



Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes

October 10, 2024 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 134

Zoom Meeting ID: 85699132849

Attendance: Rodney Farrington, Billy Lemus, 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, Isac Ortega, Kim Tuschhoff, President Cynthia Pemberton, Provost Fred Chilson, Sr. Vice President Andy Hanson

Guests: Logan Fowler

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 September 12, 2024

Call for motion to approve to September 12th, 2024, meeting minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes as written by Eric Stoffregen. Motion seconded by Katie Roberts. No further discussion. Call for vote – Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion carries.

III. Announcements/Updates

A. Chair's Report

Reminder Faculty Senate agreed to utilize an open/closed meeting schedule throughout the year. The September 12th meeting was the first closed meeting. The next meeting on October 24th will be our second closed meeting. Intention is to continue this structure moving forward. Will defer discussion regarding AI use and types of AI trainings requested and alternative dispensations for sabbatical funding to garner more division participation at the next closed meeting.

IV. New Business

A. Guest: President Pemberton (email policy)

B. Guest: Logan Fowler, Director of Communications & Marketing (email policy)

President Pemberton presented background information/introductory information on our institutional emails. LCSC.edu is a publicly funded resource/communication vehicle. President Pemberton and the Cabinet have identified some templates for campus community to use as email signatures for our LCSC.edu email. There are

certain components that will be required to be standardized across campus. The Cabinet has been working on this standardization the last few weeks. Logan Fowler was tasked to research how other institutions implemented or standardized email signatures. There are some models for faculty/staff to choose from (such as an area to provide a booking link). This will roll out the first part of November. The goal is to interact with PSO, CSO, Cabinet, President's Council to provide multiple opportunities for understanding prior to roll out and to allow individuals enough time to update their email signature.

Go live date for email signatures is in November. There will be a bit of flexibility built in. Please take back the Email Signatures guidelines to divisions for review and discussion, so people are aware of the new updates and guidelines.

Logan Fowler demonstrated sample templates/document titled "Email Signatures" to the Faculty Senate regarding email signatures. He presented that the new trend is to provide simplicity and conciseness in email signatures across campus. Long email threads with long signatures are not current practice. One item noted in his research across all institutions is a standardized email signature template. The Email Signature document demonstrated to Faculty Senate provides a list of "Do's and Don'ts" for Email Signatures.

Areas of focus in the "Do's and Don'ts" list that include use of one of several standardized office email signature templates that best need the faculty/staff members needs and increasing conciseness of the email signature. The Email Signature document also includes instructions on how to apply the signature in Outlook. He would also like to emphasize not include a confidentiality statement unless instructed to do so by your supervisor. A reminder to Faculty Senate is that all correspondence from an lsc.edu address is subject to open record requests.

Question from Faculty Senator: Can the copy of the email signature requirements/guidelines be sent to Faculty Senate Chair Remien to distribute to faculty.

Response from Logan Fowler: Yes. It is also located on website but can be hard to find. He will send a copy to Peter.

Logan Fowler reported he will be researching automated template programs and will get back to committee on findings on best practices.

Question from Faculty Senator: What if we list our office hours on the email signature so that it is easy to find and accessible for students? What is the recommendation of implementation of office hours in the email signature?

Response: Recommendation would be to link your faculty profile page, which is required to list your office hours. We are focused on keeping email signatures concise, but you can bring items like that up for discussion.

Response from President Pemberton: She recommends any feedback/recommendations be sent to the Faculty Senate Chair to bring back for discussion at Cabinet. The Cabinet can review recommendations and reach a consensus on how to approach any suggestions or additions to the signature.

Response from Logan Fowler is to think of if additions to the signature are either helpful for your audience or concise. The goal is to have a concise signature to decrease file size of emails.

Reminder the goal is for roll out first of November. Please use one of the suggested recommendations. Please begin making these changes, adopt a template and bring

forward any questions/feedback regarding use based on division discussions so it can be determined if any modifications need to be made regarding the “Do’s and Don’ts”.

Question from Faculty Senator: Is the College logo a .txt file or embedded file?

Response from Logan Fowler: College logo is now an embedded file which has the alt text that is needed to make it ADA compliant and no longer seen as an attachment. We would like to have consistent elements in campus communication style and to ensure we are ADA compliant.

Question from Faculty Senator: If we are using one of the email signature templates from the last few years, should we update to the current format?

Response from President: Please update to the new format choosing one of the suggested templates.

Additional Questions for the President:

Question from Faculty Senator: Is there an update on the university/college name change?

Response from President: We were asked to give a second presentation (made by Royal Toy and Logan Fowler) to the SBOE, which was well received. We are currently on hold regarding the name change. Executive director of the SBOE is very supportive of the change. We were referred to as a university by the Executive Director. Due to legislative processes and the current election year, we will be working on building relationships with our legislature, which is our strength. Once elections take place, we will continue to build positive relationships with our legislatures to move forward in the Spring with the proposed name change for the SBOE to review and finalize in the summer for it to be voted on in the Fall 2025. This allows us more time for conversations from the campus community.

Question from Faculty Senator: Will we be receiving some updates or an agenda regarding the SBOE visit to LC State campus next week?

Response from President: There is a link that will be presented to faculty/staff for the meetings to be watched virtually or you will have the opportunity to attend in person. On Wednesday, presentations will occur from the President, Students, Faculty Senate Chair, in addition to key players who can highlight healthcare education trends or enrollment trends. We will be hosting the SBOE by pairing them with a student from our panel to have lunch in our renovated SUB to highlight our new changes. We will also offer board members campus tours and tours of the Healthcare Immersive Learning Lab (HILL) to show our Anatomage tables and VR stations. We will also have a MOU signing with our paramedic program from ISU. Lots of events are coming up next week.

Thank you to the faculty for your support. Please bring all questions back to your Faculty Senate Chair to bring to Cabinet.

C. Guest: Andy Hanson, Vice President for Student Affairs (political speech)

Sr. Vice President Andy Hanson presenting on Tabling Policy involving political speech/beliefs. Several scenarios were posed to faculty senate. The first scenario was if you asked someone walking by the SUB if they are registered to vote, would you be protected by the 1st amendment? Is that protected speech?

Response from Faculty Senator. They stated no, as it is confusing if the comment

could be perceived as a personal reflection or a reflection of the State of Idaho as an employee/representative (government).

Second scenario: What if you said, "Do your part to protect democracy. Register to vote." Is this protected speech?

Third scenario: What if you said, "Do your part to protect democracy, vote for this candidate?" Are you protected by the 1st amendment?

Clarification from Sr. Vice President Hanson is that we do have some protections under the 1st amendment. We are limited when performing in our professional capacity. The more we invoke our titles and affiliation, the fewer protections we have under the 1st amendment.

The first scenario is not necessarily an opinion, as faculty/staff, we can promote voter registration on campus and are protected.

The second scenario provides a gray area which leads to a judgement call. If you pursue this further, how are you able to distinguish the statements as your opinion or as a faculty member on campus.

The third scenario, if there is a formal event, where we are affiliated with LC State, such as at a career fair, we have very little protections under the 1st amendment. We must maintain viewpoint neutrality when acting as a representative of LC State. The same thing goes for wearing an item such as a button declaring an opinion on a certain political candidate. If you are at home or in the community, as long as you are not saying you are affiliated with LC State and adding in institutional affiliation to your statements, you are protected.

Fourth scenario – If our President was out in the community and circulating a petition for her presidential candidate? How could we distinguish if she is a private citizen or President of LCSC? It could cause great reputational risk to the President or the institution by sharing her political opinion.

In looking at a different aspect of the policy, we had a situation where an individual was screaming scriptures at people walking by the SUB. For this individual, where do his first amendment rights begin and end? When should we intervene?

When the individual was following people down a sidewalk and interfering with their path of travel, his first amendment rights stopped. The judgment call or boundaries is if the individual is disrupting business or the flow in or out of the building. There was a gray area in this situation, but overall, no true harm was occurring. As a public entity, he was within his rights to do what he was doing. Due to situations like this, we felt we needed to tighten our policies.

Tabling Policy puts parameters on events that occur on campus to provide more guidelines. If someone wants to come on campus to hand out brochures, etc., they are within their rights to do so, and they don't have to pay for the spot if they are not interfering with normal business functions of the institution. If they bring their own table/chair/yard signs/banners/or box, we can institute parameters which was confirmed by our legal counsel. Once they set up a table/bring a box of supplies, they need to check in with the institution, so public safety and the institution is aware. There would be fees associated with this, as they would need to work with Events and Conferences to reserve the space. The protocol also discusses boundaries of where signs could be displayed.

Two purposes for this policy. Internal policy is that faculty/staff need to be viewpoint neutral when representing an institution. External policy is to provide guidelines to allow for control over our learning environment. This policy will be placed on the events and conferences planning page. Events and Conferences will start to query individuals about what they are bringing to campus to guide them to the correct direction per the policy.

Question from Faculty Senator: If we walk past someone who is tabling, is it acceptable for faculty/staff to ask if they have registered with Events and Conferences and direct them in the appropriate direction?

Response from Sr. Vice President Hanson: It is well within faculty/staff right to ask that question.

Question from Faculty Senator: Where should we direct them if we do come across someone who is tabling?

Response from Sr. Vice President Hanson: Call Events and Conferences – ext. x2644.

Question from Faculty Senator: A concern from faculty regarding a question of what we present in official capacity. Student organizations and groups require a faculty representative/mentor. There are some groups on campus that outsiders may consider political. How far do protections go for those faculty representatives of political student orgs where people may disagree with their opinion?

Response from Sr. Vice President Hanson: Student Clubs and Orgs policies addresses this question regarding political policy. There are some parameters on activities that Clubs and Orgs can/cannot do when representing differing political policies, so they may have similar guidelines to the policy we are speaking of today. Regarding what role an advisor may have over the student group and what responsibilities do employees have over the student club/org as an advisor, they should ask the question “In your role, were you viewpoint neutral and did your division chair or dean know this is going to be occurring?” Clubs and Orgs advisors get some latitude in that respect.

An example scenario is if we had a student group carrying banners for a political candidate. If the advisor was joining the student group and carrying the banner, that could be an issue as they would no longer be viewpoint neutral, which is against policy. We want to support students exercising political opinions, but participating in the event as an advisor crosses the boundaries.

Question from Faculty Senator: If we have a student in LCSC scrubs who are out doing illegal activities, what ramifications could occur?

Response from Sr. Vice President Hanson: A good example of this is something that occur with athletes as well who are representatives of LC State. If an athlete gets pulled over for a DUI when wearing their uniform, is the coach responsible? The coach is not responsible, but they can help handle the student code of conduct issue. If their behavior infringes on the rights of students or employees, then they are not supported.

Question from Faculty Senator: Is there a policy regarding student violence towards faculty?

Response from Sr. Vice President Hanson: There are several areas that cover student violations in the student code of conduct. Student violence towards faculty would

mean a violation of policy, which would be adjudicated. Punishment would deal with harassment, stalking, etc.

No further discussion on Political Speech and Tabling Policies.

Sr. Vice President Hanson presented on changes on Policy 5.301 Involuntary Administrative withdrawal

Changes to policy shared with senators. Sr. Vice President Andy Hansen is looking for input prior to routing for final approvals.

Review of the policy was established when we had a student make substantial threats of violence but were incapacitated enough to not be able to go through the normal judicial process. We needed a procedure for removing individuals from the learning environment. It discusses contingencies to protect due process but also give us the authority to make decisions in the presence of substantial adverse student behavior. Another example given was if a student was not meeting academic requirements. They had a nursing student who failed to meet the pre-requisite requirements for a program and refused to withdraw from their program courses. This policy would protect the division chair/faculty member to remove their registration from courses due to not meeting the pre-requisite components of the program.

We would love feedback on the policy.

Call for discussion from Faculty Senate. Overall consensus from faculty senate is that it seems like the policy is reasonable.

D. Faculty Representative for Admissions Committee

The Admissions office is working on forming a small admissions committee and are requesting one faculty representative. The committee will not meet often and will often communicate over email. Primary duty will be to review student statements from those students who were denied admission. Timeline for appointment is as soon as possible. There is already work for the committee. The absolute deadline for nomination would be October 24th (the next senate meeting). If you know of someone who would be interested in this committee, please forward a name to the Faculty Senate Chair.

Question from Faculty Senator: What would be the committee's role or next steps once you review these statements?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: Job description would include reading statements and providing feedback to the committee regarding whether the student could meet admissions criteria.

Response from Faculty Senator: An example, is if there was a student who is enrolled in a dual credit course who ended up withdrawing from the course. They may have withdrawn through the high school, but not with the college due to lack of knowledge that this was needed. This would impact their overall institutional GPA to where it doesn't meet admission requirements, meaning they are ineligible for admission. The committee would review to see if this is a pattern of behavior or a one-time incident.

Question from ASLCSC Representative: Would we also need a student representative on this committee?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: I will reach out to Soo Lee and get back to you.

Currently, the process is if a student is denied admission, it just went to Soo Lee to make the decision. Her goal is to create a committee to make the decision instead of a sole decision from one individual.

No further discussion.

V. Committee Reports

A. Budget, Planning & Assessment (Peter Remien)

Committee met 9/19 to review basic functions of the committee and to look forward at the FAC reports which will be coming due.

B. Curriculum (Marcy Halpin)

Committee has met. Per communication from Curriculum Chair – there are no items from curriculum committee that requires Senate action. The committee want to share a “Tips for a Successful Curriculum Proposal” document to help reduce the workload for the curriculum committee. This document is available at the top of the curriculum webpage. Item #4 on the list was highlighted due to many curriculum proposals needing to be sent back to divisions, increasing workload and dragging the process out.

Response from Faculty senator: For clarification, the purpose of this tip sheet is when creating your proposals, please make sure your course description of your syllabi match needs to match the catalog course description and information input.

Response from Faculty Senator: The course description in the syllabus shouldn't change as it matches the course description in the catalog. It can't be changed unless through an edit through curriculum committee. We should just be using broad, generalized terms. It should be generalized so any faculty who teach the course should be able to fit the course description. The goal is uniformity across the board.

Reminder from Faculty Senate Chair that this document is located on the curriculum website.

Response from Registrar: Registrar's office takes the information with pre-requisite courses literally on curriculum submissions. If pre-requisite courses are not in your curriculum proposal, they will be removed.

C. Faculty Affairs (Charles Bell)

Committee met. Broad slate of faculty development grants to rank. Good representation in faculty sabbatical applications this year as well.

D. Student Affairs (Lorinda Hughes)

Committee has met. Student Affairs were tasked by Sr. Vice President Hanson to review a few policies that his office owns. The first policy is the Excused Absences Policy (Policy 5.314). The biggest changes were in the language regarding removing “must” and switching to “should” when it came to students being excused from class due to a scheduled absence for students representing the college through

extra-curricular/co-curricular activities.

The example given was the impetus for changing policy. If a student athlete makes it to nationals, they may not have two weeks' time to give notice to the faculty members in the affected classes. The policy change allows for the suggestion that arrangements be made at least two weeks in advance of the excused absence when able. The suggested policy language revision will state "The arrangements should be made at least two weeks prior to the scheduled absence."

In addition, under point of contact in "Other LC State offices directly involved with implementation of this policy, or significantly affected by the policy", it was recommended to add in the Athletic Director. If some reason an athlete is abusing the policy, then we can involve the Athletic Director regarding student athlete communication issues or noncompliance.

Student Affairs is requesting Faculty Senate to review and discuss the changes in the policy and vote on the policy changes.

Motion made by Katie Roberts to approve changes in Policy 5.314, changing statement under Section 1.B.i to "The arrangements should be made at least two weeks prior to excused absence." Seconded change proposed was adding the Athletic Director as a point of contact under "Other LC State offices directly involved with implementation of this policy, or significantly affected by the policy".

Motion seconded by Rodney Farrington. Call for discussion. No further action. Call for vote. Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion carries.

Question from Faculty Senator: We used to see forms from athletes the first few weeks of the semester regarding a potential semester schedule for our student athletes. The faculty in general agreed we have been seeing this less regarding notification. Could we see this form again?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: He would like to invite the Athletic Director to a future meeting to discuss a process.

Response from Sr. Vice President Hanson: He will take this question to the Athletic Director regarding this form and will come back with more information to Faculty Senate.

Question from Faculty Senator: Is there a policy on absences accrued when the student is dropped for non-payment? Faculty have a wide variety of ways to deal with students being dropped, which could pose potential issues for students. It will be helpful for guidance for faculty.

Response from Sr. Vice President Hanson: There is a policy on this item. There was some discussion in student affairs regarding this policy. The policy doesn't address what role faculty must play but does address student accountability.

Response from Registrar: When students are pulled from their classes, it is usually after 2-3 mornings that they need to resolve a financial issue. The ones who get dropped often have been ignoring notifications. This year on the warning list, we had 145 students. After the first couple of notifications, the list decreased to 77 students who were notified classes were cancelled. Rosters will no longer show them as registered on the faculty end. After these 77 students were sent notice of classes cancelled, there is increased traffic for resolution, but not everybody follows through. Would like to see a dialogue on best practices to handle this?

Response from Sr. Vice President Hanson: There is a concern regarding educational

malpractice. If a student is dropped from the course, they should not legally be in the course and would not be covered if there are legal problems. If they are taking tests in the course and not officially enrolled, they could come back in court and state they were technically legally in the course and could demand a final grade. We would legally have to give them a final grade if they completed the components of the course. Sr. Vice President Hanson stated starting point for this discussion is to see how this policy can change. He will bring back more information for discussion after talking with legal counsel.

Question from Faculty Senator: Is there a deadline students are given after they are dropped out of the course for non-payment?

Response from Registrar: Impacted students are given 10 days to correct financial situation after they are dropped out of the course. Some exceptions occur with students who worked out a plan with instructors to be reinstated after that date. After the first warning sent out, impacted students are given a deadline of noon the next day. If this deadline is not met, their classes are cancelled, and they are given 10 days to correct financial standing.

Response from Faculty Senator: It would serve the student better if this deadline is shorter.

Response from Registrar: Changes in dates/deadlines is in discussion. Some of the new freshman may not be aware their financial aid does not cover anything. Common response from students is they didn't read the email. Discussion will occur regarding timeframe for student response before full withdrawal from courses.

Student Affairs Committee Chair presented future discussion items the committee has been tasked with reviewing. They will be reviewing student policies covering calendar days versus business days and timelines and the policy regarding 48-hour timeframe students living in LC State residences must vacate the campus premises after a total withdrawal from school during the semester.

No further discussion.

VI. Good of the Order

- *Feedback from Faculty Senator: Thank you for the templates for items such as email signatures or course descriptions, as they are helpful for those faculty who do not have education backgrounds. Suggestion from a Faculty Senator is to give the email signature template to students as well to use.*
- *Proposal for a future meeting agenda item from a Faculty Senator is a discussion regarding issues with SD 107 courses. Response from another Faculty Senator is to invite Tate Smith for this discussion to provide insight and answer questions. Issues faculty are seeing are there have been a lot of emails to advisors for students not completing assignments or showing up to the course. The faculty would like some direction regarding advising students struggling in this course. The Faculty Senate Chair response is this item will be moved for discussion at the next Faculty Senate meeting.*

Motion to adjourn made by Katie Roberts. Motion seconded by Angela Wartel. Call for a vote. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at 4:42 pm.