



## Faculty Senate Meeting

### Minutes

September 12, 2024 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 134

Zoom Meeting ID: 832 8305 4372

Attendance: Rodney Farrington, Randy Erikson, Kelly FitzSimmons, Julie Bezzerides, Gina Lott, Jennifer Cromer, Jenna Chambers, Katie Roberts, Eric Stoffregen, Jessica Savage, Rachelle Genthos, Angela Wartel, Debra Lybyer, Suzanne Rousseau, Thomas Hill, Charles Bell, Peter Remien, Lorinda Hughes, Kim Tuschhoff

Guests: Tracy Adkins

I. **Call to Order:** 3:16 pm by Faculty Senate Chair Peter Remien with review of agenda.

II. **Approval of Senate Meeting minutes from August 29, 2024**

*Call for motion to approve to August 29<sup>th</sup>, 2024, meeting minutes. No corrections or discussion.*

*Motion to approve the minutes as written by Julie Bezzerides. Motion seconded by Katie Roberts. Call for discussion. Call for vote - Unanimous Approval. No abstentions. Motion carries.*

III. **Announcements/Updates**

A. Chair's Report

a. Open and closed meeting structure

*Reminder during last Faculty Senate meeting, Faculty Senate voted to implement an open/closed meeting structure. This means we will be alternating meetings where administration members are invited (open meetings) and not required to attend (closed structure). This will provide an opportunity for more open conversation for faculty. The plan is to implement this for the full academic year. Today's meeting is considered closed.*

*Faculty Senate schedule – Meeting cancelled next week due to lack of items for agenda and based on turnaround time for the draft minutes from today's meeting.*

*The next Faculty Senate meeting on Thursday, October 10<sup>th</sup> will be an open meeting, where President and Provost will be invited.*

*Faculty Senate Chair extended a welcome to Kelly FitzSimmons as our CDA representative to the Faculty Senate.*

b. Goals for the academic year

*First area of focus - AI use across campus. It is an emergent issue that impacts all faculty regarding impact on classes and assignments. There are also several different viewpoints/perspectives from faculty regarding the use of AI. Faculty Senate Chair would like to continue this discussion throughout the year. Some divisions have an AI policy (detailed syllabus statement) and others do not. Guest Tracy Adkins, from Nursing and Health Sciences, introduced to start discussion on AI. Tracy provided a brief introductory welcome on the work she has done within the NHS division.*

- *Question from Faculty Senator – Would nursing be willing to share syllabus statement?*
- *Response from Tracy Adkins, Guest – Tracy verified she would be willing to share the AI syllabus statement and a module she created in Canvas with interested parties.*

*Second area of focus– Awarding faculty development grants and sabbaticals. Last year, Provost’s office was generous and was able to fund all sabbatical applications (2 full year and 3, 1-semester sabbaticals). An issue that the committee deals with is that sabbatical applications trend more in humanities/social sciences versus other divisions. Faculty Senate Chair would like to see more diversity in sabbatical applicants across divisions and would like to brainstorm ideas on how to increase participation across campus.*

---

**IV. New Business**

**A. Guest: Tracy Adkins (Assistant Prof. in NHS) Artificial Intelligence policy**

*Tracy is a new member of a subcommittee fellowship on AI use in the state. Marlowe Daly Galeano and Dawn Lesperance have been working on this subcommittee as well for the past year. Tracy has been tasked by the subcommittee to gather information to take back at her next meeting and has a few questions for faculty senators to bring back to their divisions regarding college-wide statements, suggestions, and ways to implement AI. In Nursing and Health Sciences, a big discussion point in our division is we wanted to know what our students know about AI and how they use AI. NHS division went with the American Psychological Association (APA) style regarding citation of AI, to determine what is the student’s original work and what they are implementing from AI. Tracy mentioned AI use has become common in the medical world. Understanding of how we use AI on campus has been up to the individual and is varied. Her goal is to see us use information about AI use to shape behavior, so we can use the tools correctly.*

*Discussion: Question from Faculty Senator: What is your current approach to AI?*

*Response from Tracy Adkins: Dawn and Marlowe looked at our current tools on campus and found our AI tool aren’t accurate reviewing student work. A big clue that AI is being used is through the overuse and overwhelming number of adjectives. Tracy shared a statement from Dawn that the spectrum went from completely banned to using it occasionally. Royal Toy was also included in the workshop.*

*Question from Tracy Adkins: Would college-wide training be interesting to faculty?*

*The training could contain information on AI resources.*

*Question from Faculty Senate Chair – Would we want to discuss what kind of training faculty would like to see?*

*Response from Faculty Senator: From discussions in Social Science division, everyone implements technology differently and many people may not know what the different AI platforms can do. They would like to see general training on what platforms such as ChatGPT are capable of. Also, a discussion on how different people use AI across campus would be valuable.*

*Response from Faculty Senator: Faculty Senator shared they attended a conference regarding AI use and shared some professors would give assignments to show how ChatGPT can provide wrong information that is unable to be cited, to demonstrate to students how AI isn't always an accurate resource.*

*Response from Faculty Senator: Last year, TEAMs Division brought in an expert who wrote a book on AI to hold a training through the CTL. Only TEAMs faculty showed up. If training is available, we need a better process on communicating or advertising availability on campus.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: Are we still using the Faculty Senate Teams page to share information, such as for trainings or events?*

*Answer from Faculty Senate Chair: The agenda has been posted on the Faculty Senate Teams. This is a process we can continue to use.*

*Faculty Senate Chair demonstrated a recommended statement regarding syllabus addendums on AI use that is located on the Provost's page.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: What is the purpose of the AI training? Are we talking about recognizing AI work in the classroom or how to use the tools in our daily work? Is there an expectation for us to use them in our daily work? How does this impact our workloads? Will we be mandated to use those tools moving forward?*

*Response: If there is a policy moved forward to the college level, we would have to have software purchased by the institution to use, as different AI checks provide different responses in order to be fair to students. It should not be an expectation of faculty/staff to pay for their own checker.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: Less than a fraction of AI is used to generate papers. The first question is how do we cite AI in our daily work (grading) and in our student's daily work? What would be the expectation of the student if in one class, AI grades their work versus a professor who grades their own work without AI use, and they see different results?*

*Statement from Tracy Adkins: The training would involve increasing our confidence in how we use AI in our classroom and in developing our personal and student expectations on use in the classroom.*

*Statement from Faculty Senator: We need to consider the ethical considerations as AI uses increases electrical demand and resources more than using Google, which impacts the environment. Students are also not aware that AI can provide incorrect information. The library has seen many instances where when citations were checked by AI, AI made up citations. In addition, depending on user*

*agreements, AI companies collect a lot of details about us which can impact future security as they can sell that data to a third party.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: If any information inputted into AI technology can be sold, what implications does this have to FERPA data and potential violations?*

*Response from Faculty Senator: We need to instruct those who are going to use AI how to use it responsibly and ethically. We also need an understanding of how companies use the data they collect.*

*Question for clarification from Faculty Senator: Are you trying to gather information to take back to the AI subcommittee?*

*Response from Tracy Adkins: Yes.*

*Response from Faculty Senator: SBOE has been holding several AI workshops/trainings. On October 4<sup>th</sup>, there will be an “Ethical considerations in AI” workshop. In November, a workshop on “Enhancing student information and engagement workshop with AI” will be held. We do have multiple resources to use without having to create our own training. Question is are the divisions getting contacted about these SBOE workshops?*

*Statement from Faculty Senator: Attended workshop last week by the SBOE. Kelly FitzSimmons attended a workshop last week by SBOE and can send the link with the recording discussing potential of AI on request. Many of the AI tools require a subscription to use them to their full potential. If we are going to use these, is there a way to access these AI tools through the college or could the college pay for them?*

*Statement from Faculty Senator: We have access to an AI tool through Microsoft Software – Microsoft Co-Pilot that comes with the new Windows.*

*Statement from Past Faculty Senate Chair – Could we have one universal training for faculty across campus instead of individual division training?*

*Statement from Faculty Senator from Library: UCLA library has an AI guide on the webpage that has many faculty specific resources on AI use.*

*Comment from Faculty Senator: If we are going to learn how to use this or use it for students, we need to get a site license, so all students are using the same product and create a fair playground. They tried placing a difficult exam question into 4.0, and it gave a detailed, appropriate response.*

*Next meeting, Dawn Lesperance from e-Learning services who served on the statewide committee last year will attend to provide insight into the topic of AI.*

*No further information from Tracy Adkins. Faculty Senate Chair requested Tracy Adkins to send AI resources to be placed in the Faculty Senate Teams. If you have any questions or comments, please email Tracy at [tladkins@lcsc.edu](mailto:tladkins@lcsc.edu). Reminder to please email Tracy if you would like access to her AI module on Canvas.*

*Next meeting is the first part of October. Tracy would like to receive feedback/more information from the divisions before the next meeting.*

*In summary, discussion on AI use and implementation of training to be continued this semester at future Faculty Senate meetings.*

## **B. Broadening sabbatical and Faculty Development Grant participation**

*See notes under goals in the Chair's report. Faculty Senate Chair identified most sabbatical applications are from the College of Arts and Sciences. How can we broaden conversation regarding participation from other divisions?*

*Faculty Senate Chair discussed investigating how we can bring back the mini sabbatical – which is defined as a project course release for a semester (around 3 - 6 credit course release). This course release opens the amount of time for a smaller project. This could help increase applications from faculty who are not inclined to apply for a full sabbatical. Faculty Senate Chair had a discussion with the Provost about re-implementing mini sabbaticals, and it was indicated there was a small pot of money available for all sabbatical use. Mini sabbatical is overall more expensive to fund as faculty receive paid benefits and salary during mini sabbatical time frame and requires funding an adjunct to cover the faculty course. It will increase the impact on sabbatical funding more than a regular year-long sabbatical, leading to less approval of full sabbatical applications.*

*Response from Faculty Senator: In CTE, there is no definition of faculty load, tenure. CTE would like to be a part of the sabbatical process with the academic part of the campus, but there is not mechanism for CTE faculty to take/apply for sabbatical. Historically, CTE did have access to apply for sabbatical, but it was taken away.*

*Response from Faculty Senator: How can we help CTE be a part of this discussion or be eligible for sabbatical?*

*Question from Faculty Senator: Is there a campus concern that sabbatical is taken by different divisions more frequently? If it is only taken by one college more frequently, it might cause division on campus. If this conversation is being had regarding certain divisions getting sabbaticals more than others, what are the barriers to other divisions applying?*

*Response from Faculty Senate Chair: Faculty Affairs committee doesn't necessarily see applications awarded to one division due to differences in scoring in applications. They only see applications from two or three divisions on campus.*

*Discussion involved that there is a mindset that some divisions are so specialized or short staffed that it would make application for full sabbatical difficult for their divisions, which is a common issue in BUCS, NHS, & TEAMS. Many members pointed out the difficulty in replacing a faculty member's role in the division (teaching a specialty class or performing assigned tasks). This presents a large barrier for application.*

*Another perspective from divisions is that faculty didn't feel like they could ethically apply once they hired individuals to help replace/teach classes. There is an equity issue to determine how classes could be covered.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: Could we ask administration if we can reallocate funds to offer more professional development opportunities for faculty/staff to entice those divisions that normally do not apply to pursue professional development/renewal? Could we think creatively about what the needs are in the different divisions?*

*Response from Faculty Senator: Feedback from CTE surrounds is if there would be time allotted or professional support in a specialty like automotive training. An adjustment to teaching load or financial support to complete the training is*

*valuable, which makes it difficult to pursue due to lack of coverage. Faculty in CTE would like the opportunity to go to training courses for certifications to benefit the students.*

*Response from Faculty Senator: Having a mini sabbatical was useful as I had time to complete research but still be present on campus for the semester. My mini sabbatical did not leave my division short-staffed regarding coverage of classes.*

*Response from Faculty Senate: While Mini Sabbaticals are beneficial, we are still dealing with the issue of covering funding for mini sabbaticals. Can we change the wording/requirements in how we use mini sabbaticals to allow for more professional development opportunities?*

*Response from Faculty Senator: We need to emphasize we are looking at creative options to recruit and retain students. We would still be able to teach the classes we are specialized in but also develop ourselves professionally to recruit more students to our specialties to LC State.*

*The consensus from Faculty Senate is that Mini Sabbaticals would be beneficial for all divisions regarding access to professional development training while also not short staffing the division. Taking another look at mini sabbatical funds and changing how we distribute them would be helpful, though we also need to ensure the ability to apply for full sabbaticals does not disappear.*

*Response from Faculty Senator: We should focus on identifying a mechanism for us to attend professional development more frequently. Our divisions get professional development funds each year which covers training for faculty. Is there a mechanism to identify funds for covering professional development training, so people who aren't eligible due to job description can use funds for training and renewal?*

*An idea proposed by faculty senator is to remove the prohibition on faculty development grant for trainings and certifications to allow for more opportunities for faculty.*

*Statement of clarification from Faculty Senate Chair: Sabbaticals and Faculty Development grants are different pots of money with different requirements.*

*Statement from Faculty Senator: Just because we cannot go on sabbatical doesn't mean we don't find sabbaticals valuable.*

*Statement from Faculty Senator: In the near future, can Faculty Senate Cabinet bring to our next meeting a more concrete proposal to move forward to administration. It would be important to include those who may not be eligible for sabbaticals to be part of the conversation.*

*Statement from faculty senate: Should we do a generalized survey of our faculty to identify barriers that exist for those individuals eligible for application for sabbatical?*

*In summary, Faculty Senate Chair requested we bring back this conversation to our divisions. Faculty Senate Cabinet will meet to bring back more concrete ideas to our next faculty senate meeting for further discussion.*

C. Alumni Association committee appointment: Jennifer Uptmor

*At our last Faculty Senate meeting, we had a representative of the Alumni*

*Association committee express the need for appointment of a new faculty representative. We have had one nomination, Jennifer Uptmor.*

*Motion to approve Jennifer Uptmor as our Alumni Association faculty representative made by Rachelle Genthos. Motion seconded by Rodney Farrington. No further discussion. Call for a vote. Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion carries.*

*Congratulations Jennifer!*

---

## **V. Committee Reports**

*Reminder by Faculty Senate Chair Peter Remien that all committees need to have their first meeting by the end of September.*

### **A. Budget, Planning & Assessment (Peter Remien)**

*No report. Committee has not met.*

### **B. Curriculum (Marcy Halpin)**

*Curriculum committee met this week. Report from Marcy Halpin shared that there were only two outstanding proposals from last year to review. No requests for Faculty Senate review at this meeting.*

### **C. Faculty Affairs (Charles Bell)**

*Meeting scheduled. No report.*

### **D. Student Affairs (Lorinda Hughes)**

*Student Committee meeting scheduled. Agenda will include a review of a few topics proposed by Sr. Vice President Hanson. He will be joining their first meeting for discussion.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: Regarding faculty who either cannot make the campus committee meetings or who fail to attend the meetings, are we able to ask the division to appoint a new representative? Question was seconded by another Faculty Senator.*

*Response from Faculty Senate Chair: Please let me know who is not attending, so they can contact the individual about their appointment/commitment.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: Is there repercussions if a faculty member doesn't attend their assigned campus committee meetings?*

*Response: From the perspective of the committee, the division will not have a voice. Individual perspective is our faculty are held accountable by the division chair.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: How would attendance get back to the chair regarding campus service feedback for their annual review?*

*Response from Faculty Senate Chair: The Division Chair would be notified of faculty absence to hold them accountable.*

*Question from Faculty Senator: Could the chair of the committee email the individual and copy the chair following up on absence?*

*Statement from Faculty Senator: Individuals who are on committees have to report in their division meetings.*

*Question from Faculty Senator to Student Committee Chair: When is the timeframe for the new SCEs to be implemented.*

*Answer from Faculty Senate Chair: It was reported by administration that they will be implemented this semester.*

---

VI. Good of the Order

- Faculty Development grant applications due Oct. 1
- Sabbatical applications due Oct. 1
- Curriculum proposals due Oct. 1
- *Constitution Day is September 17<sup>th</sup> 6 – 7:30 pm. Please attend!*

*Motion to adjourn made by Katie Roberts. Motion seconded by Rachelle Genthos. Call for a vote. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at 4:27 pm.*