Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
October 24, 2024 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 134

Zoom Meeting ID: 81931814489

Attendance: Kelly FitzSimmons, Julie Bezzerides, Ian Tippets, Jennifer Cromer, Jenna Chambers, Katie Roberts, Eric Stoffregen, Jessica Savage, Rachelle Genthos, Angela Wartel, Debra Lybyer, Thomas Hill, Christina Brando-Subis, Charles Bell, Isac Ortega, Kim Tuschhoff, Lorinda Hughes, Peter Remien

Guests: Chris Riggs, Dawn Lesperance

I. **Call to Order**

3:15 pm by Faculty Senate Chair Peter Remien with review of the agenda.

II. **Approval of Senate Meeting minutes from October 10, 2024**

Call for motion to approve to October 10th, 2024, meeting minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes as written by Thomas Hill. Motion seconded by Jessica Savage. No further discussion. Call for vote – Unanimous approval. One abstention. Motion carries.

III. **Announcements/Updates**

   A. **Chair's Report**
      a. **AY goals: AI and sabbatical/FDG participation**

We will be returning to these topics today under Old Business. Reminder that today is a closed meeting.

IV. **New Business**

   A. **Guests: Chris Riggs (Social Sciences Chair) and Amanda van Lanen (Humanities Chair) on Gen Ed. Requirement**

Faculty Senate Chair shared that Amanda Van Lanen was unable to attend today's meeting. Chris Riggs reported on behalf of Martin Gibbs regarding an Idaho Legislative Subcommittee that is looking into the issues with DEI at the 4-year colleges/universities in Idaho. A questionnaire was sent to the deans at our Idaho colleges/universities to the deans with a quick turn-around time for response. One of the questions brought for Faculty Senate discussion today is "Does LCSC require our students to take any DEI coursework?". When reviewing information in

response to this question, a question came up about the general education core diversity requirement. One area we are closely reviewing is the title "Diversity" in our general education core. Decision was made by Dean Gibbs in consultation with the President and Provost to change the name "Diversity" in our general education core requirement to "Global Perspectives." This name change was made in order to be consistent with the spirit of why the diversity component was integrated into the general education core, to broaden thinking about other types of cultures and other areas of the world. This is not the final decision on the name. The Gen Ed committee is in the process of soliciting feedback from faculty to identify if the name "Global Perspectives" encompasses the diversity category. The deadline for this decision is November 4th, as the gen ed committee will be meeting on the 5th to enact the name change. SBOE is working on identifying a definition of what the legislative subcommittee is looking for when talking about DEI and what do they perceive as problematic. The biggest concerns from SBOE are the ambiguity surrounding the topic of the boundaries regarding DEI in 4-year higher ed institutions. SBOE will be seeking clarity to help our 4-year institutions deal with the political climate.

Call for questions:

Question from Faculty Senator: If we change the name, are we still going to have concerns about the content that falls under this category that the name change will not directly solve?

Response from Chris Riggs: Stated that Dean Gibbs had reported there were 24 total classes that fall under this category. The senate has been vague regarding the boundaries within this DEI category, but there are 24 classes that are impacted at our institution.

Question from Faculty Senator: When we discuss the 24 classes in the gen ed core, are these courses just under the general education category, or do they include all courses on campus that fall under the DEI category.

Response from Chris Riggs: Stated that Dean Gibbs had identified it was 24 classes in general, not just under general education core description.

Response from Faculty Senator: The 24 classes on the list are the ones that can be substituted for diversity requirements in the general education core. Other diversity courses in the organization not on the list.

Question from Faculty Senator: How does this impact program changes within the curriculum committee regarding name changes of courses or name change in the diversity core?

Response from Registrar: Logan Fowler has already changed the name in sequential plans, the catalog, etc. to this name. On the back end, WarriorWeb, which is only viewable by advisors/students, still reflects the name "diversity" under the General Education Core requirements. The registrar's office will have to change the wording in several places in multiple degree audits across campus, which will be time intensive. They are waiting for final approval of the name change before changing wording in degree audits.

Clarification of Question from Faculty Senator: Does these name changes still need to go through curriculum, or just the course name changes?

Response from Registrar: Yes, name changes or course changes would need to go through curriculum. Sequential plans are just changed on our end and do not need to go through curriculum.

Question from Faculty Senator: Why are we changing the name "Diversity" in past catalog years?

Response from Registrar: It is confusing to have some wording in the degree audits state "Diversity" and some wording in the degree audits state "Global Perspectives" to our students. We will be only changing active programs for active students. We will not be changing the name for students who have graduated.

Question/response from Faculty Senator: Global Perspectives title is a framework which does not fully encompass diversity and can mean very specific things in certain areas of academia. Does naming it this way indicate a culturally sustaining pedagogy? Are we titling it after big GP or a little GP? Who should we send comments to regarding the name change?

Response from Guest Chris Riggs: Please send comments to the Gen Ed committee members in your division. Based on question, the global perspectives name changes reflect the "small GP", not "big GP" or framework/field with specific discourse and perspective.

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: Currently, the name change is just a placeholder, and the Gen Ed Committee is looking for feedback.

Question from Faculty Senator: Is this name going to be adopted by other institutions in their General Education Core, as these courses are gem-stamped courses?

Response: Currently, this is an institution placeholder and change in our own Gen Ed Core. We do not know how other institutions will respond.

Question from Faculty Senator: Can we clarify what was mean by big GP? Sociocultural items to discuss similarities across other cultural groups. It is a mindset or framework.

Gen Ed Committee member should bring this back to the divisions.

Question from Faculty Senator: What about the diversity component in the Vector trainings for faculty/staff?

Response from Faculty Senator: In clarification of historical knowledge: there was a rule that no state funds could be used to support anything that promotes DEI. We had to reflect in the past regarding Women's History Month. Right now, we are working on rephrasing the title and seeking clarification on whether or not we change what we teach.

Question from Faculty Senator: What about DEI-type courses that are required by accreditation agencies?

Response from Chris Riggs: This topic came up when reviewing a course in the social work program. When the SBOE asked if the course was required by the accreditation body, we clarified it was, and the course was left alone. This doesn't mean this will be the same for other programs, but this is historically what has

occurred.

Question from Faculty Senator: Why is the response different in addressing DEI required under an accreditation body versus not?

Response from Chris Riggs: The difference is that the student is choosing to participate in those programs with those requirements, versus being required to participate.

Question from Faculty Senator: Does our college accreditation body require DEI being integrated into curriculum.

Response from Registrar: No.

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: There is always the option for the student to opt out of taking a DEI course if they so choose.

Response from Registrar: Because the catalog is history and changes in course name and description goes through curriculum, we may need to check with the Provost's office if the "Global Perspectives" change would need to go through curriculum. If so, this change would occur in the 26-27 catalog year, as the 25-26 catalog year is under review.

Thank you to Chris Riggs for presenting information on the name change.

No further discussion.

B. Fulbright Scholar-in Residence Program

Rebecca Snodgrass from International Programs reached out to Faculty Senate Chair regarding having a faculty member from campus to apply for the Fulbright Scholar-In Residence Program. The flyer for this program will be placed in the Faculty Senate Teams folder by the Faculty Senate Chair.

The Fulbright Scholar-In-Residence Program brings an international scholar to campus to teach in courses broadening intercultural awareness and diversity. The purpose is to help smaller, regional schools who do not have a large international presence. A barrier is you cannot bring a scholar in to teach a language class.

The Faculty Senate Chair wanted to bring this item to Faculty Senate to see if any one division is interested in taking a lead on this project. There is a stipend with this fellowship in organizing this program.

The school will write to the program to identify what areas they are seeking, and the program will match scholars who have applied with the current needs.

Ideally, we only want one division applying for this program to avoid competition with multiple divisions applying for this program.

Question from Faculty Senator: What is the timeframe?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: The scholar would be brought to campus for an academic year (two classes per semester). It is a good stipend for the scholar. The institution would have to kick in as well, such as reduced housing, an office, etc.

If you have ideas, please contact the Faculty Senate Chair who will contact Rebecca Snodgrass, or you can contact Rebecca Snodgrass directly. The bulk of the work for the grant is next semester (spring).

Question from Faculty Senator: Is there certain divisions that this would be a better fit for?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: They are not defining it directly regarding different areas on campus.

Statement from Faculty Senator: We need to be aware that we may be restricted regarding diversity support from more than state funding.

C. Updates to Policy 5.202 (Undergraduate Admissions)

Policy 5.202 was sent to Faculty Senators prior to the meeting. Most changes in the track changes draft document are formatting changes. This policy came from the Student Affairs committee regarding undergraduate admission standards.

Substantial changes proposed to policy are addition of admission standards for international students per updated Idaho SBOE policy. We had to adjust standards for international students. In addition, the title of the policy changed to "Undergraduate Admission Standards" as we are now offering graduate programs, which will be a separate policy.

Under CTE, previously, a student who was applying for one of our CTE programs would not be admitted unless they provided test scores. Most of CTE programs have specific requirements for admission, in that if the student didn't meet that requirement, they would not be admitted. Currently, academic programs do not require test scores.

In addition, international admissions credential evaluations were added to the policy.

In addition, we added in Faculty Senate as contact, which allows us to be a stakeholder in this policy.

Question from Faculty Senator: Did we do away with ACT/SAT requirements?

Response from Debra Lybyer: Yes, for academic admissions. We are now changing the policy to have the same requirement for CTE.

Motion to approve the changes to Policy 5.202 Undergraduate Admission Standards by Angela Wartel. Motion seconded by Julie Bezzerides. Call for vote: Unanimous approval. One abstention. Motion carries.

V. New Business

A. Guest: Dawn Lesperance (Director eLearning services) State Artificial Intelligence Committee

Conversation regarding AI was a big agenda item at LC State's SBOE visit last week. We just also received a survey from Gov. Little office regarding AI use. SBOE has been sharing that they would like to see a policy for divisions or standard syllabus statements at colleges/universities in addition to wanting to promote good use of AI.

Dawn Lesperance presented her background in the AI discussion. She was an active member on the Idaho Higher Ed AI Alliance, an informal committee put together by the state that consists of members from all institutions across the state made up of

a mix of faculty/staff from all Idaho colleges/universities to discuss policy. From these meetings, the alliance felt it didn't make sense to have a universal policy for all institutions. The alliance provided a statement of shared principles from this committee to create a starting point for conversations to bring back to the institutions to start the conversation on what we are seeing on campuses regarding AI use. Dawn will send out this statement of shared principles to faculty. In general, the committee felt there were positive benefits for AI use in the campus, and strategized ways to introduce AI use/benefits to faculty/staff who are still hesitant about use.

One big topic was to create equitable access to AI (students using the same version) to avoid increasing student costs, to create a culture of continuous learning of AI, and to build connections and provide support in navigating landscape of AI. Expectations around privacy with AI change daily, including entering or sharing copyrighted, private or confidential information. It retains all information on any papers put through the system. Last, being transparent with our students regarding responsible use of AI.

The state working group also created professional development opportunities on AI use, which have been shared through the Monday Message or through division chairs. There will be one last workshop on November 7th regarding Enhancing Student Engagement. Logan Fowler shared this opportunity in the Monday message. They have also created drop-in sessions to workshop with other faculty/staff at institutions across the state. Dawn will share this document with faculty regarding AI professional development opportunities.

An actionable item that came out of this committee was an AI Fellowship. Two faculty in the state were nominated research/workshop and talk about AI. This fellowship includes a stipend. These two faculty presented to the SBOE their findings from their fellowship. Lisa is an English Teacher at CWI. Jason is from nursing at BSU. Both are working at reaching out to different departments and different areas on campuses throughout their year. At the beginning of next fall/summer, both fellows will be presenting on their findings and their work. This fellowship may also potentially occur again next year. We did have people apply this year from LC State, but would encourage applications for the next fellowship from LC State faculty.

At LC State, we did develop our own AI committee (around 10 faculty/staff members) who met to discuss what we saw occurring on our campus. Ultimately, as a group, the committee determined they did not want a policy at the college. We already had a technology use policy which helped to cover the personal information component. Out of the committee, they came up with resources on the "Information for Faculty" page, such as a syllabus addendum in addition to Sample AI statements. They worked with several different departments to group to share sample statements of what they have written to all faculty. Sample statements involve prohibited use, situational, or permitted use of AI in courses.

Key points from the AI conversation: Having conversations about expectations is a big component of sample statements. We expect students will need to use AI in the workplace as technology evolves, so it is an expectation that we teach students the right way to use it.

Question from Faculty Senator: Some of these sample statements were ones I

created. I did use some examples from other institutions. Can we add in the citation of other institutions policy that informed the statements that were written?

Response from Dawn: She will add the citation information back into the statement sheet.

Question from Faculty Senator: If I do not put a statement on AI in my syllabus and only utilize a plagiarism statement, am I covered?

Response from Dawn: She confirmed that faculty would be covered in this case regarding plagiarism, but make sure you have the conversation with the students regarding expectations on AI use if you are not including a statement in your syllabus.

Question from Faculty Senator: Do we have students who understand that AI use can be plagiarism, since it doesn't come from a real person?

Response from Dawn: She confirmed that students may not realize it is plagiarism. We need to have the conversation regarding academic integrity and expectations on citations and use.

Question from Faculty Senator: Different institutions have different capabilities dependent on packages purchased for their LMS and algorithms are not without error. Are there any checkers that are more dependable?

Response from Dawn: Currently there are programs that exist, such as "Turn It In" for plagiarism detection. This doesn't work well with checking AI as it doesn't repeat itself often. There is not currently a detector that is accurate enough that warrants spending money. Several people used "Turn It In" last semester and it was inaccurate. IT met with the head person for "Turn It In", who clarified it was not supposed to be an AI checker. There was a recent request from IT regarding a different AI checker. E-Learning has assessed many checkers frequently. In this process of auditing an AI checker, Dawn usually submits two papers, one original, one rewritten by AI, and it will often flag the AI one as an original. There is not a great checker yet to utilize.

Recommendation regarding checking for AI use is it comes down to assessment. Bryce Kammers has reported to the committee that he will have them initiate their writing in class. If the writing submitted from home is different from what they wrote in class, then he will flag it as potential AI use.

Quote from "Turn It In" software was $4000 for campus use, but funds are limited regarding purchase of checker software. If there was an overall recommendation from faculty, e-Learning can assess the software to see if it would be beneficial.

Response from Faculty Senator: While the recommendation for in course assessment is helpful, this would be difficult to implement in an online course.

Response from Dawn: We are aware of what responses to expect from online students regarding our course content.

Question from Faculty Senator: Do you have any recommendations on AI checkers that are beneficial to use?

Response from Dawn: No, we have not seen accurate software yet. There are a lot

of lawsuits happening in many other schools who are purchasing AI checker programs.

One area to be cautious about with AI checkers as well is that use of third-party sites that faculty can purchase to run student information through can lead to a potential FERPA violations, as the third-party site collects and stores all data. This is why e-Learning and IT collaborate to review third-party site requests. Any requests coming in have to fill out paperwork and go through security checks to ensure we avoid potential FERPA violations.

The overall recommendation is to get familiar with AI. The biggest reason SBOE is focusing on AI use is in looking at the security piece. If the state ends up requiring all schools to have a checker, it would be funded through the state.

Question from Faculty Senator: Did this committee's work focus entirely on generative AI or replicative AI?

Response from Dawn: Focus was on generative AI.

Question/statement from Faculty Senator: We need to be aware that there are course tools or Third-party sites that can be enabled by students to answer questions on quizzes/exams even with LockDown Browser enabled. Most schools do have a policy regarding unauthorized collaboration that uses an unauthorized tool. Could we put an item under our Student Code of Conduct policy to ensure we are covered in the event such tools are used?

Response from Dawn: You would be covered under the Student Code of Conduct and could sanction the student if you feel there was unauthorized use that falls under the Student Code of Conduct policy.

Question from Faculty Senator: How does lack of policy affect the division's policy/ability to ensure students adhere to code of conduct or report violations of student code of conduct?

Response from Dawn: It is considered unauthorized use of materials under the Student Code of Conduct? A good place for this policy or changes in wording to live would be under Student Code of Conduct. Dawn demonstrated to Faculty Senate the current wording in the Student Code of Conduct policy under Prohibited Conduct Item A. Academic Dishonesty. Some AI tools are blocked on campus or prohibited by faculty in their syllabi.

Why we don't have a policy on AI is this world is rapidly evolving, so we would have to continuously change policy.

Main takeaway is to have these conversations with the students regarding expectations regarding AI use in the classroom. An example given was she discussed AI use in SD 107 when discussing digital identity.

Response from Faculty Senator: After attending one of the SBOE workshops, he was able to see the potential in AI use for faculty and students. There was a cost in using the tools. Is there potential in the future to have a subscription for our students or faculty in how to access these tools or provide equitable access?

Response from Dawn: This was a discussion point regarding topic regarding a whole school or group subscription, but if it was something you required for the whole

class, you could incorporate it into student fees. If the whole school were to use it, then a platform should be provided for use. We may not receive a response on this until next year.

Question from Faculty Senator: Does anyone's division set a precedent for Grammarly or Chat GPT fees.

General response from Faculty Senate: No

No further discussion.

B. Expanding sabbatical and Faculty Development Grant participation

Conversation on expanding sabbatical and Faculty Development moved to next meeting due to time constraints regarding expanding FDG.

VI.   Committee Reports

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

Committee has not met since last Faculty Senate Meeting. Bulk of work beginning of spring semester.

B. Curriculum *(Marcy Halpin)*

Faculty Senate Chair shared information on Marcy's behalf for a new certificate – BU-CERT: Nonprofit Management Certificate. This certificate is 15 credit hours. There is already a pre-existing minor in Nonprofit Management that is 21 credit hours. Faculty Senate Chair shared that this certificated has been thoroughly vetted in the workflow and checks all the boxes for requirements for a certificate.

Motion to approve BU-CERT: Nonprofit Management made by Thomas Hill. Motion seconded by Katie Roberts. Call for discussion.

Question from Faculty Senator: What is the difference in credits between a certificate and a minor.

Response from Registrar: Clarification that a certificate can stand alone. A minor needs to be associated with a bachelor's degree.

Question/statement from Faculty Senator: On the Program Prioritization committee, administration is not a fan of certificates due to it being difficult to stand alone, so they are not in favor of adding a certificate when many certificates may be on the chopping block in other programs. They are looking at cutting around 20-25 certificates from different programs, particularly those with 0 enrollment and 0 completions. Will this clog up the process/workflow?

Call for vote on motion. Unanimous approval. Two abstentions. Motion carries. Faculty Senate approves the certificate.

C. Faculty Affairs *(Charles Bell)*

Robust discussion and almost finished with rankings for Faculty Development Grants (FDG) and sabbaticals for fall.

Question from Faculty Senator – When will those who applied for FDG receive notification?

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: FDG approval goes to Provost's office, so it depends on the timeframe in the Provost's office for approval.

D. Student Affairs *(Lorinda Hughes)*

Have not met since last meeting. Reminder to please make sure your representatives are bringing the information from the committee to your divisions.

VII.   Good of the Order

No items presented for the good of the order.

Motion to adjourn made by Katie Roberts. Motion seconded by Jessica Savage. Call for a vote. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at 4:51 pm.