



Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes

October 9th, 2025 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 135

Present: Jennifer Uptmor, Peter Remien, Gina Lott, Jennifer Cromer, Jenna Chambers, Rikki Ober, Eric Stoffregen, Jessica Savage, Rachelle Genthôs, Angela Wartel, Debra Lybyer, Thomas Hill, Provost Chilson, Kim Tuschhoff, Isac Ortega, Charles Bell, April Niemela

- A. **Call to Order** by Faculty Senate Chair Charles Bell at 3:16 pm.
- B. Approval of Faculty Senate meeting minutes from September 25th, 2025

Motion made to approve Faculty Senate meeting minutes from September 25th, 2025, as written by Eric Stoffregen. Motion seconded by Peter Remien. Call for vote. No further discussion. Unanimous approval. Motion passes.

- C. **Old Business**

- D. Chair's Report

Faculty Senate Chair reported he is working on a comprehensive campus policy manual. Both IT and the President's Executive Assistant are collaborating on merging the policies into one manual but have also identified some challenges. The policy website is still under construction, so be patient with everyone as we work out these challenges. The website will be fixed. They have identified at minimum that we will be able to create a comprehensive document per policy section, as we will be unable to have one large, combined policy manual. These updates will at least narrow our policies down to 5 documents for ease of searching instead of over 100 different documents.

SBOE is currently running a pilot group during our SBOE visit. They reached out to the Faculty Senate Chair and Chair-Elect to meet one-on-one with SBOE members during their campus visit. This differs as the SBOE generally does not meet with small groups of faculty. The request was to meet with

faculty leadership and have queried leadership for topics for the agenda. Charles and April identified a few items for the meeting agenda.

B. SPRC policy language

Policy 1.102 Section 6: SPRC Makeup

Faculty Senate Chair reported that suggested alterations to Policy 1.102 Section 6 SPRC makeup is located in Faculty Senate team since the last Faculty Senate meeting. Faculty Senate Chair also held conversations with a few faculty senate chairs regarding potential alterations to this policy. One idea proposed was to dissolve the rest of the SPRC committee and integrate it into the STPRC. We could allow one CTE representative on the committee to help with CTE oversight. Rationale is membership and availability of eligible faculty members is reduced for the SPRC committee. General feedback regarding being a member of the STPRC committee makeup is not burdensome in relation to time commitments. This might suggest incorporating this into STPRC could work.

Faculty Senator question: If this committee exists for only twelve faculty moving forward, and if none of these individuals leave to go to another institution, is this an issue we need to worry about regarding absorbing SPRC into the STPRC committee now or down the line?

Faculty Senate Chair response: The longest timeline regarding need for the SPRC committee with the remaining eligible faculty members who could apply for promotion would be around 9 years. There may be a few others in other divisions regarding BTS faculty, but this committee would still standing for only twelve members. Several currently hold the assistant professor position and are up for promotion next year. Most will be eligible for promotion within the next 5 years, and a few remaining for the 4 years after that.

Faculty Senator question: Is there value in talking with Matt Johnston, the chair of STPRC for comment on whether the SPRC committee can be absorbed into STPRC.

Faculty Senate Chair response: Feedback from SPRC committee indicated they didn't have any feedback about combining the two committees, except to indicate that it would be important to have at least one CTE representative or position on the committee. There is still clarity in the policy regarding the differences in promotion criteria for faculty.

Faculty Senator question: When do you want detailed feedback from the divisions regarding proposed suggestions to policy?

Faculty Senate Chair response: We have time to review this and gather feedback. A tentative goal would be to get this completed by end of spring. We are not in a rush.

Faculty Senator question: Can you outline in brief what the main changes are to the policy?

Faculty Senate Chair response: The SPRC has very strict requirements of who can serve on the committee, directed at rank and limited terms depending on rank. This puts the onus on faculty leadership to nominate new people during Faculty Association meetings. An example is the Associate Professor that is on the committee is the only one who overlaps regarding time committee with the others who hold a separate rank, which poses of issue of continual knowledge of the committee. Currently, only 5 members of CTE hold the rank of Assistant Professor. By next year, we will only have one Assistant Professor left in CTE to fill the position on the committee as currently described in the policy. In ensuring we have institutional knowledge on the committee, the current full professor positions are limited by policy to only serve one-year terms. Removing specific terms dependent on rank would ensure everyone the same term/timeframe. Hopefully, we will not have turnover of all positions occurring at the same time in order to hold historical knowledge on the committee. One idea is to also make it so Faculty Senate Chairs can make the decision to dissolve the faculty once all promotable faculty members have been promoted. Guidelines may also change. Faculty Senate Chair reported we haven't had a lot of division feedback. Further discussion moved to future Faculty Senate agenda item once all divisions had opportunity for input.

Faculty Senator question: Is this the time to vote on policy changes to move forward to Faculty Association?

Faculty Senate Chair response: We may need more feedback from divisions before making a decision. Faculty Senate has the time to review policy changes in order to make the best decision. It is important to ensure faculty have input.

No further discussion or reports.

E. New Business

A. Remarks from the Provost regarding State board and Accreditation

Provost Chilson extended thanks to those faculty who encouraged students or brought students to the career fair. He reported we had a wide variety of employers available today. One item of feedback from our employers who attended the career fair was to ask students to bring copies of their current resumes with them to the next Career Fair.

Second item: SBOE visit will be occurring on campus next week. If you are involved in meetings or in our upcoming NWCCU accreditation visit, please be ready and prepared. The Provost reported we did a great job preparing our accreditation report for our upcoming visit. NWCCU has not yet reached out

for additional clarification on the report as of today. The NWCCU visit schedule is available on the Academic Affairs website under Accreditation. The schedule lists the various meetings and designated individuals who are assigned to attend the meetings. One question that has been asked frequently is if you are not on the list, should you attend the meeting? Faculty are free to participate in meetings listed for faculty and general education-type meetings. The Deans also provided a list of names of those who will be attending other meetings on the agenda. Please review the agenda, and identify if there are areas you are able to participate in. These visits are a great chance to showcase how great LC State is.

Faculty Senator question: Where would we find the SBOE visit schedule/agenda? Will the link come out in the Monday message?

Provost response: The meeting schedule/agendas are hosted on the SBOE website. For the SBOE meeting, there will be a full agenda and partial agenda available. This session will be streamed as well on YouTube. It is great for faculty to make an appearance to the meeting.

Faculty Senator Question: Will the SBOE visit be similar to accreditation where we will know when and when not to attend.

Provost response: The SBOE visit will be streamed on YouTube, so you can watch it online. There will also be a faculty panel where faculty will be presenting.

Faculty Senate Chair response: There is a specific time for the faculty forum for our NWCCU accreditation visit. Faculty Senate Chair will send out a meeting invite for faculty/staff forums to place on faculty radar if they would like to attend. Same thing for the agenda, there is a whole list of items for the different sections they will hold on the SBOE agenda.

Faculty Senator question: Are both visits happening concurrently?

Faculty Senate Chair response: The SBOE visit will be occurring October 15th – 17th. NWCCU is here the following week, starting October 20th.

Third item: Provost also queried Faculty Senate on how use of the bookstore is going this semester. He reported we ran a pilot of Inclusive Access use this past fall with the nursing program and a few other courses on campus. Inclusive access integrates financial aid and student accounts with information at the bookstore and is included as part of their student fees. The bulk of items within inclusive access contain digital-type or eBooks. If the student ends up withdrawing from a course, the publisher will take away access to the student. Students are also able to opt out of inclusive access. Use of inclusive access would guarantee that students have all the access for what they need for their courses.

Call for discussion:

Faculty Senator Comment: Senator reported they had difficulties as their prison education books didn't come in until 6 weeks into the semester. Bookstore was not able to provide a rationale for the delay.

Faculty Senate comments: Many faculty/divisions reported displeasure at the timeliness of getting textbooks and resources ordered and into the bookstore were delayed again this semester.

Provost question: How many faculty are using paper books?

Faculty Senate response: Multiple faculty indicated they provided paper as an option for their textbooks.

Provost response: There may be a time when we need to decide if we are using new versions of the textbooks every year or identify ways to stay in advance of technology.

Provost question: How many are using the digital access codes to take you to the supplemental items?

Faculty Senate response: Overall consensus is many faculty are using digital access codes to utilize textbook resources.

Faculty Senator comment: We are able to indicate use of older versions of textbooks. However, this increases costs of the textbooks to students as the publisher and bookstore have to source multiple copies of the old edition to hand out to students.

Faculty Senator Comment: Expressed issues with phone communication with bookstores and publishers. In the previous year, when the textbooks were late, the publisher provided the first three chapters to the instructor who was able to upload them to Canvas for access. This was helpful this semester.

Provost comment: The Provost reported that the bookstore and the campus are going to continue the pilot run of inclusive access in the spring with specific groups. The bookstore has also been given specific student instructions regarding processes and timelines. Faculty need to be aware that requiring hard copies of textbooks comes with its own set of challenges. As we continue to pilot inclusive access or if you are experiencing challenges with the bookstore, please contact the Provost for follow-up.

Faculty Senate question: Are students able to opt out of the inclusive access pilot? What percentage of students are opting out.

Provost response: Shared that students are given the option to opt out of inclusive access. Not very many opted out this semester. Reminder to keep in mind if we require these resources, these students need this resource to pass the course. Movement to inclusive access is to help provide less expensive resources for our students in order to be successful.

Student feedback: Most students expressed issues regarding how difficult it is to enter access codes.

Provost response: Inclusive access allows textbooks and resources to be accessible in the Canvas course so use of access codes isn't needed.

Faculty Senator question: Faculty are required to enter in textbook information early on in the semester before. Why does it take so long to get the textbooks ordered and available for the student?

Provost response: We have had a lot of transitions in the bookstore positions, which has impacted timing. If we order a book for fall, we order it in early spring to allow student access. Federal law specifically states when a student registers for the course, they should see the list of required textbooks.

Faculty Senator question: How long will students be able to access their textbooks and resources in their Canvas courses or how do they access resources outside of the semester, if they purchase the item?

Faculty Senator response: Students will continue to be able to access these resources through the publisher's website/platform outside of the semester, when they lose access to their Canvas courses.

Provost response: All the textbooks should be on campus at least a week before the semester starts. Please send any ideas you may have to share on timeliness of textbooks to the Provost. Vice-President Andy Hanson and team met to give some tentative dates to the bookstore. They will meet with Deans and Chairs in the discussion regarding dates we have to be firm on to ensure textbooks are here.

Faculty Senator question: Are any of these textbooks that are being delayed rentals? A family member reported having issues because the rental is just for 30-day-timeframe, which is problematic when they do not receive them in time.

Provost comment: Inclusive access is a purchase not a rental. With digital access, there is no possibility of buyback for the textbook.

No further questions or comments on bookstore timeframe or resources.

Call for any other questions.

Faculty Senator question: Curriculum committee wanted to propose an idea of waiving the fee for graduating with a certificate, as it can be a cost prohibitive idea for students to have to provide extra fees for a certificate, even if they meet requirements. Is this a possibility we can look at waiving this fee for graduation.

Provost response: We have several situations where students who are eligible to obtain multiple credentials may only get one of their credentials because of extra fees. The Provost is working with Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to identify a plan moving forward.

Faculty Senator question: During advisor training, we were told that if WarriorWeb states the class is offered in the incorrect semester then the

semester it is offered, we may need clarification on if we submit a curriculum proposal to correct the course to the correct semester offering?

Provost response: If it is an internal issue, the Registrar's office is able to correct it internally without a curriculum proposal if we are just getting the course or rotation back on track. Please send the information to our Registrar Kim Tuschhoff, so she can make changes in system instead of having to navigate it through curriculum.

No further questions.

B. Academic Affairs site information and dashboard

Faculty Senate Chair pulled up Academic Affairs website to show where agenda and schedule can be found. Faculty Senators and faculty are encouraged to review the information over on the Academic Affairs site, including LC State's Strategic Plan and Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (Seven Year). Recommendation to review information if you attend the faculty/staff panels, as questions and discussion topics most likely will revolve around the report provided.

F. Committee Reports

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

Committee met. No work items until Spring.

B. Curriculum (*Thomas Hill*)

October 1st deadline has come and gone. Any new proposals will not be implemented until AY 27-28 if submitted after the October 1st deadline.

Math 253 is being renumbered to MATH 254. This number change is a state requirement to keep us aligned with other 4-year institutions. MATH 253 course is located in language in various catalogs, syllabi, etc. in all divisions across campus. If your division requires MATH 253 as a Gen Ed specific requirement, the Registrar's office will be able to make the substitution on their end. If you require a substitution for this course for a division or program requirement, you will need to submit a change through curriculum committee so that the degree audits accurately reflect the change. Please bring this back to divisions. We are trying to anticipate changes now.

Encourage everyone that you can still submit curriculum proposals now for the following academic year (27-28). It would be beneficial for the curriculum committee to have advance notice to review the proposals now.

Highly encourage everyone to not wait until the last minute on the deadline to submit curriculum proposals/changes.

C. Faculty Affairs (*April Niemela*)

Want to emphasize what a great group of faculty that make up the Faculty

Affairs committee this year. With the next two weeks with our SBOE and Accreditation visits, Faculty Affairs committee was able to meet last night and have a robust, substantive discussion of each of the sabbatical applications. Waiting for the deans to submit their letters of recommendation on October 15th. At that point in time, we will be moving forward with our recommendations regarding sabbatical applicants.

Faculty Senator question: Is it appropriate to share how many applications were submitted for sabbatical?

Faculty Affairs Chair response: There were 6 sabbatical applications submitted. We were impressed with quality of the applications that were submitted. Thank you to faculty regarding their great work on sabbaticals. All faculty should attend their post-sabbatical presentations in support of their hard work!

D. Student Affairs (*Peter Remien*)

Student Affairs committee met last month. Discussed two major goals for the year:

1. *First goal for the academic year is creation of a policy on disruptive students – Brought back feedback from divisions for a good discussion on creation of the policy.*
2. *Second goal for the academic year – Identify strategies in making living learning centers more meaningful with the emphasis on learning centers. We received good feedback from divisions as well on this topic.*

The committee plans to meet again at the end of October. Chair is drafting language right now for the potential policy for disruptive students based on policies other institutions in the state have. We are looking at our peer institutions as well to identify policy structure. Main goal is to see if we can align policy with the practices we now have. Purpose is what do we need to do to remove a disruptive student in class and how do we transition the student back to class.

Faculty Senator question: Are we going to have any say from Faculty to be involved in creation for the faculty. How much faculty input will be on this policy?

Student Affairs Committee Chair response: Great point. We are composing policy from scratch. One idea is to create an ad hoc faculty committee regarding development of the policy. We can continue this discussion regarding how to incorporate faculty input as we draft the policy. You can reach out to Student Affairs Committee Chair Peter Remien further regarding input into the policy.

Faculty Senator question: Pi'amkinwaas is currently going to be used as a health living learning center. I know there was some discussion on the controversy and questions about taking this center away from our native students. Are we going to receive any information on that in the future.

Student Affairs Committee Chair response: Faculty Senate held several discussions a few years ago on this topic. There were some vocal objections to moving Pi'amkinwaas. Pi'amkinwaas location was moved to the bottom of RCH and is now called "The Den" or "The Bear Den".

Faculty Senator question: Were Native American Services and Veteran Student Services and Outreach involved in this process and discussion?

Faculty Senator response: Part of the decision to convert the building and move Pi'amkinwaas was due to upgrades in fire suppression in our buildings. When they looked at some of the buildings on campus, it was identified the Pi'amkinwaas building didn't have adequate fire suppression for the services it was providing.

Faculty Senator response: During February 22nd, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting, this move to RCH was presented to faculty. There was no tribal agreement for the building, it was just a gift for the students. There wasn't a lot of legality behind moving the center out of there. This move was shared as a courtesy and wasn't part of senate discussion. This decision was made years before but was just enacted that year.

No further discussion.

G. Good of the Order

Faculty Senator question: Working group of the SBOE has recently put together a new draft regarding faculty and institutional faculty regarding non-renewal of non-tenured faculty members and termination of employment for tenured faculty. The first read through of this draft is. Can we review these policy changes at the next Faculty Senate meeting?

- *Faculty Senate Chair response: Chair will get a copy of the draft and put it in the Senate Team for readthrough and early discussion prior to the next senate meeting.*

Faculty Senate Chair item: Next meeting is two weeks from today. This is the same week as our site visit. With SBOE next week and NWCCU being several days leading up to it. Should we hold the meeting that week? Can we cancel the Faculty Senate meeting and attend the next scheduled meeting in November?

- *General consensus is that Faculty Senate agree regarding cancelling the next scheduled Faculty Senate Meeting.*

Faculty Senate Chair item: A calendar invite will be sent out as optional for all agenda items where administration want faculty to attend during the NWCCU accreditation visit and SBOE visit in addition when faculty panels occur.

Registrar update: Reminder regarding issues with students adding/dropping classes this late in the year and impact on student fees which include such items as inclusive access. At this time of the year, students add in late-start classes, clubs,

etc. Most students pay student fees in the first week of the semester. Be careful when students are adding or dropping courses late due to student fees issues. Another issue is section swapping between an in class and an online class portion, which causes increases in fees and issues with student financial aid. Be careful what we are advising students regarding swapping classes and to be aware of changes in fees.

- Faculty Senator question: Regarding late adds for Session B courses, if students register for session B courses when fall registration opens, are they not required to have instructor permission?*
- Registrar response/clarification: Students need their advisor to approve so advisors are aware they are adding/dropping classes. Session B classes do not need instructor permission if added before the course starts and only need advisor permission. There are financial aid implications with adding the course late. Using the add/drop forms helps to address some of these issues. We don't require instructor permission for late starts, just the approval that they are okay to come in late.*
- Faculty Senator question: Does it state on the inclusive access opt out form information to make students aware if they drop a course late that they may be out the textbook money?*
- Registrar response: We may need to look at the language regarding this topic on the form.*
- Faculty Senator question: Could we purchase classroom sets of textbooks to use for the students to help alleviate costs of textbooks?*
- Faculty Senator response: We have to be cognizant on the amount of OER resources, because this is assessed as well, and could mean less institutional funding direct to our institution.*

No further items for the good of the order.

Motion to adjourn made by Jessica Savage. Motion seconded by Angela Wartel. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned by 4:29 pm.