Committee Chair Peter Remien. The main order of business the committee was tasked with this year is to come up with a new policy to address disruptive behaviors in the classroom. This policy is meant to establish procedures to follow in the case of wanting to dismiss a student temporarily in class, and procedures that could be followed in the event of permanent dismissal.

Today will be the first read through of the policy with Faculty Senate. This policy is housed in Vice President's Hanson's office. Vice President Hanson has joined Faculty Senate today for the first read through.

Faculty Senator question to Vice President Hanson: What are the expectations for today for Faculty Senate – are we anticipating voting today on the policy?

Vice President Hanson response: Today is the first step in the approval process for the policy.

Faculty Senator question: Under Item 2. Definitions, under the definition of "disruptive behavior," could we elaborate more with additional descriptions of behaviors that fall under this category? Will we need to add specific items into our syllabi with the addition of this policy?

Student Affairs Committee Chair response: In their discussions on the policy in the committee, their discussion determined they could delineate all behaviors in the policy and be descriptive. An example is some programs, such as nursing, have their own program requirements, so we defer to those.

Faculty Senator question: Is there something that could be added in the general syllabus addendum to ensure every syllabus on campus has the same information listed?

Response: It would be nice to have a general standard be listed in the syllabi addendum that we could tweak to our program requirements. Feel like a description should be similar throughout the whole campus.

Response: What is similar right now in the syllabi addendum is the Student Code of Conduct?

Vice President Hanson response: What we are generally talking about makes sense. We are legally bound to respect First Amendment rights. First amendment rights do not extend to volume or frequency. For example, I have someone speaking up in class and claiming first amendment rights. What they say is protected, but frequency, timing, etc. may not be protected under First Amendment rights.

Faculty Senator question: Will we be creating a recommended addition to the syllabus addendum, such as putting the definition of disruptive behavior of the student in the syllabi? Could we add or list the Student Code of Conduct in the definitions?

Response: The current syllabus addendum has the student handbook and Student Code of Conduct already listed.

Faculty Senator question: Sometimes we see students who are very disrespectful to instructors. Is there something we can place in this policy about disrespectful behavior?

Response: Under 2. Definitions, A. Disruptive Behavior, it lists the definition of student behavior as "Student behavior in violation of course policies as defined by

the course syllabus and/ or published program requirements or otherwise deemed by the instructor to be detrimental to the educational environment," which gives instructors latitude over classroom management.

Faculty Senator response: Isn't disrespectful students covered in the Student Code of Conduct? Wouldn't referencing the Student Code of Conduct be covered in the policy? We could potentially add in "Student Code of Conduct" "published program requirements" in the definition.

Student Affairs Chair response: We had this same conversation in the committee regarding defining what is disrespectful and defining what is deemed by the instructor to be detrimental to the educational environment.

Vice President Hanson response: What we are anticipating is that this is an important policy to have in place, and hopefully not used often, but at least establishes guidelines for temporary and permanent dismissal.

Student Affairs Committee Chair questions: Is this policy prescriptive enough to help provide support for faculty – regarding steps identified in the dismissal procedure. Committee tried to be detailed in dismissal procedures to help assist in process.

Faculty Senator question: Will the Student Code of Conduct be rewritten or will it include a link to this policy?

Vice President Hanson response: If this policy is approved, Vice President Hanson will ensure this policy is cross referenced within the Student Code of Conduct.

Faculty Senator response: There is a typo on Initial response #3 – "revolve" should be "resolve."

Student Affairs Committee Chair response: This typo will be corrected.

Faculty Senator question: How much has the need increased for this kind of policy?

Vice President Hanson response: In the last 3-4 years, the inquiries regarding disruptive behaviors have been more frequent. About 4-5x a semester, he will get a question from a well-intended faculty member on what their rights are. Reminder that faculty hold the right to manage the classroom as you see fit.

Faculty Senator question: In section 4, under dismissal procedures, is there reason why temporary dismissal was defined as one or two class periods?

Student Affairs Committee Chair response: In the meeting, we discussed adding in "or as determined at discretion of the instructor." However, this causes issues with the de facto process. If the behavior continues, we should pursue permanent dismissal. If a student misses more than two class periods, it could cause an issue in that the student would have trouble making up course work or class.

Faculty Senator response: It might have a different impact for those students, depending on how often courses meet. Many syllabi also list absence policies, where so many absences could mean they do not pass the course.

Student Affairs Committee Chair response: The real point of this policy is in some situations where it is necessary to remove a student, it helps provide steps regarding gather evidence to provide VP Hanson to help make the best determination in the best interest of the faculty and to help provide evidence if the need arises to permanently remove the student from class.

Faculty Senator question: If we are needed to dismiss a student for part of a class today prior to the policy approval, would we still have to put it in writing?

Student Affairs Committee Chair response: As part of dismissal procedures, please notify the student in writing of their behaviors to create a record and copy the division chair and VP for Student Affairs.

Faculty Senator question: It says the student cannot attend class while they are under review for permanent dismissal. Are we expected to accommodate them with makeup assignments during this time?

Student Affairs Committee Chair response: This is in order to give VP Hanson's office enough time for a review. Timeline dictated by policy is that permanent dismissal will be fully reviewed and adjudicated within 10 business days. If the student is to return to the classroom, we will have made accommodation for the student to return. This is mentioned under C.5 Permanent Dismissal – The instructor should make reasonable accommodations for the dismissed student to make up work missed during the review process.

Faculty Senator question: Would there ever be a case to bypass temporary dismissal and move immediately to permanent dismissal?

Vice President Hanson response: There could be a cause if the behavior was egregious enough during the temporary dismissal phase to immediately shift to permanent dismissal. We normally like to see documentation of an initial warning first.

Faculty Senator response: There is a grammar correction needed under B. 1 Appeal Process. We should correct "dismission" to "dismissal" for clarity.

No further discussion. General consensus from Faculty Senate is they would like to bring this policy back to their divisions prior to making a motion for approval. Most divisions have not seen a draft of the policy yet. Next Faculty Senate Meeting is April 9th, and Faculty Association Meeting is April 16th.

Motion to take this current draft back to divisions for review and input prior to seeking final approval from Faculty Senate, with the goal of getting division feedback by April 9th made by Jennifer Cromer. Motion seconded. Call for vote: Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion carries.

Reminder to Faculty Senate to hold all discussions and gather feedback prior to April 9th Faculty Senate meeting. Goal is to get the policy through the approval process prior to end of semester, so Student Affairs office has time to make appropriate edits over the summer.

B. SCE tab on Warrior Hub

There is a new Student Course Evaluation tab on Warrior Hub per faculty request. This tab will still navigate similarly to how it did before. Please let the Faculty Senate Chair know if there is any feedback on use of the tab. Overall, it is easier to access now. This tab can be found in Warrior Hub under the "Academics" tab and is labeled "Course Evaluations." There are also tabs available for Luma and 25Live for ease of access.

C. Campus Employee Survey

Campus Employee Survey was sent out to employees. Please make sure you all fill out the survey.

Faculty Senator response: Reminder that there is no back button.

Faculty Senate Chair question: Were there any questions that we need clarification on from the Provost?

Faculty Senator response: There were some open-ended questions where faculty may not have knowledge or history to provide input, in addition to understanding associated benefits or costs that we may not have knowledge to help guide decision making.

Faculty Senator response: Tried to ask a question on Teams last time about what the issues with the current organizational structure. It may benefit faculty to have an understanding or historical knowledge of why we reorganized the first time (such as if it was to equalize workload among division chairs, etc.). We do not have the breadth of knowledge to understand what worked last time or why our current structure is not effective or working.

Faculty Senator response: We appreciate being asked today to provide input on the questions asked in the survey. Overall, felt the questions were too general and too broad.

Faculty Senator response: A past example of clarifying information was when in All Campus Meetings how the President describes several models of CEC to faculty to help us understand how to allocate resources or what to expect. It may be helpful to have several different structural models presented in order for faculty to understand what the end goal is for reorganization.

Faculty Senate Chair response: It sounds like the questions were broad enough to gather ideas to come back and ask more focused questions in the future. This is helpful information to bring back to the Provost. Will identify in conversation with the Provost that the data gathered may not provide much context to move forward due to confusion on the open-ended questions.

Faculty Senator response: On the questions that used a scale, there were no options for "I don't know" or "Not Applicable." Adding these options may make the survey more user-friendly.

Faculty Senator question: Would you have preferred that there are two separate surveys or one survey? Would faculty have completed both surveys?

Faculty Senator question: Could people with different expertise areas opt in to ad hoc groups to help contribute information on reorganization? Rationale for this is if this impacts our lives significantly, would we want to have the people who it impacts provide as much information as possible.

Faculty Senator response: It may have been ideal to split the survey into two surveys.

Faculty Senator response: It would be difficult to split the survey in two because it makes data collection difficult for tracking purposes.

Faculty Senate Chair response: If you haven't filled out the survey, please do so. It closes tomorrow, March 13th. Please encourage all faculty in your divisions to complete the survey. Will send out the link to the survey via email after the meeting. Historically, the response rate is super low on a similar survey (around 17%). Would like to see a 50% response rate from faculty.

No further discussion.

V. Committee Reports

A. Budget, Planning & Assessment (Charles Bell)

Compiled all observations and the report. Submitted the report to the Provost. Will be available to all of us when published. Date TBD.

B. Curriculum (Thomas Hill)

No reports from Curriculum Committee today.

C. Faculty Affairs (April Niemela)

Provided detailed feedback on sabbatical policy. Made changes, and changes sent back to Provost Chilson for review.

Faculty Senator question: Have you heard about the possibility of sabbaticals for next year.

Faculty Senate Chair response: The President indicated that this is still a priority for faculty for this next year.

D. Student Affairs (Peter Remien)

See above discussion on first read through of policy on disruptive behaviors.

VI. Good of the Order

A. Faculty and Staff Awards March 26th 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Reminder the Awards event will occur next week. Please attend the event.

Faculty Senator question: Have we received any feedback on whether award winners will be notified prior to the event?

Faculty Senate Chair response: No, we have not been notified of award winner notification process.

Faculty Senator question: We have not had our Faculty Emeriti presentations yet this semester at a Faculty Association meeting. We usually honor them at the awards ceremony, which is taking place next week. Will this process not occur before the awards ceremony?

Faculty Senate Chair response: Will follow up with the Provost and do the leg work to figure out how to clarify our retirees who were nominated for Emeritus status and what that process looks like moving forward. Nominations were due from Division Chairs to the Provost's office last week. Will get ahold of the Provost to identify if a brief Faculty Association meeting is needed for this or if we can do an email poll. If an email poll occurs, we will still have Faculty Emeriti presentations at the next Faculty Association meeting to ensure these individuals are recognized at the meeting.

B. Faculty Senator question RE: Emeritus Faculty Keeping LC Email

Faculty Senator question: Did the Provost ever give a response regarding the status of emeritus faculty keeping faculty emails? This is needed to ensure they have access to log into library databases in the library. Several of our Emeriti faculty use the library databases or utilize interlibrary loans currently, and without an email, it provides a significant barrier.

Faculty Senate Chair response: The email system we are using currently is not free to allow Emeritus faculty to continue use of their LC email. It costs around \$36-50 a year per person. There has been a cost in trying to balance what we can and can't provide with the additional costs entailed. We are working on trying to list or keep a database of Emeritus faculty members on our website, which could be accessed easily. We are working to come up with a solution, but do not yet have a cost-effective solution.

Faculty Senator question: Email access was a part of the Emeritus status designation. Is there some kind of workaround in being able to maintain this access?

Faculty Senator question: Would faculty emeritus be willing to pay for their own emails to maintain access to library resources and keep their email? Is that an option they could be given?

Faculty Senator question: Could we just poll the Faculty Emeritus peer group to see if they would be willing to pay for this resource.

Faculty Senate Chair response: Will pose these questions to administration and IT.

Faculty Senator response: The hesitancy is if we provide email access for one person, we have to do it for everyone. It would make sense to have a process, such

as if a Faculty Emeritus is actively using their email, we would maintain email access. If they haven't used it in a year, then it is deactivated by IT. Could there be an annual renewal opt in process?

Faculty Senator question: How long does someone who retires want and need to keep their email address?

Faculty Senate Chair response: Good idea to address. This would decrease the burden on IT as well. At this moment, there are more faculty emeriti than current faculty.

Faculty Senator question: What is the process other institutions use?

Faculty Senate response: Information is vague on their websites, due to not having a public facing policy with details.

Faculty Senator Response: UI does allow non-UI email addresses to use SSO. There are other ways for them to grant library access.

Faculty Senator response: It would be great to find a workaround but would love to have emeriti obtain access they need.

Faculty Senate Chair: Will bring back feedback to Provost/IT.

C. VP Hanson – Contract Cheating

Interesting phenomenon happening at similar sister institutions called "Contract Cheating." Students are hiring people to take their Canvas materials and complete their courses for them. This new method was discovered when someone notified the campus when a student didn't pay the person who was taking their courses for them. We have started investigating this at LC. We identified 47 suspicious Canvas log ins where someone was in another country and the US within two hours of each other. We are continuing to review those Canvas log in conflicts and will approach faculty who are impacted by this suspicious activity. This is preliminary review but is occurring at other institutions. This concept was presented at the Registrar's Council meeting.

Faculty Senator question: Is this something we need to bring back to our divisions?

Vice President Hanson response: As of right now, no. There are too many unknowns. This would be considered a violation of student code of conduct. We are continuing to gather more information and will keep everyone informed. We need more information before presenting to campus as a whole.

In addition, we have noticed a new ghost student phenomenon for institutions who have gone away from in-person testing. What this means is students are using AI to replicate the student on the screen that it appears the student is on the screen and engaged, but it is another person taking the exam. This was noticed as an issue when faculty members identified the students using this method were not blinking.

Faculty Senator question: In the Contract Phenomenon situation above, what about bilingual students who need assistance with exams, etc.? The Testing Center stated they were unable provide any assistance.

Vice President Hanson response: Will follow up with the Testing Center on this question. He does have several resources to provide for those bilingual students or ESL students who are struggling in their classes.

Motion to adjourn made by Marc Riendeau. Motion seconded by Jenna Chambers. Call for vote. Unanimous approval. Motion carries. Meeting adjourned at 4:28 pm.