



## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Oct. 26, 2023 | 3:15 p.m. | **ZOOM**

Zoom Meeting ID: 911 863 9554 <https://lcsc.zoom.us/j/9118639554>

**Attendance:** Jenny Scott, Celeste Ellis, Peter Remien, Polly Knutson, Leif Hoffmann, Suzanne Rousseau, Gina Lott, Lorinda Hughes, Jenna Chambers, Marti Reese, Jessica Savage, Katie Roberts, Thomas Hill, Jennifer Cromer, Eric Stoffregen, Rodney Farrington, Charles Bell, Kristy Gonder, Mike Owen, Debra Lybyer, Kim Tuschhoff, President Pemberton, Lonny Gehring, Seth Long, Billy Lemus

**I. Call to Order: 3:15pm**

**II. Approval of Senate Meeting minutes from Oct. 12, 2023**

- Motion to approve as written by Jessica Savage, second by Jennifer Cromer. Unanimous approval, no opposed, no abstentions.

**III. Announcements/Updates**

- President Pemberton: *Keeping you up to date with Monday Message material. Does anyone have any questions for me at this time? No response.*
- Chair: According to our fall schedule for meetings, the next meeting - Nov. 9 - will be our last Senate meeting for this semester, unless there is need to have another one just before winter break. For all committee chairs: if there are any action items or Senate discussion you would like to have on anything else this fall, please plan to do that Nov. 9.
- Chair-elect reports on behalf of Academic Affairs:

*Library is concerned about rising costs of journals and databases that this institution is subscribed to. Reminder to use the tools that are important to your discipline so we don't lose access. Topic for discussion: Brainstorming ideas for an "Honors College." This might be used for a recruitment tool.*

**IV. Committee Reports**

- A. Budget, Planning & Assessment (*Jenny Scott*): we will be meeting again in the next few weeks.

B. Curriculum (Polly Knutson):

*Curriculum Committee is almost all the way through all the proposals received, we are making good time. Krista Harwick asked for the Master's in Nursing Leadership proposal to be sent back to see if a couple of courses could be found elsewhere on campus. Bus 512 Human Resource Management and Bus 560 Leadership were found to be suitable.*

C. Faculty Affairs (Peter Remien):

*Met three times now this semester and we have ranked and given recommendations for faculty development grant proposals. I believe recipients have been contacted. Many good proposals were received this semester. A few days ago five sabbatical applications were ranked and our recommendations were given to the dean and provost.*

D. Student Affairs (Lorinda Hughes):

*Have not had need to meet, please bring topics forward.*

V. **Special Presentation & Discussion - POSTPONED to Nov. 9**

A. The Student Perspective of AI (Neto Garcia Rosales & Peter Zepeda)

VI. **Old Business**

A. (action item) Student Petitions Committee Policy

*Chair: after review and discussion last meeting, it was suggested that you all take this back to your Divisions for additional review and feedback. One suggestion I have received since then is to move the "Limitations" item to the end (after "roles"). Other suggested edits?*

*Reminder, need to have this written as policy for accreditation reasons. The only change was that the elections may not need to happen "each" semester if there are no vacancies, but instead "during" the spring semester when needed. The other suggestion was to add "Limitations" to clarify what "not to do" following "Function." The recommendation was to move Limitations down beneath "Structure" to keep with how other Policies are formatted.*

*Discussion from Senator: "Limitations" fits well under Function to clarify what they are not responsible for. Keep it there.*

*Discussion from Senator: There was a split in two committees—Financial Aid and Student Committees. Is there a merging of these committees? If so, we may need to separate these things.*

*Discussion from Chair: Let's get this clarified—are there merging of committees? Let's discuss this with Financial Aid. My understanding is the staff of the Financial Aid Office reviews these first. Is there faculty involvement with Section 2a?*

*Question from Senator: Is there a separate Financial Aid Petition Committee?*

*Chair: the wording states that the committee will review "select" financial aid*

*appeals. That seems clear. And it states that the Financial Aid office reviews first then sends to committee.*

- *Motion to approve edits made by Leif Hoffmann, second Peter Remien.*
- *Vote: Unanimous approval, no opposed and no abstentions.*

B. *(action item) Sabbatical Policy revisions (reconsideration of proposal last spring) Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, Peter Remien, presents recommendations: There are five proposed edits to Policy 2.114 (Sabbatical Leave) that the Faculty Affairs Committee voted to approve last spring. Edits 1, 2, 5, and 6 were made for clarity and to align policy with existing practice. Edits 3 and 4 change the scoring system for sabbatical applications. Here is the detailed description of each edit:*

**Edit 1 (page 1):**

We have added the sentence “If granted, Sabbatical may be taken in the seventh year” to 2.A (Policy) for clarity.

**Edit 2 (page 2):**

We have rephrased E.3 (Evaluation of Proposals) to read: “Relative value of the proposed leave to scholarly activity, creative activity, and/or professional development” The existing phrasing in E.3 is “Relative value of the proposed leave to scholarly/creative activity and professional development” Our rationale was that the new phrasing is clearer and invites a greater range of activity. *Example: A CTE representative discussed the difficulty in supportive “Creative Activity” when taking a sabbatical for a diesel project while working in industry.*

**Edit 3 (page 2):**

We have raised the points awarded in E.3 from 20 to 25, thereby emphasizing scholarship and professional development in the scoring system.

**Edit 4 (page 2):**

We have changed the phrasing of E.6 from “with no upper limit” to “with a maximum of 15 points.” The idea was to limit the number of points granted for years of service to maintain competitiveness.

**Edit 5 (page 2-3):**

We have eliminated E.6 because it is redundant with I.A and not part of scoring.

**Edit 6 (page 5)**

We eliminated “the applicant” from the October 25 row in III to align policy with practice.

*One of the reasons this hasn't happened is because then it would be “awkward” for the chair to let the candidate know that their application has ranked low. Upon an individual basis, the faculty affairs chair will offer feedback to the candidate.*

*Discussion on the first set of edits?*

*Comment from Senator: In "Action" section (Oct. 25) should we clarify "the dean of the applicant's school of studies" or do all the deans need to be notified?*

*Discussion: Yes, this needs to be looked into. Would we like to vote on these edits?*

*Question from Senator: Is there a reason why the dean needs to be notified?*

*Discussion from Senator: Are we notifying the deans and the chair too early? If the candidate doesn't advance, then there is no reason to notify.*

*Question: Peter, should we switch the language to professional revitalization? Is it really clear to us the difference between professional development and professional revitalization? Is this language clear enough for your committee?*

*Clarification: Is the concern that E1. And E3 have differing terms—professional revitalization and professional development? Is it understood that professional development is under the umbrella of professional revitalization?*

*Discussion point on notifying the dean: The provost does typically consult with the dean even at the early stage of the ranking process. In my opinion it would be good to keep the dean in the communication loop, so let's leave the dean on this list.*

*President Pemberton: The President does not need to inform the SBOE of accepted sabbatical proposals. This is found on the Action Item Table under section "May."*

*Senator speaks: Just be aware of the ambiguity of language between E.1. and E.3.*

*Peter Remien speaks: E.1. is holistic in nature and E.3 is representative of the project.*

*Chair: Makes clarification that "self-renewal" is no longer there. It was taken out in last year's revisions approved by Senate and now updated in policy.*

*Are we concerned that someone would conflate professional development and professional revitalization?*

*Peter Remien: It is possible that the repetition of "professional" in professional development and professional revitalization could produce ambiguity, but the intended difference is between the specific project and a broader sense of how the sabbatical might benefit a person's professional career.*

*Chair: Item 3 made sure to separate by commas to separate the various types of activities.*

*Peter Remien: We haven't changed the wording, but rather separated out the projects to honor what we get to do at this college. Our revision doesn't introduce the ambiguity, but rather separates and, in my opinion, clarifies.*

*Chair: Would you like to take action on this now?*

*Motion to approve Edits 1, 2, 5 and 6 (see above) so far made by Leif Hoffmann, Second by Charles Bell. Unanimous approval, no opposed, no abstention. Motion passes to approve the edits thus far for practice alignment and clarification.*

*Peter Remien discusses "Edit 3 (page 2):*

*We have raised the points awarded in E.3 from 20 to 25, thereby emphasizing scholarship and professional development in the scoring system."*

*Discussion from Senator: Are we going to over emphasize points for scholarly research and not the other activities.*

*Discussion: The discussion in the committee considered 20 points to each, but then decided to give more points the actual project being delivered.*

*Discussion from Senator: Are we leaving points of service to the institution to help in the competitive nature of the process?*

*Discussion from Peter Remien: We have had years where someone who has had 25 years with the institution come in and outrank someone with less service and a project to develop.*

*Discussion from Senator: I think it is important to keep this in there as is so we can have a way to sort out those close point differences. We want to award for longevity but also award for outcomes of projects as well.*

*Chair: Are you ready to vote on this? I'd like to ask for a motion if there is one.*

*Motion to approve Edits 3 and 4 on the Memo made by Charles Bell. Second by Jessica Savage. 17 in ayes. 1 nay. 1 abstention. Motion passes.*

## **VII. New Business**

### **A. (action item) [Curriculum Committee proposals](#) (click on CourseLeaf link)**

#### **1. NU-BABS Health Studies**

- Are there any questions for our Curriculum Committee Chair?
- *VOTE: Motion to approve by Leif Hoffmann. Second by Jennifer Cromer. Unanimous approval, no objections, no abstentions. Motion passes.*

#### **2. NU-MSN Nursing Leadership in Healthcare**

- This one was approved by Senate last spring; however there were some wording changes that got kicked back all the way to the committee; thus, it is going through the normal workflow of coming back to Senate after verification of the two BUS courses mentioned earlier.
- Are there any questions for our Curriculum Committee Chair?
- Is there a motion to approve this proposal? Second? Further Discussion?
- *VOTE: Motion to approve Billy Lemus, second by Leif Hoffmann. Unanimous approval, no objections, no abstentions. Motion passes.*

## **VIII. Good of the Order**

- *Remaining Senate meeting this semester: Nov. 9 (ACW 134)*
- *LC Theatre students are putting on Shakespeare "Twelfth Night" with a baseball theme Nov 2-4 and 9-11<sup>th</sup> at 7:30pm.*
- *Any high school students interested in pursuing career in secondary education— there is a conference in WCC tomorrow. Contact Thomas Hill.*

## **IX. Adjourn**

- Motion to adjourn made by Katie Roberts, seconded by Jessica Savage. Unanimous approval.
- Meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.