



Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes

November 7, 2024 | 3:15 p.m. | ACW 134

Attendance: Rodney Farrington, Kelly Fitzsimmons, Julie Bezzerides, Gina Lott, Jennifer Cromer, Jenna Chambers, Katie Roberts, Eric Stoffregen, Alex Bezzerides, Rachelle Genthos, Angela Wartel, Thomas Hill, Christina Brando-Subis, Charles Bell, Peter Remien, Lorinda Hughes, Kim Tuschhoff, Provost Fred Chilson

Guests:

Zoom Meeting ID: 83018116745

I. Call to Order

3:15 pm by Faculty Senate Chair Peter Remien with review of the agenda. Last faculty senate meeting of the semester. Faculty Association meeting is scheduled via Zoom next Thursday, November 14th.

II. Approval of Senate Meeting minutes from October 24, 2024

Call for motion to approve to October 24th, 2024, meeting minutes.

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

III. Announcements/Updates

A. Chair's Report

General Education Committee met this week to discuss the name change from "Diversity" to "Global Perspectives" in the General Education core. Based on feedback from general conversation and faculty senators, the committee discussed several alternatives for names. The change has been made. However, the General Education committee would like to move forward names for suggestion such as "Cultural Perspectives" to Faculty Senate chair to review, to bring back dialogue to Faculty Senate. Please talk to your Gen Ed Committee division representative if there are any suggestions.

Robust conversation regarding AI this semester. Moving forward, it appears faculty are not interested in an overarching policy right now. We do have syllabus statements available on the website. Faculty Senate Chair would like to see Faculty Senate work gathering division or specific discipline statements on AI in collaboration with the CTL to make a library of statements available as a resource for the campus. In the SBOE meeting, the general feeling is that there is an interest in faculty engaging with AI and not ignoring it in the classroom. Faculty Senate Chair would like to create an archive of assignments from different disciplines using AI for faculty to help guide conversation surrounding AI without policy direction.

B. Provost's Report

Provost Chilson reported that our recent election could have significant impact to

institution financially. There will be a lot of changes this year based on requests from our legislature. Be aware, there may be times administration is requesting information from faculty with a short turn around. Currently, we are dealing with DEI investigation/requests. The legislative group has asked for us to provide information on DEI.

Thanks to the committee who is working on Program Performance Committee, as they are doing great work. We completed a peer evaluation with our 16 institutional peers with LC State. LC State offers 212 different programs. Closest peer offers only 60 programs on survey of 16 institutions. Average amount of programs is somewhere in between 20-60 in that group. We are working on cleaning up curriculum as we move forward in order to cut down programs.

The Provost's office just received ranking orders for sabbaticals. Provost Chilson will be meeting with President Pemberton to review ranking and identify plan for this year. The Provost will update after meeting with President (tomorrow or the next day).

Faculty Development Grants – Faculty Affairs committee had great meeting. Faculty recipients notified regarding FDG approval.

October 20-22nd, 2025 is the NWCCU accreditation site visit (7-year annual visit) which is a week after the SBOE visit.

Last item is our state superintendent is moving to eliminate a category of grad requirements with speech by adding in a technology component. One of these components will include AI. If this occurs, we will need to revise our Teacher Education curriculum on the secondary side but will also need to identify and address impact on other curriculum. We will be needing to build this into our classes.

Call for questions.

Question from Faculty Senator: When will the repairs on the back stairwell be repaired?

Response from Provost: Unsure of timeframe. Will find out more information.

Question from Faculty Senator: What type of programs are we looking at cutting within the Program Performance Committee?

Response from Provost: We are looking at programs as an overarching piece, with many different tracks within the program, such as certification pathways. Examples are hospitality management with different pathways, or secondary education with different certificates. All the ITCs and certificates are listed in the system as independent programs. We are attempting to move towards an overarching degree with the ITCs/certificates located within them instead of as a separate program. Understanding, is we have 170 different certificates, but we don't have 170 different programs on campus. SBOE sees the individual certificates as different programs. It should be broken down categorically. Committee is in process to work with Registrar and IR&E to clean it up.

Faculty Senator Question: Are there concerns that reducing the COMM requirement for high school students will reduce need for COMM faculty at LC?

Response from Provost: Do we need students to understand technology and public speaking? He may defer response to someone who can better answer the question.

Question from Faculty Senator Chair: Was there a comm ed degree proposed? Response from Provost: There was a Secondary Education Communication Arts degree. It is rare.

Question from Faculty Senator: What is the motivation behind why they are removing speech and adding in technology?

Response from Provost: It would be a win for the state superintendent regarding accomplishments within the K-12 model. It was a recommendation from the State superintendent.

Question from Faculty Senator: Is the state concerned about the privacy issues involving

AI?

Response from Provost: State has put a ton of resources into AI, regarding putting out education for faculty/staff on use.

Question from Faculty Senator: Dependent on how they input AI for high schoolers, is there concern regarding judgement of students of what they input into AI and access of how to use it?

Response from Provost: There is a statewide initiative for AI that goes from K – 12 to address education on use.

Question from Faculty Senator: Concern across campus regarding advising is the amount of time/effort and overwhelming abundance with it. Are there any solutions to solve this problem?

Response from Provost: There are a few divisions that are extremely overwhelmed. It might be worth a consideration in the RRF to request an advisor, but there is only so much money in the pool. We need to identify needs for whether the division needs an additional new faculty versus adding in a program advisor. Any issues, please bring it forward.

IV. Old Business

A. Expanding Sabbatical and FDG participation

Faculty Senate Chair Peter Remien wanted to return to the issue of expanding sabbatical and FDG participation. Currently, the Faculty Affairs committee is more focused on sabbatical applications. Most applications come from Liberal arts and Sciences. It is helpful to have a CTE viewpoint from the current Faculty Affairs chair. One idea was to resurrect the mini sabbatical, which was a project-based course release, which went away during COVID. In T&I and other divisions, it may not meet the need, especially with faculty members who are specialized in what they teach.

Response from Faculty Affairs Committee Chair: In T&I, there is not a definition of course load. You cannot give a course release via a mini-sabbatical if there is not a definition of load. Many faculty members already teach in overload already in T&I. To have a course release, the division would need to reduce overload and reduce load even further, which reduces number of available classes to students due to specialty courses offered. Mini sabbaticals were not solving the issue regarding equity on course release.

An alternative the Faculty Affairs committee identified was an expanded version of FDG, with expanded timelines on reporting. Committee spent time expanding on what would work best with faculty from other divisions who often don't submit sabbatical applications while eligible. Faculty Affairs Committee spent time talking to divisions and putting together a questionnaire of what would help.

Proposal was an expanded FDG awarding between \$3000 - \$4000 range with expanded requirements to simulate sabbatical and to help give funds for them to do something during the summer to further their development and best meet other division's needs.

Call for Discussion:

Question from Faculty Senator: Initial thoughts are that faculty may have to give up summer session to complete requirements for the expanded FDG? Is that fair to ask faculty to do this type of work over the summer to help provide restoration, which is part of sabbatical purpose?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: Faculty Affairs Committee was looking at expanding opportunities for faculty to apply outside of a traditional sabbatical, not necessarily when the faculty would be completing requirements. Many faculty in divisions across campus feel like they cannot apply for sabbatical due to workload. If we align it with the sabbatical, it

will feel unequal to the sabbatical. If faculty feel like nothing is available to them, providing an opportunity is better than nothing, regarding opportunities available to them.

Question from Faculty Senator: Would applying to this expanded FDG prevent that faculty member from applying for sabbatical down the road?

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: We wouldn't have funds to add both mini sabbaticals and expanded FDG idea. It may depend on how policy would be set for timeframe, and would the policy stipulate one or the other, and if there was a wait timeframe between application between the two.

Statement for Faculty Senator: For clarification, I would be applying for money for faculty development, not necessarily a sabbatical, where you would receive course release. Most conferences may be a weeklong and cost between \$3-4000, that we have had funded from multiple resources in the past. There has been discussion regarding potential classroom impact regarding attending long conferences (weeklong) for faculty development and to bring relevancy to courses, versus smaller courses that are less expensive. Unsure if we would restrict the timing of when funds should be used.

Question from Faculty Senator: Which pot of money will the funding come from - Sabbatical versus FDG funds?

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: Yes, it will come from the same funds. We don't always get the same amount of funding each year for sabbaticals. Provost stated he is unsure what we will be able to do currently and are looking at the numbers.

Response from Provost: Every division is allocated \$1500 per faculty member for faculty development. Provost stated it is not a choice for allotment. In the past, there were some divisions that were significantly underfunded and some with lots of money. We made it more equitable by allocating \$1500 per faculty member. Idea is to use this money first before requesting any additional funds through Faculty Development Grants. The Provost understands week-long conferences are costly. Just be aware that there are some funds, but not to the degree of this proposal (\$3000 – \$4000). This was the proposed idea to shift those funds for professional development. Funds not used in the division for these faculty go to the local account. If your division wants to build a nest egg, they may not advertise or shell out the money in order to put it in the local account. Whole intention is to ensure there were professional development opportunities for faculty.

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: Back to the conversation on if this was aligned with sabbaticals, if faculty were awarded this grant suggestion, would this reset the timeline with sabbaticals? While we don't want to restrict faculty to apply for it, if a faculty felt they may in a few years apply for a sabbatical, they wouldn't apply for this grant.

Response from Provost: One variable that you can see is that the conference you want to attend is right now, whereas a sabbatical is a whole year away. It makes planning hard.

Questions from Faculty Senator: Would this be something that could help to contribute to a conference or training for a certification?

Response from Provost: There is a gray line for what the state would allow for certifications and funding use. Will have to evaluate to see where it would fit in to see if it crosses the line?

Response from Faculty Senator: This would be a good method to help assist faculty with certifications for their discipline.

Question from Faculty Senator: Since this is the same pot of money, if I received a sabbatical last year, I would have to wait 6 years to apply for this larger sum of money for faculty development.

Response from Provost: The timeframe is something we would have to consider.

Response from Faculty Senator: Some faculty in CTE teach 16-21 classes, and there is no

one to take over for them as there is too much to be completed to take a sabbatical.

Question from Faculty Affairs Chair: Would something like this benefit faculty in CTE.

Response from Faculty Senator: There are some great conferences to help enhance professional development. These often occur in the summer, so we would be able to attend.

Question from Faculty Senate Chair: Is there enough interest in this idea to support Faculty Senate Chair and Faculty Affairs Chair Charles Bell in moving forward with their proposal? It sounds like it might be potentially beneficial to some divisions to assist with equity and raise morale.

Question from Faculty Senator: Do we need to put a motion forward or are we gauging interest?

Response from FAC: Looking for interest in moving forward, to bring back to committee. Look for Faculty Affairs committee members to bring back questions to the division.

Question from Faculty Senator: Are there certain categories the provost is looking at regarding this proposal.

Response from Provost: The only parameters are that I am open to whatever. We would have to look closely regarding using funds to obtain certifications, as the state looks closely at the language used and has parameters/requirements.

Question from Faculty Senator: Is there any advantage for the pot of money is allocated between the different schools?

Response from Provost: If we break it out evenly (in thirds) towards the three schools, it may create a disadvantage, if only liberal arts faculty apply for funding.

Question from Faculty Senator: For clarification, we are not touching FDG money, this is just the sabbatical pot of money?

Response from Provost: Funding would only come from sabbatical funds.

Question from Faculty Senator: Could we get a course release with full salary in addition to the money to assist with professional development?

Response from Faculty Affairs chair: There is not a course release definition.

Response from Provost: It would be encouraged to have the release time at normal salary with additional funds to support professional development. For example, a mini sabbatical plus funding.

Question from Faculty Senator: If faculty could obtain course release, could they get a few weeks of summer salary plus funds for course release.

Response from Provost: We don't have a budget for summer. Summer is self-sustaining, so the Provost would have to look at the budget.

Question from Faculty Senator: Our division Faculty Affairs committee representative sent this out for discussion. Someone in the division proposed a mini-sabbatical with a higher amount of course release (6 credits), so someone could pursue a doctorate.

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: This is a great idea. It may be more difficult to make this feasible regarding course workload as different schools may have different needs.

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: There is still a lot of discussion on this topic. Good goal of coming out of the winter break into the next Faculty Senate meeting would be to identify a couple concrete proposals or draft language for proposals.

Please reach out to Faculty Senate Chair or Faculty Affairs representatives for ideas.

No further discussion.

V. Committee Reports

A. Budget, Planning & Assessment (Peter Remien)

No meeting since last senate meeting. Most work occurs at beginning of spring semester. There will be an informal meeting late in the fall semester.

Question from Faculty Senator: Have there been ideas for the CRC committee that will be added to the report. Does NWCCU requires a CRC committee for accreditation.

Response from Provost: NWCCU accreditation does not require a CRC committee for accreditation.

Response from Faculty Senator: We wouldn't want to have the CRC committee dissolve, which is where we are allowed to make funding requests.

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: The meetings for both blurred together, as they have similar tasks.

Question from Faculty Senator: What does CRC mean?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: It means Compensation Review Committee. It brings faculty, PSO, CSO.

B. Curriculum (Marcy Halpin)

No updates from Curriculum for Faculty Senate to vote on today.

C. Faculty Affairs (Charles Bell)

Report: Committee has met a few times and will meet again on December 4th. Committee will be working on clarity in rubric used for FDG. This year, we had great participation for FDG, but a wide spread of ranking of these grants. Committee identified they would like to review, revise and publish the rubric before the time period FDG applications for spring come out, to help provide more context on what they would like to see in applications.

Question from Faculty Senator: Can you identify what were some of the disparities?

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: In the rankings, there were some applications that were as long as sabbatical applications and some with brief sentences. Some the budget was not well laid out. It may be more appropriate to increase ranking of taking students to experiences versus singularly presenting at a conference. The applications were not representative of type of teaching we do currently.

Question from Faculty Senator: The application itself may need updated to add some clarity of how long you want the responses to be to application questions.

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: That is great feedback. Funding may be different (institutional grants for taking students to activities versus FDG funding for faculty development).

Question from Faculty Senator: Can you offer up a sample application that demonstrates clear expectation to ensure we are filling it out correctly? My division passes around past applications as an example, but we do not know if that meets expectations.

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: Yes, we can do this. We are also considering publishing the rubric used for FDG on the website, as it is not currently available.

Response from Past Faculty Senate Chair: People who are applying should speak with Faculty Affairs Committee division representative to support their proposal, so the representative is not going in blind.

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: There is only one member with history on the committee who may be aware of this need for applicants to speak with their representative.

Response from Past Faculty Senate Chair: Having the person who submitted the application, or some type of representation to help answer questions during the meetings is helpful. The division representative should be able to present.

Question from Faculty Senator: Should the FDG rubric be part of policy, or part of the application?

Response: The rubric changes so much it should not be part of policy. It could be made part of the application.

Response from Faculty Affairs Chair: That's a good idea.

No further discussion.

D. Student Affairs (Lorinda Hughes)

Met a few times and will again before end of semester. Asked to review 3 policies. Just got done reviewing grade appeal and grievance policies. Question was business days versus calendar days, but they identified more issues. One group fixed one item in the policy, but didn't correct the redundancy. Your representatives should be asking the division if we can agree on the suggested changes. If you have an opinion, tell your representative.

VI. Good of the Order

- Discussion re: Email Signatures

Question from Faculty Senator: When President visited with Logan about email signatures, we collected feedback from our division? Who should we send it to?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: Please send feedback to Logan Fowler?

Question from Faculty Senate Chair: What was some of the feedback?

Response from Faculty Senator: Some felt there was a lack of individuality, in the signature. Are we able to list pronouns?

Response from Provost: Please share any feedback with Logan Fowler/Provost.

- Discussion re: Fullbright Scholarship

Question from Faculty Senator re: Fullbright Scholarship: For clarification on Fullbright Scholarship, during the last Faculty Senate meeting, it sounded like certain divisions may claim this opportunity. As an institution, there is a push to not compete against ourselves, as we may only be awarded one scholarship.

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: This was the push to take it to Senate to have this discussion. If multiple divisions interested, we could apply multiple years but would like to avoid multiple applications in one year.

Question from Faculty Senator: Are you looking for committee members?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: It depends on how the committee is housed in a specific division. The idea is to form a mini committee who would be in charge of moving this forward. This could be any division.

Clarification from Faculty Senator: If a division stepped forward with interest, a mini committee would be formed.

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: What if two divisions stepped forward for the scholarship. Jennie would have to make the decision.

Response from Provost: The Provost indicated we would have to contribute institutional funds, so he would like to be part of the decision-making process as well, in order to review the budget.

Question from Faculty Senator: If our division is interested, how much work or preparation goes into this grant?

Response from Faculty Senate Chair: You would be committing to work as part of the committee in the spring. Right now, we are putting in the general call for someone who could teaching in a particular area, to receive a match from someone who fits. If you have someone who could apply, you can write the grant towards the person who applied.

- SAC Hall Stairway

Provost made an announcement based on a response to an inquiry during meeting – LC State received a quote from Quality Contracts last month regarding the back stairwell in SAC Hall. This is being reviewed by an adjuster. He has requested a timeframe, but the current response is that the timeframe is unknown.

- Human Library - GSA

GSA is having a Human Library tomorrow, Friday, 11/8 at 5 – 7 pm in the WCC. You can check out a human in order to ask the questions you would like to ask.

- LC State play “Turn of the Screw”.

Play is opening tonight, 11/7 at 7:30 pm, in addition to Friday, 11/8 and Saturday, 11/9. Sunday, 11/10 is a 2 pm showing. Times will reoccur next week as well. All are invited to attend. Play will occur in the Silverthorne Theater.

Motion to adjourn made by Katie Roberts. Motion seconded by Thomas Hill. Call for Vote. Unanimous approval. Meeting adjourned at 4:21 pm.