



Faculty Senate

Minutes

April 15, 2021

3:15pm

Virtual Meeting

Present: Lauren Connolly, Polly Knutson, Erin Fay, Sue Hasbrouck, Bill Hayne, Natalie Holman, Leif Hoffmann, Lorinda Hughes, Bryce Kammers, Tracey Koch, Julee Moore, Spencer Payton, Alicia Robertson, Clay Robinson, Suzanna Rousseau, Eric Stoffregen, Gene Straughan, Royal Toy, Heather Van Mullem, Scott Wimer

Guests: Grace Anderson, Nikolous Bertling, Christina Brando-Subis, Amy Canfield, Fredrick Chilson, Douglas Cruthirds, Laura Earles, Rachel Jameton, Billy Lemus, Luella Loudenback, Heidee McMillin, Angela Meek, Mike Owen, Cynthia Pemberton, Lori Stinson, Zoe Undercuffler, Ted Unzicker

- I. Call to Order @ 3:15pm
- II. Introductions
 - I. Ted Unzicker – New Registrar
- III. Approval of Senate Meeting minutes from March 25, 2021

Motion to approve the minutes made by Eric Martin, 2nd by Lauren Connolly, minutes approved (13 yes, 3 abstention).

- IV. Remarks:
 - i. President Pemberton
 1. The State Board held a meeting April 14th. It was resolved at that meeting that all the state-funded institutions of higher education will hold tuition flat next year. Without a source of additional funding, LCSC will have about half of the allocation necessary for raises this year.
 2. Report on Legislation: House passed the critical thinking freedom of expression legislation. I would like to thank Gene Straughan for his advice as we do not have legal counsel on campus as many other institutions do. In general, this is a codification of first amendment rights.
 3. JFAC did not bring up higher ed. But they are looking at budgets. Friends of LC State are working to ensure that the good work we do is understood.
 4. Advocacy message: A letter was sent out requesting advocacy support from donors and others. It has not gone out to all of the public at this point.
 - ii. Provost Stinson
 1. Accreditation: We have formed a committee to help us get prepared for the mid-cycle review and to set the tone for the year 6 and 7 review. Faculty members Chris Riggs, Sarah Graham, and Leif Hoffmann are all involved.
 2. Question: What is the current state of Zoom for next year?
 - a. Provost Stinson: The President ultimately makes the purchasing decisions. We will move on with this as far as I am aware.



- iii. Leif Hoffmann: Concerns have been brought up since last Monday's Message to Sue, Lorinda, and I. We had a great amount of discussion and made a decision to involve the 'wisdom of the elders' We reached out to current and past faculty leadership to meet last Thursday (10 people). At that meeting we decided to draft a statement that was created on Monday of this week. This message was sent to the Senate, Provost, and President as a matter of transparency to give a chance to address these items as far as it is possible within the constraints of law. This is brought forward to see what we want to do with this and to bring up the morale concerns. We would like to have input from the faculty, deans, division chairs, programs, CTL, etc.
1. Response by President Pemberton – Thanks for taking the time to come together and to put your concerns in writing. I was concerned by the amount of angst that I received in response to recent events:
 2. First bullet: “Reassignment of a widely respected and highly effective provost to a faculty role without consultation or involvement of the faculty;” I have no personal issues with the matter. I like Lori and appreciate her good work.
 3. Second bullet: “Restructuring of administration to include new and altered executive-level positions (including the pro tempore elimination of the title of provost), without consultation or involvement of faculty;” The outlook for next year is an interim step. The subsequent email that went out outlines the roles for the next year. All the pieces of faculty voice are still present as they exist right now. I also expanded president's cabinet to include deans to increase voice. I also suggest inviting the faculty senate president or designee to be part of cabinet next year. This is by invitation and not a mandate... it is one for you to consider.
 4. Third bullet: “Lack of timely notification/communication to faculty of matters impacting academic operations of the institution, and in a manner consistent with professional courtesy;” I had a meeting with the Provost at 5pm on Thursday, sent her a text at 8am on Friday as well as Outlook invites for meetings at 10am on Friday. Monday morning rumors were flying about the events. Perhaps the reason for some of the challenge in this case was that I was overwhelmed by the IFF events. I don't know how it got out, as I spent the weekend dying eggs via Zoom with my family and riding my bike.
 5. Fourth & fifth bullets: “Appointment of a dean without a search or faculty involvement, thereby denying faculty the opportunity to hear the candidate's vision/goals for the affected units; Appointment of division chairs without faculty involvement or input, and where a search has normally been required;” The appointments were recommended by the Provost and I supported her, and I will support her again. The recommendations were made with the interest of the institution at heart.
 6. Sixth bullet: “Appointment of a director of Grants & Contracts from the president's former institution, without a search;” I recruited an interim and responded to the recommendation request of a waiver. I agree that we should not always move interims to permanent. At the very least, we should be following the model of a visioning presentation as I saw with the presentation for a new CTL director. I also inquired about past experience with making interims permanent.
 7. Seventh bullet: “Budgetary cuts to departments and divisions without first talking to the impacted faculty, prior to finalizing those decisions;” The direct cuts I was responsible for were under my reports. The other areas were based on the recommendations of the Provost and Vice-Presidents regarding their direct reports. They were well considered choices.



8. Eighth bullet: “Policy changes that diminish faculty voice in matters pertaining to them, including program termination.” At first, I had no idea what was being talked about with this statement. The Policy change for Tenure was administratively driven and as our institution has changed, we cannot afford to maintain the policy as it was drafted and initially implemented. The policy takes away degrees of freedom and is no longer current with practice. Regarding curriculum policy, I didn’t even know what that policy was. I understand now why it was necessary. The prioritization process is a state board requirement. And I told them I was against it when I was hired given that it is divisive, yet I still got the job. I was ignorant of the policy until it was brought to my attention.
 9. The end of the statement: I absolutely agree. I assumed that the communication happened. It is difficult and we all need to be better. I appreciate the opportunity how this document came to be. In defense of those who brought recommendations forward, the recommendations were well considered. last thing I would say is that these are all hard times for us. I am waiting for frogs to fall from the sky. The Governor’s mandate that we cannot mandate shots, masks, and possibly other things. This gave me a chance to address you and become aware of your concerns.
 10. Comment: There has been a rumor that you might have publicly insulted the former VP of finance by insinuating that he was stupid or not very intelligent.
 - a. President: I did not – his move to the new position is an asset to the entire state of Idaho.
- iv. Other Questions/Concerns/Comments?
1. Have individuals resigned from our alumni board?
 - a. Response: President Pemberton – A person who is remaining on the board who is chairing a subcommittee over student engagement stepped down from the chair position. We used to have four people on the board and now we have two. One of these was the Dir. of Alumni. They were not happy about that change and we are bringing the positions back.
 - b. Faculty Member: Two members of the Board have resigned over the last two months not including the one the president mentioned. Many of the alumni and board are refusing to participate.

Motion to adjust the meeting to cover the new business made and seconded. No vote

Faculty were invited to remain during the discussion. The Floor was opened regarding the Draft Faculty Association Statement dated April 22, 2021 (FAS):

There are several divisions reporting that they are upset with the ways many of the decisions have been made. The following are the general themes/concerns/questions addressed:

Concerns discussed:

- President Pemberton may be making decisions without full knowledge of the policies involved (IV.iii.8 above).
- Cuts for programs/divisions were not viewed as equitable.
- Allocated funding was moved around in ways that do not permit those monies to be utilized and caused unnecessary disruption to processes and increased workload.



Ideas Discussed:

- The FAS should remain 'in house' for further development.
- The development of an advisory council comprised of senior faculty.
- Sending the FAS to the State Board's Chief Academic Officer and/or Matt Freeman.
- Changing the makeup of the Senate to senior faculty, or a blend of senior/junior faculty as determined by the divisions.
- Have the President revisit the items from the FAS during the upcoming association meeting.
- Create a committee made up of senior members for further drafting and discussion, then bring it back to the senate?

Comments:

- Appreciation for the moral courage of the senate body, the association, and specifically to faculty leadership for developing the statement and providing the President the opportunity to be made aware of the faculty perceptions on several items.
- Morale, communication, and shared governance seem to be the major issues
- Culture is not created by one person. Concerns are about the process. We need to be aware of the various factors involved. I think that we are losing people and that they are pulling away. The pandemic further impacts this.
- We should have some sort of statement where the burden goes to the administration and faculty leadership to correct the issues. I would like to see what the good faith bonified response will be.
- What does LCSC look like after all of the changes occur? It appears that administration and faculty do not have a shared vision of where we are going at this point.

Actions Needed:

- Take the issues to the divisions and report back on ideas/question/comments, but more importantly ideas for actions that administration can work towards to demonstrate good faith efforts to rebuilding community.
- Bring back draft suggestions for ways to improve the concerns that were listed in the FAS prior to next senate meeting.
- Be specific in the language used when discussing items to ensure that we are all have common vocabulary and understanding.

Note: Senators have until the Monday after Spring Break to submit feedback to Leif Hoffmann otherwise bring it to next senate meeting. Be sure to bring forward suggested language for action items.

Motion to move forward with feedback from divisions, discussion at association meeting, and revisiting for further development in the next senate meeting made by Sue Hasbrouck, 2nd by Eric Martin, motion passed (23 yes, 1 abstention).



- V. Division Updates
- VI. Old Business
- VII. New Business
 - i. Election for a Hearing Board Member – Division Chair Alternate: Term Fall 2021 – Spring 2024
 - 1. Chris Riggs

Motion to approve Chris Riggs as Chair Alternate by acclamation made by Royal Toy, 2nd by Sue Hasbrouck, motion approved with no dissent.

- ii. Second year in a row without a nomination for the Talkington Award - is the process prohibitive? Do we need to take a look at the requirements/language?
<https://www.lcsc.edu/provost/awards/hl-talkington-faculty-achievement-award>

The discussion led to a few ideas regarding the burden of proof required for this particular award. It appears that the consensus is that the award is best suited for those who have just completed the requirements for advancement as they have much of the required documentation compiled.

It was recommended that it may be best if faculty self-nominate, are initially nominated by Deans, or some combination of the two ideas. Also, due to the requirements it may be of benefit for those who did not receive the award in a previous year to be considered the following year as well, which would require a change in the ‘record of performance.’

Please take this question back to your respective constituent faculty for additional comments or ideas and report to Leif Hoffmann.

- VIII. Committee Reports
 - I. Budget, Planning and Assessment
 - II. Curriculum
 - i. A.S. Engineering discontinuance – Provost Stinson
 - 1. Administration proposal for discontinuance as of December 2021
 - 2. No Faculty positions were impacted by the discontinuance of this program.
 - 3. Senators have 14 days to provide feedback with May 12th as close of comment period.
 - 4. Questions/Comments
 - a. Bryce Kammers – What is the level of feedback to stop the discontinuance?
 - b. Provost – This program began when I was newly appointed to the Provost position; however, the program is not directly in alignment with our mission. Elimination of this program is part of a surgical approach. There may be an opportunity in the future to reintroduce this if there is compelling evidence; however, I am not sure that there is enough compelling evidence at this point to stop the change and keep the program.
 - c. Eric Stoffregen - DONSAM did have comments about this program and will be entering feedback as part of the Senate Documentation. The Division is not supportive of the closure of the program.
 - III. Faculty Affairs – Lorinda Hughes
 - i. Group applications for development funds were submitted and will be funded.



- IV. General Education
- V. Student Affairs – Jenni Light
 - i. Tuesday April 20th Feedback from the Draft SCE policy. Get information back to Jenni Light by the end of Monday.
- IX. Good of the Order
 - i. Last Lecture – Rhett Diessner – _April 21, 2021 at 10:30am Meeting ID: 935 4691 5967. No password is necessary

Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Bryce Kammers, 2nd by Lauren Connolly, motion passed (14 yes 1 abstention).