LEWIS CLARK STATE COLLEGE

Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
September 11th, 2025 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 134

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

I. **Call to Order by Faculty Senate President, Charles Bell at 3:16 p.m.**

II. **Approval of Faculty Senate meeting minutes from August 28th, 2025**

Motion to approve meeting minutes as written from August 28th, 2025, by Rodney Farrington. Motion seconded by Peter Remien. Call for vote. All in favor. Two abstentions. Motion passes.

III. **Old Business**
   No items addressed.

IV. **New Business**

   A. **SPRC Committee pre-election Review**
      a. *See discussion below under SPRC appointee requirements.*

   B. **SPRC appointee requirements (discussion)**
   - *Review of Policy 1.102 Operational Guidelines regarding SPRC committee make-up by Faculty Senate Chair Charles Bell.*

   On review, the policy identifies those who can serve in the roles on the SPRC committee include one faculty member at associate professor level, one member at full professor level, one faculty member of any rank, and a chair. An issue with the policy is identifying timing issues on the committee, including those coming on or off the committee in addition to what timeframe a faculty member of any rank serves (one- or three-year term). Secondary issue seen within the policy is identifying what rank the chair needs to hold. On our website, SPRC members are all currently listed for three-year terms, which doesn't match our policy. With turnover this year, we are short one person and do not have a chair. Only one or two members on the SPRC committee had

been through the process to serve and understand the chair role of the committee. Most of the members agreed to stay for a longer term.

In addition, in CTE, we no longer hire promotable faculty members but instead now hire instructors without rank. Currently, there are 23 faculty members within CTE, 11 which are non-promotable/instructor rank. This means we are limited in members who can serve on this committee per policy. Some of these individuals who can serve on the committee do not meet rank requirements. Faculty Senate Chair has been working with the Provost and CTE faculty members to identify restructuring of the committee to accommodate changes in faculty makeup. Some of those changes will include those who can serve a 3-year term. The committee can choose their own chair which serves a revolving term. In the future, once many of our promotable faculty members go through promotion, the committee may not have many faculty to run through the committee in the long term. Overall summary for relooking at policy is that the committee is short on people who meet qualifications to serve. If we are in violation of a policy reviewing promotion, and there was an issue with promotion moving forward, the applicant applying for promotion may by default, be promoted because committee is outside of policy, allowing the opportunity for the individual to file a grievance.

The request is to go back to our divisions that have former BTS members serving in them, to identify how many members this impacts in our different divisions.

Questions to bring back to the division: If a faculty member serves as instructor without rank that isn't promotable, should we have them serve on a committee the reviews promotion for their peers. They may run out of members. Over time, we do not want a precedent to have non-promotable people serving on this committee.

We have two members who have agreed to serve. Andy Tuschhoff has agreed to serve another term, and to serve as chair of the SPRC committee this year.

- *Discussion:*

Faculty Senator question: What is the logic behind having an associate professor serve a 3-year term, but only a 1-year term for full professor?

Faculty Senate Chair response: There is not any historical background on why these terms were chosen. SPRC structure was modeled off the STPRC.

Faculty Senator question: What is the background in moving to not hiring promotable faculty in CTE?

Faculty Senate Chair response: Instead of offering a promotion track in CTE, they are offering an instructor without rank position which allows them to offer a higher wage that is tied to 80% of CUPA instead of initial standard. Incoming non-promotable faculty are coming in at $55,000 instead of $45-$47K. The downside is they are not eligible for promotion. If they were hired for a promotion track, they must start at a lower wage, which makes it difficult to recruit. In addition, many incoming CTE faculty will come with certificates in their specialty, but do not have the terminal degree initially for promotion.

Having them try to meet the promotion criteria without the terminal degree makes it difficult in the promotion process.

Faculty Senator question: Was hiring an instructor without rank part of a state-mandated or institution decision?

Faculty Senate Chair response: There is not a clear answer. It appears this change came mostly from the state due to institutional push from positions open for longer without any applicants. We do still have many open positions, but the decision was made to try to recruit and hire for those positions.

Faculty Senator question: Andy Tuschhoff's name is spelled incorrectly on the SPRC list on the website. Can this be corrected.

Faculty Senate Chair response: This will be corrected.

Faculty Senator question: If we are cleaning up SPRC language in the policy, should we also clean up the STPRC language as well?

Faculty Senate Chair response: STRPC language regarding committee terms of service was updated in 2023 to three-year terms due to similar issues.

No further questions.

- *Current list of those who will be filling seats for SPRC:*

Dave France has agreed to serve as the 5th person in SPRC. Others on the committee will agree to serve 1–3-year terms. Andy Tuschhoff has agreed to serve as chair for the next year. Currently, they have identified 4 faculty this year who are eligible to apply for promotion, one from T&I. There are 7-8 individuals up for promotion each year for the next two years.

Other SPRC members: Jay Kimble (T&I), Jennifer James (NHS), Sam Coulter (Hum), Andy Tuschhoff (Hum/T&I).

Will run a poll on Monday. Are there any objections to nominating Dave France for the 5th seat and for the individuals currently serving to serve for one more year to fill the committee. Not looking for a motion today, but up for discussion today. Please present to your divisions.

C. **Student Petitions Committee Appointment**

Faculty Senate Chair reviewed of Policy 1.102 Faculty Governance – Section 7 Student Petitions Committee with the Faculty Senate.

In the past, faculty were appointed to the committee by vote of the Faculty Association. Last year, we placed Student Petitions Committee into policy, which now identifies appointment to the Student Petitions Committee is made by Faculty Senate. This policy, while approved through appropriate channels, was not posted on the website.

Structure is located into policy, including structure of committee. Per policy, the Student Petition Committee is composed of 4 faculty members, 1 division chair, a Committee Chair that is a Dean or its designee, and two ex-officio members; the Registrar and Director of Financial Aid, for a total of 8 committee members.

Dean Ober has been the perpetual chair of the committee. We are short currently one member. We typically vote on this in the spring.

Peggy Mata has rotated off. In the spring, Faculty Association was tasked with voting in one position between two nominees, and Megan Goforth was voted in by Faculty Association by majority vote. We have since identified the need for both nominees for the committee. Our other nominee during spring vote was Bill Frei.

Motion made by Marc Riendeau to appoint Bill Frei to Student Petitions Committee. Motion seconded by Peter Remien. Call for Vote. Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion passes.

D. Policy on Policies 1.100 (discussion)

Faculty Senate Chair reviewed Policy 1.100 LC State Policy and Procedures (Policy on Policies) with the Faculty Senate.

In the process of policy development and revisions from when the policy is submitted to the appropriate parties and implemented (posted or used as official policy at LCSC), the policy seems to disappear or is not posted to the website. One example is the Student Petitions Committee policy was added to Policy 1.102 during the March Faculty Senate meeting but was lost at some point in the process of policy amendment.

A process is outlined in 5. Policy Development or Revision, regarding if policies are proposed, and what occurs. Policy owner drafts a new policy, coordinates with relevant units and follows the chain of command up to getting the new policy printed off and handed to the President for final approval. The current policy states after the President approves the policy, it will be officially implemented. On our end, there is a gap in what implemented means, and the timeframe of when we can function under that policy and when the policy is posted on the website.

Reason for discussion is to bring forward ideas from Faculty Senate regarding how to improve the policy and continue discussions with the Provost and President regarding timeframes we can suggest ensuring we make effective progress.

Faculty Senate goal is if we work to improve policies, it would be helpful if policies are approved for them to be posted in our policies and procedures manual for next spring, and as anything else comes up throughout the year. Student Affairs committee made several changes to the policies.

- *Discussion and Call for Questions:*

Faculty Senator question: We have great timelines implemented in Promotion and Tenure and Faculty Sabbatical policies. Would this be a great area to implement a timeline for policy approvals?

Faculty Senate Chair response: Admin may be opposed to timelines in policy due to being restricted to certain timeframe for review and approval.

Registrar response: Registrar's office has been reviewing several policies due to a FERPA audit and did note some of the policies did not reflect the current updates, such as use of old terminology like "LCmail". Since Kyle, the President's Assistant, was appointed, he has been doing a great job in getting items posted

Faculty Senator question: Clarification on when does a revised or new policy become actual policy? This needs to be clarified more in Policy 1.100, as the current language does not specify. Should we have language in the policy that states "within X number of days, this policy will be implemented/posted".

Faculty Senate Chair response: There is specific language regarding clear timelines on interim college policies, which can only be a policy for 6 months. We just do not have timelines regarding permanent college policies.

Faculty Senator question: Once the policies have changed, it would be nice to outline what steps need to occur to get the changes approved (what administrative offices it has to go through or a workflow method).

Faculty Senate Chair response: Unsure if there is a workflow method available for use for this. There is no clarity in the timeframe regarding when to reach back out to follow up on policies that passed through Faculty Senate/Faculty Association. Faculty Senate doesn't own this policy, but we can make a reasonable recommendation to admin on what we would like to see.

Faculty Senator comment: Regarding timeframe, posting within a semester seems like a reasonable timeframe.

Faculty Senator question: If a policy becomes official because the President has approved it, a semester lag after policy approval is too long. If the policy isn't official until it is posted, how would we know which policy is the official one, if the voted on and approved updated policy isn't posted.

Faculty Senator clarification RE: previous comment: Would like to clarify, the timeframe of a semester would be how long it takes for the policy to make it through the chain of approvals and is posted.

Faculty Senator question: When can the policies be posted? Is there a certain timeframe or period new policies are added to our Policy and Procedures on the website.

Registrar response: Web site postings, which include approved policies and procedures, can be posted at any time. We no longer have web editors on campus but will now have designated people working on the website.

Faculty Senate Chair response: While the process is getting better with new transitions, the goal is to try to identify some guardrails on process, especially with change of personnel.

Registrar response RE: Workflow: Many of the policies that come through the Registrar are tracked with regards to policy review and areas to sign off that they were part of the review/workflow process. This is one way policy workflow is tracked.

Faculty Senate Chair comment: We are trying to identify where communication between Faculty Senate and Administration falls through when we are not listed as being impacted by policy, which would mean we are not included in the workflow.

Faculty Senator question: If one policy goes into effect later, but you are completing work based on the posted policy, how does that impact campus? Are you held to the policy that is approved but not posted?

Faculty Senate Chair response: If the policy goes into effect, it would be good to identify an adjustment period by stating this policy will go into effect on a certain date. One example could be with our new Office Hours policy; it would be helpful to state when the new policy would be enforced.

Faculty Senator question: Is there a way to notify faculty/campus when policies have been posted? Also, could we put a timeframe on when items or policies will be updated, such as once a semester, etc. so we are not frequently having to look for updated items?

Faculty Senator question: Is this something that could be posted in Monday message regarding updates to when the new and revised policies are posted and what dates they go into effect?

Faculty Senate Chair response: That is a great idea.

Registrar response: We may have to go through all the policies again when we have our name change. In addition, some policies are under once-a-year review.
Faculty Senator question: Could we ask IT if it would be possible to look at the policies on the webpage and "Ctrl F" these policies to find items we are looking for a bit easier?

Faculty Senate Chair response: The way our policies are currently posted on the policy website, we can click a link on the individual policies to read it. There is not one cumulative or comprehensive policy manual to search or "Ctrl F". You would have to open each policy to identify what you are looking for. Would this be beneficial to faculty to have this function? Did you feel you had good guidance as a new employee in finding policies?

Faculty Senate general response: No and they would appreciate the "Ctrl F" features for policies and procedures.

Faculty Senator comment: As a new faculty, it was difficult to dig through the policies to find items. It would be beneficial to also have a comprehensive policy manual to be able to easily search.

No further discussion.

E.   Committee Reports

A.   Budget, Planning & Assessment *(Charles Bell)*
Committee has not met yet. No report.

B. **Curriculum** *(Thomas Hill)*
Curriculum committee has met. The Curriculum Committee Chair brought a request to the last Chair's Council regarding any of the new proposals coming in before the October 1st deadline need to include the new syllabi template with the DEI statement in there.

Faculty Senator question: Met with admin today to set up information regarding ITCs for CTE. Are we still able to submit proposals for ITCs even if they may be pushed back at the Provost level?

Curriculum Chair Response: I do not have the answer for you today but have requested a separate conversation for more clarification to bring back to the committee.

C. **Faculty Affairs** *(April Niemela)*
Committee has not met yet. No report.

D. **Student Affairs** *(Peter Remien)*
Student Affairs Committee Chair met with Andy Hanson. Set goals for this year with a focus on crafting a policy to deal with disruptive students in the classroom, and a policy to identify a procedure for temporary removal of disruptive students and a method to bring students back into class. Another item for the committee is to work on the new Living, Learning Centers and emphasize the learning portion to make it meaningful for students, with ideas like common reads, having professors come in a facilitate activities, etc. Will be seeking faculty input.

Will be putting out a Doodle Poll for first Student Affairs meeting in September.

Faculty Senator question: Can you tell us more about the Living/Learning Centers?

Student Affairs Chair response: We do have some new Living/Learning Centers on campus, and we want to make them meaningful experiences for students.

Faculty Senator question: Clarification: These students are cohabitating with a common area?

Student Affairs Chair response: Yes.

Faculty Senator response: One idea is to hold fireside chats.

Faculty Senator response: We have two education housing units where students cohabit in the house with a shared living room. One of them has a backyard BBQ and is located on the corner of 7th and 10th next to the garden. Currently, the old music building has been turned into a Living/Learning Center which houses the dance team.

F. **Good of the Order**

A. **Events Attendance (query)**

Faculty Senate Chair question. There are some events such as the Employee Recognition Banquet in the spring that are not well attended. I would like to brainstorm ideas on how to make it more meaningful for faculty.

Discussion:

Faculty Senate General Consensus: Would recommend not scheduling or holding the event when most faculty are teaching. It makes it difficult to have to reschedule or identify different activities for their classes in order to attend the event. It also sets a bad precedent to cancel class to attend an award banquet. Thursday afternoons are difficult for most faculty regarding their teaching schedules.

Faculty Senator question: Could we keep the awards for the faculty and the recognition of the faculty in the Lewiston Tribune and social media, but maybe not hold the event if not well attended?

Faculty Senator question: During events such as graduation and convocation, a lot of time is spent on recognizing the same faculty multiple times. Is there a way to streamline this, so faculty getting recognize do feel valued, but also not take away from student events?

Faculty Senator response: Historically, the Faculty Recognition Banquet used to be an evening banquet, but faculty stopped attending due to its length.

Faculty Senator response: Many individuals winning awards are not told they won, so it makes it difficult for faculty to attend or to invite their families. Even if they were aware and could invite family, an event at 1:30 – 2 pm makes it difficult for loved ones to attend to celebrate due to family/friends work and school obligations.

Faculty Senator question: How can we celebrate faculty without a face-to-face event? We also want to make the distinction that the awards are important, but we are learning away from the event itself.

Faculty Senator question: They have heard from individuals in the community who were asking why faculty walked in before students at graduation. Shouldn't the students walk in first to celebrate the students?

Faculty Senator response: The individual graduation ceremonies keep getting longer. If we can get rid of faculty recognition at each graduation ceremony, it would shorten the ceremony.

Faculty Senator question: If we are trying to focus on the students at commencement, when it is announced that the faculty have voted on and conferred these degrees, wouldn't it be impactful to have faculty stand and face students. Also, should we also take this discussion regarding faculty attendance at events back to division?

Faculty Senate Chair response: Yes.

Faculty Senator response: The Faculty Recognition banquet was one method to bring all faculty on campus together. It may be wise to brainstorm other ideas on how to bring faculty together on campus to help boost morale.

B. Update to Windows 11:

If your computer does not have Windows 11 on it, you are required to get it updated, otherwise, it will stop connecting to the network. If you see a computer in the classrooms you teach without Windows 11, please contact IT and let them know it is not updated. Helpdesk is ready to receive tickets if you notice a classroom is not updated. They have 281 computers that still have not been updated to Windows 11. The deadline is October 1st.

C. *Faculty Senator Question re: Duo Mobile: It is possible to make our lengthy Windows passwords visible when we type them in so we don't make mistakes? There is not a visibility icon available.*

Faculty Senator Chair response: I will ask IT about this.

D. *Announcement: There is a new CEO from the LC Valley Chamber of Commerce, Mark Losh. Would recommend reaching out to him, as he will be a great collaborative community partner.*

E. *Leif Hoffman, Natalie Holman, and Angela Wartel are taking students to Washington DC in March. They are selling Kristy Kremes this month as a fundraiser if you would like a box.*

Motion to adjourn made by Rachelle Genthos. Motion seconded by Marc Riendeau. Call for vote. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm