Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes

February 6, 2025 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 136
Zoom Meeting ID: 89322523178

Attendance: Peter Remien, Rodney Farrington, 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, Lonny Gehring, Kim Tuschoff, Lorinda Hughes, Provost Fred Chilson

Guests: None

Quorum Met.

I. Call to order

Meeting called to order at 3:15 pm by Faculty Senate Chair Peter Remien. The Faculty Senate Chair welcomed Faculty Senators to the first faculty senate meeting for the spring semester.

II. Approval of Senate Meeting minutes from December 5, 2024

Motion to approve senate meeting minutes as written from December 5th, 2024, made by Rodney Farrington. Motion seconded by Katie Roberts. No further discussion. Call for vote. Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion passes.

III. Announcements/Updates

A. Chair's Report

a. *Faculty Senate Chair Peter Remien reviewed goals for this semester. We will continue broad engagement and discussion on AI use in the classroom. In addition, Faculty Senate will continue to explore sabbatical/FDG participation across divisions. Regarding sabbatical/FDG participation discussions, our Faculty Senate Chair shared that the Faculty Affairs Committee has been experiencing challenges in thinking of expansion to ensure equitable access but will continue exploring process.*

b. *We are still seeking volunteers for nomination for Faculty Senate Chair-Elect. As of today, there are no nominations. Please speak with colleagues who would have an interest in this position.*

Faculty Senator Question: Is there a deadline for when we need nominations in order to vote for the next Faculty Senate Chair Elect.

Faculty Senate Chair Response: We need to vote for this position by the

next Faculty Association Meeting. The deadline for nominations would be ideal by the end of February in order to place it on the agenda for the next Faculty Association meeting.

IV. New Business

A. Guest: Provost Chilson on implications of new state DEI laws

In our November Faculty Senate meeting, we discussed the draft copy of the DEI resolution in addition to two other resolutions that were under review by the Idaho State Board of Education. Those resolutions made it through the SBOE and were approved.

What does this mean for us as an institution? It will not have a huge impact on us, as we don't have many offices that are DEI-related. LC State has always had the mindset that we serve all students. Other institutions will have to make significant changes.

One resolution that was approved was related to governance. In the approved resolution, the SBOE has taken any shared-type governance away from the institutions, switching to a participatory governance model. In the participatory governance model, the President on the educational institution makes all the decisions. While faculty and staff will be able to provide input in decision-making, at the end of the day, the President makes the final decision. In the old model, faculty and staff were heavily involved in decision making. Today's culture, it is no longer the case. Board policy states we have to have participatory governance. Note that the President is receptive to ideas, concerns, and comments. Administration will also still provide input to help assist our President to make good decisions. To be clear, we cannot change this resolution at this time as it has gone through all the channels and final approval.

Call for questions on this resolution:

Faculty Senator question: When you are talking non-shared and participatory governance, how does this impact Faculty Senate?

Provost Chilson response: We will not see a change in the model we currently use. The President will not make any decisions without information. We will have to also look at it from her perspective, as our President may see things differently than we do as she has more information. Our common goal is to put students first and educate our students. In his interim here, Faculty Senate has not demonstrated a shared governance model where input was equal with the President.

Faculty Senator question: In addressing the levels of approval per our policies on campus, will we still follow these guidelines?

Provost Chilson response: Regarding curricular process, the President signs off on all curricula. However, we do all the legwork before it is sent to the Provost and finally to the President for sign off, so it can be sent to the accreditors. The policies we currently have were developed based on the participatory governance model.

The language in the policy read introduced or reintroduced language that the Legislature/Senate can put more pressure on the President. SBOE also wants to be

involved in confirming the Presidents for the higher ed institutions. We may face more scrutiny regarding curriculum and offerings related to DEI as well. Because our President can be put under extra level of scrutiny, especially with the DEI resolution, it puts us in the position to provide more information in order for her to be informed to protect us and answer questions. On administration end, the President has to remain in close contact with all the Vice Presidents to ensure she can obtain information quickly when it is requested of her by the SBOE. Our President has done a great job in answer questions.

Other updates: Recently, LC State had to address pulling of grant money with the change in federal administration, with no guidance from state or federal agencies. This was luckily rescinded based on the court blocking it.

Email signatures: Faculty can use the email signature template we choose off the website. The use of pronouns in the email signature topic that was discussed previously is under scrutiny at the legislature. There is a chance that because we are state employees this will be requested to be omitted.

Call for questions:

Faculty Senator Question: With the DEI resolution, what services on our campus were impacted?

Provost Chilson Response: We have Veterans, Native American and Minority services. When we provided information on these services, we were told it doesn't apply under the DEI scrutiny. We are in the process of changing the name to "Veterans Services and Outreach".

In addition, it is emphasized that the commitment to academic freedom does not impinging on designing our courses. Be aware of places where people might flag classes. Be able to justify any topics that you are teaching if someone reaches out for clarification.

Faculty Senator question: What about the name change from college to university?

Provost Chilson response: The name change is still being considered. We will be meeting with the PPGA board (subcommittee of the state board) in a month to discuss it again. The name change was put on pause last year but will be revisited this year.

Faculty Senator question: Wasn't there a survey in the Monday Message regarding the name change?

Provost Chilson response: Provost Chilson says they recommend submitting feedback via the survey. This will also be placed as an agenda item at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Faculty Senator question: How does this impact NIC with their recent accreditation review? Are there any updates?

Provost Chilson Response: Although, NIC is not directly with the board. SBOE has a higher level of oversight with NIC which also has an internal board. They meet with NWCCU this month or next month. If they do not get an approval, the institution will shut down. He has no doubt that they will reinstate their

accreditation. Things are looking better now that the new board members have been elected.

B. New Qualtrics software for SCEs

New Qualtrics software has helped us review our SCEs earlier and monitor total numbers in real time to keep track of whether students are doing them. IR&E purchased this software, and almost none of us used it. Please use this software which is a value-add to our campus. Prison Education students were not able to complete SCEs via the link. IR&E is working on developing a process for courses in prison ed.

Faculty Senator question: Could we have students complete their SCEs while you are in the classroom?

Response: Recommendation is to not have students complete SCEs while the faculty member is present in the classroom. The Provost recommends giving students time in the first 15 minutes at the beginning of class to complete SCEs while you step out. This ensures they don't just leave without completing them. Reminder that SCEs are optional. We want authentic responses, and we also don't want to force them to do it or make it punitive if they do not complete.

Encourage students to fill out course evaluations and use this software!

V. Old Business

A. General Education category renaming (options from Gen Ed. Committee: **Comparative Perspectives**, **Community Perspectives**, **Communities & Culture**)

Faculty Senate Chair presented that last semester, LC State was directed to change our Gen Ed. Diversity requirement name. The Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences came up with the category name – Global Perspectives, as we had a quick turnaround time to change the name. At the time, it was emphasized that "Global Perspectives" was potentially a placeholder to allow us time to discuss the name change to ensure we find an appropriate title. As we had discussed, there were potential problems with the name change to "Global Perspectives". The Gen Ed committee had robust discussions involving feedback from Faculty Senators regarding possible alternatives to Global Perspectives category which is what is being shown today - Comparative Perspectives, Community Perspectives or Communities & Culture.

The Faculty Senate Chair is bringing these three potential names to the Faculty Senate for discussion. If Faculty Senators feel strongly about one of these options today, we can vote to recommend a name change. If a name change was voted in, the change would occur in all our systems over the next calendar year.

Call for discussion:

Faculty Senator response: We discussed these options in the Social Sciences

Division meeting. The overwhelming majority preferred Comparative Perspectives for the change.

In the discussion, the Social Sciences Division was against the #2 option (Community Perspectives) as a lot of the offices/titles that were being required to change related to DEI included the word "Community." With the third option, Communities and Culture, the word culture could be flagged being under the DEI scrutiny, so it impacts the scope of the definition. A faculty member supported option number one as the term "comparative" is something beige that wouldn't face scrutiny.

In our current placeholder, the term "global" could be flagged based on different opposing ideological positions. Also, there is a potential colonial implication in terms of indigenous studies. The Gen Ed Committee was concerned with the term "global" but also concerned with coming up with a new title that could be flagged down the road.

Faculty Senator question: Why couldn't we just use "Perspectives" with no adjective?

Response: This was also proposed and discussed in the Gen Ed. Committee. It was discussed that "Perspectives" was too vague and may not be meaningful to students.

Faculty Senator feedback is "Comparative Perspectives" seems redundant. Not all courses in this category are considered comparative (one example given being Spanish language course).

In summary, the Faculty Senate is leaning towards recommending "Perspectives" versus "Comparative Perspectives" to Gen Ed. committee to continue the discussion and feedback from today's meeting will be given to the Gen Ed. committee. This will then be brought back to Faculty Senate at the next meeting for a potential vote.

B. CTL gathering AI assignments & upcoming events

Faculty Senate Chair report on AI: There will be several upcoming AI events on campus. A few faculty have sent the Faculty Senate Chair AI assignments and modules that their divisions have worked on, which will be posted on the CTL Canvas page. Faculty are encouraged to send additional assignments or units in their classes that significantly engage AI to Faculty Senate Chair. A folder in our Teams will also be created so assignments/modules can be shared directly. Having assignment prompts with a student example also could be helpful as long as examples are anonymous, and permission was granted for use. Please share faculty assignments that significantly engage AI technologies on purpose to teach how to use in classroom and to use AI productively. The overall goal is to help the students to use it productively.

Martin Gibbs, Dean of LA&S, attended a conference in Washington D.C., which had the majority of panels focused on AI, a radical shift from the previous year. Please also reach out to your Dean to get a copy of "Teaching with AI" to review. In addition, on April 8th at noon (Tuesday), during the Liberal Arts and Sciences

meeting, there will be an AI presentation which is open to other divisions. State AI fellow Liza Wong will be joining us to present. Liza will also be holding a CTL workshop on AI use later in the day. Everyone is invited to attend both events.

April 3rd, our state AI fellows will be holding an all-day research symposium that the AI fellows. Please feel free to register and drop in to the different presentations.

Question posed to Faculty Senators: How many people are using AI and what they are using? The State is interested in purchasing an AI subscription for the schools. A lot of the AI software programs are subscription-based, which is a change we are seeing with most software/technology.

Faculty Senator question: Would it be helpful to know what the high schools are being taught and how they are using AI?

Response from Provost Chilson: There is a new requirement for high school graduates, which includes technology usage/AI use. LC State is on the ground level with our teacher prep programs. The State is expecting that new teachers will be graduating with the knowledge on how to teach AI usage. It would also be helpful to collaborate with K-12 teachers on how to use it.

Response from Faculty Senator: The AI session held today was on AI detection and attribution in the classroom. There are several universities being sued as students were accused of plagiarism, based on use of detection software that didn't work or wasn't accurate. Be open with your conversations with your students about AI use. If you are uploading student's work into the detection software, it could violate their copyright rights if they did not give permission to upload their own work. With use of AI software, the user gives permission to for an AI search everything on their computer.

Response from Library: One of the vendors, ProQuest, has implemented AI in its search function by giving an AI summary. The library can turn this feature off. Is this worth a discussion in keeping this feature or turning it off? All librarians in research appointments are warning students this summary may not be accurate.

VI. Committee Reports

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

BPAC is compiling observer reports for FAC. The chair of BPAC, Peter Remien, is compiling the budget report to present to the administration. Once completed, the budget report will be available to everyone on Teams, identifying budget requests.

B. Curriculum *(Marcy Halpin)*

No report.

C. Faculty Affairs *(Charles Bell)*

No report.

D. Student Affairs *(Lorinda Hughes)*

Student Affairs Committee was tasked by Vice President Hanson to review three

different policies which were discussed in November. Today, Faculty Senators are asked to look at Policy 5.310 - Grade Appeal. Key revisions made on this policy defines how much time the students receive to appeal their grades by clarifying calendar days versus business days. The flow of the appeal process was also addressed. In addition, clean up/grammatical edits also occurred within the policy.

The first suggested revision changing business days to calendar days is seen via 2. A "Students have fourteen (14) calendar days from the date semester grades are posted to officially appeal in writing to the instructor of the course." *In the summer, this appeal would revert to the division chair, so the student is not stopped in the process to decrease financial aid impact.*

Faculty Senator question: In item 2.A, can we change the suggested policy language change to state "Students have fourteen (14) calendar days from the date official semester grades are posted to formally appeal in writing to the instructor of the course."

Overall faculty consensus liked the suggested change to Item 2.A.

In addition, in item 2.B.i, thirty (30) calendar days was added to the language regarding filing a written request reconsideration directed to the division chair being delivered from date of written response from instructor.

In addition, Faculty Senate reviewed the statement in Item 2.B.iii regarding conflict of interest in the case the division chair is instructor of the course or there is a proven conflict of interest regarding appeal process.

> *Item 2.B.iii* "If the Division Chair is the instructor of the course and there is a proven conflict of interest, the appeal would defer to the institutional Petition Committee."

Fourteen (14) calendar days was added to the timeframe regarding written "Notice of Impasse" to help with flow in Item 2.C.i.

In Item C.ix, language was also added/edited regarding role of the Hearing Board of the Faculty Senate, including their role in determining if a fair hearing was provided, the appeal process is deemed completed.

Faculty Senator question – In the statement regarding Division Chair conflict of interest, should we add language identifying who would vet a proven conflict of interest?

After Faculty Senate discussion, overall suggestion was to take out the word "proven" in the language in Item 2.B.iii conflict of interest statement.

Faculty Senator question: Should we clarify which Hearing Board the student should appeal to in Item 2. C. viii and 2.C.ix. as a grade appeal involves a student. Typically, student appeals would be held via the Student Hearing Board. Should we add the word "Student" in front of Hearing Board?

Request to add the word Student to the term Hearing Board.

Response: Clarification was made that the Hearing Board of the Faculty Senate supersedes the Student Hearing Board regarding grade appeals. The type of Hearing Board is already defined in Item 2.C.vi and 2.C.vii. No corrections made

to the Hearing Board item.

All changes made on mark-up draft.

After Faculty Senate discussion, motion was made to approve Policy 5.310 with the changes discussed and implemented on the mark-up draft by Eric Stoffregen. Motion seconded by Jennifer Cromer. No further discussion. Call for vote. Unanimous approval. No abstentions. Motion passes.

The next policy under review by Student Committee, Policy 3.13. Final Examination Make-Up Schedule, will be presented for review by the Student Committee chair at the next Faculty Senate meeting

VII. Good of the Order

A. Institutional Development Grants due Friday, Feb. 7

B. Faculty Development Grants due March 3 (by 5:00pm) –

Usual application process for FDGs this semester. Next semester, we will be utilizing Qualtrics for grant application.

C. Call for items for the Good of the Order

No further items.

Motion to adjourn by Katie Roberts. Motion seconded by Charles Bell. Unanimous approval. No abstentions.

Meeting adjourned at 4:34 pm.