

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
3:00 P.M., Wednesday, December 8, 2010
Student Senate Room, LSU Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (Senate President, English) | 2. William Daly (Past-President, Chemistry) |
| 3. Pratul Ajmera (Vice President, Engineering) | 4. Renée Casbergue (Secretary, Education) |
| 5. Ken McMillin (Member-at-Large, Animal Science) | 6. Priscilla Allen (Member-at-Large, Social Work) |
| 7. George Stanley (Member-at-Large, Chemistry) | |

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

Senators present:

1. Melissa Beck	2. Dana Bickmore	3. Stephanie Braunstein	4. Aaron Clopton
5. Larry Crumbley	6. Jennifer Curry	7. Neila Donovan	8. Kerry Dooley
9. Susan Dumais	10. Bruce Eilts	11. Guy Forrest	12. Joseph Francis
13. Craig Freeman	14. Wes Harrison	15. Dominique Homberger	16. Andrea Houston
17. Joan King	18. Joseph Legoria	19. Mandi Lopez	20. Reem Meshal
21. Patrick McGee	22. John Nyman	23. Suresh Rai	24. Larry Rouse
25. Kresimir Rupnik	26. Frederick Sheldon	27. Joseph Siebenaller	28. Michael Russo
29. George Stanley	30. Suzanne Stauffer	31. Dianne Taylor	32. Justin Walsh
33. Michael Wascom	34. Ed Watson	35. Yi-jun Xu	

Replacements for absent Senators (voting):

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. Tom Di Napoli for Paolo Chirumbolo | 2. James Murphy for John Fletcher |
| 3. Tom Di Napoli for Kristopher Fletcher | 4. David Baker for Steve Gaunt |
| 5. Mostafa Elseifi for Louay Mohammad | 6. Blaise Bourdin for Padma Sundar |

Represented by Proxy - Not Voting:

1. Justin Walsh for Kristi Dykema	2. Aaron Clopton for Jennifer Jolly
3. Ken McMillin for Michelle Livermore	4. Jennifer Curry for Rebecca Owens
5. Joan King for Cristina Sabliov	6. Suresh Rai for Bhaba Sarker
7. Reem Meshal for Gail Sutherland	

Senators absent without proxies + (# of absences without proxies):

- | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Philip Adams (3) | 2. Mary Catherine Aime (2) | 3. Linda Allen (2) | 4. John Battista (2) |
| 5. Gabriel Beavers (2) | 6. Michael Bowman (3) | 7. Kathleen Bratton (2) | 8. Josh Detre |
| 9. Benjamin Kahan (3) | 10. Jeff Kuehny (2) | 11. Michael Leitner | 12. David Lindenfeld |
| 13. Kevin McCarter | 14. Alison McFarland (2) | 15. John Protevi (4) | 16. William Stickle (2) |
| 17. Phillip Tebbutt (2) | 18. Wanjun Wang | 19. Hsiao-Chun Wu | |

Guests Attending Meeting:

Igor Matkovic	Robert Doolos	Lawrence D....
Elia Epperson	Mary Parker	Lupe Lamadrid
Ryan Landry	Jane Chandler	William Armstrong
T. Gilmour Reeve	Kurt Keppler	Staci Haynie

Consideration of the Minutes from November 2010

Motion to accept minutes (Rouse; Walsh second) - Casbergue noted a change that will be made in SR-17 that will be first read at this meeting. Motion passes and minutes accepted without objection.

President's Report

LSU-BR News:

- I'd like to thank Pratul for chairing the meeting so far. I apologize for arriving late to this meeting.
- Two of the most important occurrences were FSEC meetings with the new HRM head Mr. A. G. Monaco and President Lombardi.
- Mr. Monaco has promised to improve service at HRM and to fight for better benefits for LSU faculty, particularly with respect to issues with the Optional Retirement Plan. As you may remember, Frank Cartledge introduced a resolution to address the health insurance gap for dependents in the 21-26 age bracket. I wrote a strong letter to the state about this and finally received a reply that, unfortunately, doesn't solve the problem. OGB has responded that they are a state agency charged with enforcing legislation emanating from other sources, and that they are not authorized to extend benefits to LSU prior to when they are mandated by the state (at the next open enrollment period). They do not consider advocating for change to be part of their role.

System/State News:

- I traveled to New Orleans to visit with the LSU-Health Science Center. There was quite a bit of interest from doctors, which I found quite interesting and promising. They were very interested in the proposed move to a statewide IT Privacy Policy developed by Pratul Ajmera among other issues.
- The second trip I took was to LSU-Shreveport. It is LSU's most visible presence in the north part of our state, and similar to us in many ways with a strong research mission. We had frank discussions on collective bargaining and several other issues including budget. These discussions provided evidence of growing interest in faculty governance around the state.
- We arranged a Faculty Governance meeting in Alexandria and there was good turnout for discussion of a number of pressing issues. Topics included how to penetrate barriers across systems, status of collective bargaining, and actions that individuals can take without support or on a shoestring budget.
- The Faculty Senate Resolution pertaining to the laying off of the Foreign Language instructors was passed on to the Chancellor and the LSU Board of Supervisors. It is important to recognize that the Board moves very slowly and one must be very careful in dealing with them. They make the rules and can change those they break. The Chancellor did provide a written response. (Read by Kevin) The Chancellor basically states that proper procedures and consultation were followed in the layoffs. No changes are promised.
- I have told the Chancellor that I do not know how his response will be received.

Q&A Summary:

- Justin Walsh: The chancellor's response letter refers to an "agreed upon process." What was this process, and who agreed?
 - Kevin: I don't know the details on this "process." I'm not sure that there was an "agreed upon process."
 - Curry: The AAUP is well respected and has been helpful in many cases. It has sent a delegation to probe actions here. But it has no legal standing on campus. We need to use them for embarrassment (national press regarding violations, etc.). AAUP negative findings have been reported in the Advocate and in Gannet papers around the U.S. There has been no response from the LSU system that suggests any impact of this bad press. Do AAUP procedures have any power here?
 - Kevin: I don't think so. AAUP guidelines and procedures have no legal standing on our campus. But their public relations actions regarding this case are certainly having some impact.
- The FSEC met with President Lombardi and he discussed the system plan for raising enough money through tuition and fee increases to minimize the upcoming 2011-12 budget cut. President Lombardi and the other system presidents have made it very clear to the Governor and administration that cuts over a certain amount will absolutely result in exigency declarations across the higher ed systems and the laying off of tenured faculty. They have presented a document that shows what level of cuts will trigger exigency or other cuts. This offers a clear understandable explanation of the budget situation. The Governor does not want campuses to declare exigency and is seriously considering this fund-raising plan. We anticipate that President Lombardi will discuss this plan with us at the January FS meeting. I can't go into details on this right now due to time limitations, but I will post this soon on the FS web site.

Q&A Summary:

- McMillin: The document is posted on the system web site.
- Harrison: Is this plan from the most recent business and LSU supporter group that met with the governor?
- Kevin: No. This is the LSU System plan that the other systems have also signed onto.
- Harrison: The LSU broadcast we all received refers to major cost reductions and modest revenue increases.
- Cope: The good news is that we've managed to get through the prospect of midyear cuts because of increased student numbers, money from snack machines, and anticipated parking fees for football. The new group of advocates is launching a separate effort. LSU needs to exercise some caution in overtly joining that effort.
- Daly: The business/LSU supporter plan actually goes against the Lombardi plan since it focuses on LSU and that may not be good politically overall. We don't want to set LSU too far apart from higher ed around the state because any action will require a 2/3 vote of the legislature. The Lombardi plan is for all of higher education. The Reilly group wants to get us away from some purchasing requirements, civil service rules and so on that cost of lots of money every year.
- Walsh: The newspaper this morning mentioned changing civil service rules that could lead to a far easier firing process (and hiring). [This was from the business/LSU supporter group meeting with the Governor] Might older employees be grandfathered in?
- Cope: There is enough attrition that a change in policy is not likely to lead to mass firings soon. There is certainly a brewing crisis with over tasked, under ranked employees. Mr. Monaco is aware of that issue.
- McMillin: Sean Riley will formally announce the business/LSU supporter plan this Friday. Politically I think we need to keep a low profile on this.
- Cope: Wise advice for us to be cooperative, but low key in our support of this initiative.

Presentation by Li Li - Status of international programs, study, research and initiatives at LSU

I would like to report on internationalization on campus. I get the general feeling that while many faculty members are interested in international activities, few want to actively do anything about it. If you look at our top faculty they all are engaged in a variety of international activities. International students represent a fair number of graduate students in some areas, and all Boyd professors are engaged in international activities. Yet LSU does not compare well with other universities where the norm is to have extensive international activity.

The international office put on a very good program with speakers from outside of LSU a few weeks ago, and only 3 students and 4 faculty members showed up – an embarrassing turnout. There was an SEC collaborative effort for international engineering internships. No LSU faculty recommended students for these awards. Foreign Languages is laying off instructors and dropping some language programs. That is the only program singled out for immediate cuts. The Graduate School has cut their program for providing tuition support for some foreign graduate students. This will limit the number of foreign students that will attend LSU. This action effects the number of applications from international students overall, and especially impacts those from the strongest students who are likely to receive better offers of support from other institutions.

The Study Abroad Program had a budget of about \$150K to support undergraduate students going abroad. These grants can range from \$250 to \$2,500, but that money is now gone. It has been diverted to use as a recruiting tool, with students promised \$2,000 for study abroad later as an enrollment incentive. These students do not have to commit to study abroad and many do not use the funds, yet the money is not available to students who qualify later for international study.

Although we continue to encourage our students to study abroad, there is still an ongoing problem with credit transfer from foreign schools back to LSU, with students receiving less credit than expected and the university continuing to overturn faculty and departmental approval for transfer credit. This represents yet another barrier towards internationalization of our students. Even so, the study abroad program has improved with a significant increase in students doing international study. But faculty members create programs individually. There is no university wide effort.

LSU does not have a strategic plan for Study Abroad or more broadly for internationalization of the campus. The International Education Committee has some recommendations:

- We should work more closely with the various international programs on campus to help push internationalization. First would be helping evaluate student Fulbright applications.
- We would like to collaborate with more committees in the faculty senate to integrate international activities. For example, the Course & Curriculum committee and the Promotion & Tenure Committee to move toward more tangible recognition for international activities.
- We know the budget is tight, but the International Program Office would like to establish an award for faculty/staff that engage in outstanding international activities or work to promote international activities. It wouldn't cost much and should help highlight international activities on campus.

- International activities and plans should be formally put into university, college, and departmental planning documents with benchmarks for success.
- We would like to ask the FS to write two resolutions, one on putting international activities into PS-36 as a tangible consideration for promotion. The other concerns the on-going credit transfer problem.

Summary of Discussion

Homberger: What we are seeing is a destruction of international presence at LSU. You can't be an international person if you don't speak other languages. LSU is destroying the basis for international work. What do the accrediting agencies say about this? Learning foreign languages is important in many ways, but we appear to be destroying foreign languages. Secondly, I think there is awards inflation here on campus. I don't think an award will help promote international activities. One award won't change the fact that the LSU administration has decided to make us an international backwater. Better to give the money to some hapless student.

Li: I agree with your points. I don't know about the accreditation process. My observation is that all universities that we aspire to have strong foreign language programs. We don't fare well in comparison to other universities that require 100% of students to have some international experience. I'm not an expert on awards and their effectiveness. It doesn't cost much money and could help promote international activities. If the chancellor wants something, there is always money.

Homberger: Some departments in the sciences and engineering consist entirely of foreign graduate students. If we ignore international issues and lose the pipeline for these foreign students then these departments could be in trouble or shut down.

Li: That is a much broader topic.

Mary Parker (admissions): The transfer credit issue was brought up last year and ASH and the FSEC have pursued this. Many of the current problems were the result of students having to switch courses at foreign universities and taking courses that did not match what they put on their forms. We now have faculty evaluating these situations and that problem should be solved already.

Li: Wonderful if that is the case.

Xu: Why don't we have more foreign scholars visiting LSU? And why don't we have more of our faculty on sabbatical going overseas? I know of two Chinese scholars who wanted to visit and had Fellowships, but LSU turned them down because their Fellowships were not at a high enough level. Who determines this?

Li: LSU does not have a systematic approach for having international scholars to visit. I don't know about the Fellowship issue, or who sets the requirement at \$20,000. It is not an LSU requirement.

Xu: They were accepted elsewhere. One is at Michigan.

Li: LSU doesn't have a systematic approach to attracting foreign scholars. Our department is inviting an international visiting scholar. There are pockets of this across campus, but nothing university wide.

Homberger: The right hand at LSU doesn't know what the left hand is doing. Currently international scholars come at the invitation of individual faculty members.

Li: Right. There is no systematic effort. Thank you to all of the committee members for coming to this presentation.

Presentation by Angelika Roy-Goldman, Instructor, Foreign Language 14

Read the following prepared statement and thanks the FS for the resolution supporting the Foreign Language 14.

Dear President Cope and Senators:

On behalf of the Foreign Language XIV, I express our sincerest thanks for the efforts of the LSU Chapter and the National Office of the AAUP. It was the right thing to do. I also thank the members of the Faculty Senate for their unanimous vote in favor of Resolution 10-14-1. It was the right thing to do. In fact, this vote has been your finest moment this semester. A special thanks to Dr. Homberger, who worked so hard to draft the resolution and who argued most passionately and effectively in favor of the resolution. You are an inspiration to all who take academia seriously. It was the right thing to do. In my book, you receive an A+.

I leave you with the following meditation by Marcus Aurelius...

Very often an unjust act is done by not doing something, not only by doing something.

Good luck to all of you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Althea Ashe

Dr. Garrett McCutchan

Dr. Johanna Sandrock

Angelika A. Roy

Next read a prepared statement thanking the grievance committee:

I express personal thanks to the members of the Grievance Committee for their time to review my grievance. Although I knew in advance that the Grievance Committee has no decision making power, filing a grievance based on the criteria was the right thing to do and the only way to have it on record.

Sincerely,

Angelika A. Roy

FLXIV

Review of, Discussion, and Authorization Vote Concerning a Proposal from Registrar Robert Doolos regarding Emergency Schedule Interruption Plans.

Robert asks for a delay till the January meeting since the one attachment was not included in the materials handed out today.

Report by FS Vice-President Pratul Ajmera concerning the Revision of PS-44 and Suggested Revisions by the LSU AAUP.

(Chip Delzell reads and discusses the AAUP modifications.) We added headlines to separate various sections. The first change is to emphasize that the Faculty are in charge of grading policies.

Roman numeral III is the most important part and most of it is the same as the existing PS-44. Part B is also almost the same, but we tried to take out the one sentence that concerns “except as those qualities relate directly to the student’s level of mastery of the course material.” Please cross that part out.

IV.A. We added “subject to the guidelines in section III above”. We added the last sentence in section A.

IV.B. We are leaving out the sentence concerning grading standards as applied by the faculty member's department or college.

What is missing (from this draft as opposed to the one drafted by Pratul) is the section about removing a faculty member during a semester. That is a personnel issue and does not belong in PS-44.

Q&A Summary:

Sheldon: What if a professor loses their “marbles” during a semester and assigns crazy grades. Someone has to have the authority to step in and address the situation. Does the university have no recourse?

Delzell: What if the Faculty member in question is being “mobbed” by a group of other faculty and this is used to get rid of the faculty member? There's always the grade appeal process for students.

Sheldon. That takes forever. Students need to go a whole semester failing? That's outrageous. You don't want administrators to have any control over grades.

Daly: Chip wants to separate the issues - grades here, removal from courses separate.

Sheldon: We need a statement that this process needs to move quickly.

Delzell: That is a personnel issue.

Stanley: I have issues with section IV.C(b) that seems to give too much authority to the faculty member in that the grades assigned can't be changed. We had a situation in Chemistry where an instructor had assigned an extremely high fraction of the class D's and F's. The department had to step in and reassign grades at the end of the semester to address the issues of unfair exams and material not covered that should have been covered in the class. I think the last section in Pratul's PS-44 should remain.

Sheldon: Multiple section courses remain an issue - one section flunks while others are OK? Administration must step in - or the faculty has to establish a committee (to review such cases). We can't step back for fear of stepping on faculty rights.

Stanley: "Equitable grading" language gives some wiggle room, but this is too rigid in view of faculty right to award grades as sacrosanct.

Homberger: I'm the elephant in the room. Part of this situation concerns my situation last year. (Discusses the situation and a defense for her class and teaching, as well as the negative presentation of her case at the April faculty senate meeting.)

Sheldon: You brought it up.

Homberger: Over time, I have received lots of support from everywhere. We have examined issues in biology in a more balanced manner. We are using alarmist, inflammatory language. It's never a good idea to establish general policy because of a single case. The message has never gone out that in this BIOL 1001 class, a lot of students had Ds and Fs and they said they didn't intend to study. They thought it was unfair that they had to study in my class. I convinced students otherwise and received thanks for the life lesson and impact on other courses as well. My exam was studied by experts and deemed reasonable.

Pratul: We need to focus on the situation at hand and not personalize this.

Homberger: I didn't speak up in April, but I needed to now.

Sheldon: You've accused me of attacking you for fifteen years.

Houston: Can you explain how some departments have issued rules that a percentage of students must receive certain grades? Is this to protect graduate students? What about instructors? Graduate students teaching the class? How does this apply to them?

Delzell: I don't have an answer for that.

Forrest: Instructor of record is the term, I believe, that applies here instead of "instructor" which is a rank.

Delzell: We need to check with Robert Doolos. The term instructor is used generically.

Forrest: What is "unreturned work?" Does that apply to online assignments?

Ajmera: Unreturned work is defined here the same as in the original PS44. The intent is to give students the opportunity to get their work back, not necessarily to say that every student must get work back. If you don't give the option for students to pick up work (as is often the case with final exams), then instructors must hold onto it for the specified amount of time. I'd like to address five issues in the AAUP version Chip has prepared. I'm not addressing again the reasons why the FSEC developed the policy, but simply addressing the differences between the two versions.

- The portion omitted in the AAUP version was added to protect students. It's intended to affirm faculty control over grading while providing options to address problems.
- The AAUP version omits what is in existing PS44 - "standards established by faculties and schools..." This should not be deleted. It is important because consistency in grading standards and policies is important, especially in the case of prerequisite courses and accreditation requirements that are program wide, not course determined. The instructor must adhere to standards. The AAUP version reads this wrong. It does not mean that certain grade distributions must or would be imposed.
- The third comment concerns the assignment of grades. PS-44 already addresses the case of instructors that are unable to assign the grades, especially the final grades. It also allows for the case when a faculty member is removed from a course by the administration for causes like embezzlement and so on. The FSEC version supplements this authority already in PS-44 to address "hopelessly ineffective" instructors. We might want to believe that this never happens, but it does happen and it is important to address these cases. There have been such cases in Chemistry and Engineering. One could write a new policy for these types of situations, or revise PS 104. By putting it here, we address it quickly. If it is not here, there is no procedure for grading in such a case, and deans can do what they want. There is no right or wrong. The FSEC policy sets a procedure for all to follow and prevents impetuous action, action taken on a whim.
- The FSEC policy uses the term "instructor of record" instead of "substitute instructor."

- The last situation is that the AAUP version does not allow for any flexibility for a replacement instructor to change syllabi. In some cases it might be necessary to change the syllabus from that point forward. I think there should be that kind of flexibility.

Harrison: When you spoke about establishing procedures, did you mean for removal or for reassigning grades? What PS addresses removal of an instructor?

Ajmera: Both. PS 104 deals with dismissal for cause, but that is different.

Harrison: It seems that the AAUP version attempts to strip language about removal of instructors.

Ajmera: That can't be done because removal impacts grades.

Crumbley: Why would you allow instructors to put one representative of six on the committee? Why not three chosen by the instructor and three by the department chair?

Ajmera: It would be six people with rank above the instructor. Why would they be biased?

Crumbley: Might not like me?

Ajmera: All six?

Crumbley: Our department has history. The department chair could put forward a committee biased against the instructor.

Walsh: Do we need to find six that are equal or higher in rank? Why full professors? What if there aren't six full professors?

Ajmera. Could go outside the department, like for P & T deliberations.

Forrester: If I'm an instructor, why can't I have other instructors? A course I might teach in math is only taught by instructors - never by tenured faculty members. So my case would be judged by those who never teach the course.

Stanley: I think it is very dangerous to include assistant professors or instructors in this type of situation. Better to stick with tenured faculty members and probably full professors. Instructors and assistant professors could put their jobs in jeopardy.

Ajmera: Contracts are renewed by department chairs. Untenured people could feel pressured to vote in accordance with the chair's view.

Donovan: Is there any benefit to having the committee be from outside the department? That would take out issues of personality and pressure.

Ajmera: It has been suggested to let the six be elected. If so, the FSEC might be a good option. It's an elected body that meets weekly and can respond quickly. But faculty in the departments have more expertise to analyze a case.

McMillian: I move that we suspend discussion until the January meeting and move to new business so we can discuss those resolutions.

Vote with no dissent to suspend further discussion until January meeting.

New Business

First reading of resolution 10-18: "Increased Spending on Higher Education and the Timely Pursuit of Excellence". Sponsored by Justin Walsh (Art History).

Walsh: A little history. The Art History Department has tenured and tenure track faculty, plus one instructor. We have lost three full time faculty members and one instructor. We're now down to four total faculty members. We hoped to hire one tenure track replacement, but the position wasn't approved. We missed a prime opportunity for our university to attract talented people in a terrible job market. I know it's Quixotic, and I don't expect to change anything. But we should point out that leadership in difficult budget times isn't just about cutting.

This version is not the final one that I submitted. I've incorporated changes suggested by other faculty and the FSEC. Thanks for those suggestions:

Whereas the Flagship Agenda hopes to improve LSU's service to the state by offering "a world-class knowledge base that is transferable to educational, professional, and business enterprises; an incubator for the development of new products and technologies; prominence in the national arena for federal projects and funding; nationally-ranked programs that prepare students for the most competitive and prestigious graduate programs and employment opportunities; and a competitively educated workforce, trained for attracting high-growth industries";

Whereas the job market for scholars currently offers an almost unprecedented "buyer's market" (even by the usual

standards) for universities seeking new faculty members at both the junior and senior levels;

Whereas statewide higher education leaders, from the LSU campus, to the Board of Supervisors, to the Board of Regents, to the Legislature, to the Governor's office, have consistently reacted to the current state budget situation by arguing over the extent of cuts to university budgets, faculty, and curricula;

Whereas LSU Chancellor Michael Martin has remarked publicly on the vulnerability of LSU to the poaching of its high-quality faculty by other institutions;

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate calls upon all of the above-named higher education leaders to change the terms of the debate radically, to argue for increased spending on higher education rather than reductions, to support the opportunistic hiring of the very best rising and established scholars, who will contribute greatly to the scholarly life of Louisiana universities, who will bring new energy to the fulfillment of the Flagship Agenda, and who will raise the reputation and standing of the state as a whole.

Q&A Summary:

(Senator): Add in the last paragraph, "thereby attracting higher quality students."

Sheldon: The second to last paragraph makes it sound like things are good, but that's an artificial situation due to federal money pumped in post Katrina.

Donovan: I agree with Fred (Sheldon). We shouldn't put forth a resolution that isn't accurate regarding facts of the budget situation. Why work so hard and not say we know things are bad.

Walsh: So add something like, "we recognize these are tough times..."

Donovan: We're going to end up on the flip side.

(Senator): Don't cut yourself off at the ankles.

Walsh: There are options for the future, like a bond issue - little investment, good yield.

Sheldon: I don't mean to be discouraging. We need to be entrepreneurial.

Walsh: The FSEC suggests making reference to "ready to go" efforts.

Homberger: Make an analogy to state attempts to attract industry, with concerted efforts to attract factories.

Legoria: If Lombardi has something in the works to solve budget problems, should we say less?

Walsh: We don't want to step on toes. But we haven't heard any details (of Lombardi's plan).

King: Move to end discussion and go on to the next item.

Closing discussion informally approved.

First Reading, Resolution 10-19: "New College Preparatory Core for Admission to LSU." Sponsored by ASH, Bill Armstrong, Chair, ASH Committee.

Whereas LSU, by adopting the proposed admission requirements, has the opportunity to help simplify the process of determining freshmen admission to the university while providing for admission requirements that are stringent and academically challenging, in keeping with the nature and mission of LSU as Louisiana's flagship university, and

Whereas, the new, proposed LSU version of the BOR Core 2012 will meet the BOR's minimum criteria while retaining some of the flexibility built into the BOR Core in the way of additional course offerings,

Therefore, the ASH Committee supports adoption of the proposed College Preparatory Core for Admission to LSU, effective 2012, as described in the chart below.

(See senate website for complete chart)

Armstrong: This is an attempt to be more stringent, but also more flexible. Some schools (those in Texas for example) don't require physics. This represents only two basic changes that concern Math and Natural Sciences. Physics is no longer required, but recommended. We also recommend an increase in one credit in math and natural sciences. The physics requirement for admission was dropped due to the number of high schools here and in Texas that don't offer Physics.

Q&A Summary:

Rouse: You also increased social sciences by one credit.

Homberger: But you dropped the additional math/science requirement and essentially transferred it to the Math and Natural Sciences categories.

Armstrong: Yes, but that still represents a gain of one credit in Math or Natural Science.

Senator: Fine Arts survey was dropped from 1.5 to 1 credit. Computer science was also dropped from 0.5 credits to 0 credits.

Rouse: These are primarily courses that students would take in their senior year? So students can take what they need in their last year before coming to LSU in 2012?

Casbergue: If this is to take effect beginning with the class admitted in 2012, is there enough time for high school students to adjust? Might some of these courses require prerequisites that students haven't taken? Is their senior year too late to find out about these changes?

Parker: BESE has anticipated this and high school counselors are prepared. This is an attempt to align with what the Board of Regents through BESE has already put in place. We are getting calls now from counselors advising juniors about what they will need in the last two years. So students should be prepared for this change.

Stanley moved to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:50.

(Old Business deferred to January meeting):

Second Reading of LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 10-15: "Challenging the Membership of Unelected Faculty Senators" Sponsored and read by Senator Larry Crumbley

Whereas both the constitution and the bylaws of the Faculty Senate repeatedly mandate elections of faculty senators; in fact, the very first sentence of the constitution declares:

"The Faculty Senate shall consist of members of the Faculty Council [= all faculty on the LSU A&M campus] duly *elected* in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution" (emphasis added),

and a later sentence in the constitution declares:

"The Senate shall determine and publish the method of nomination and election of its members, provided, however, that each member of the Faculty Council shall at all times be entitled to nominate candidates *and to vote* for each Senate seat allocated to that member's college or school not within a college" (emphasis added), and

Whereas even the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors (from which the LSU Faculty Senate derives its very right to exist) require that faculty senators be elected:

"The Faculty Council [of a campus] ... may delegate its own authority to an *elected* Faculty Senate ..." (emphasis added), and

Whereas on September 4, 2009, an email (Appendix 1 below)¹ was broadcast to the faculty of the College of Science (then called the College of Basic Sciences, "BASC") stating, in part: "In order to proceed with the election [of faculty senators], we must first nominate five candidates who will participate in the election later this month..." but, while the nomination process occurred, the promised election did not, according to several faculty members in that college, and

Whereas on August 10, 2010, an email (Appendix 2 below)² was broadcast to the faculty of the College of Science stating, in part: "In order to proceed with the election, we must first nominate six candidates who will participate in the election later next month..." but, while the nomination process occurred, the promised election did not, according to several faculty members in that college, and

Whereas there is no need to assign blame for any possible shortcoming in the electoral process; rather, all that is needed is that

the requirement of elections be enforced, and

Whereas it would be easy to administer an election, and voting is quick,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall appoint a committee of three LSU faculty members outside the College of Science, to inquire into the above reports, to seek any possible evidence of an election (such as a copy of a ballot, or a vote tally, or an announcement of the winners), and to report their findings to the Senate at its next meeting. If the Senate finds that any of the senators sent by the College of Science in 2009 or 2010 were merely nominated, but not elected, then the Senate will declare those Senate seats to be vacant until a special election has been held.

¹Appendix 1 (the 2009 broadcast)

Date: Fri, 4 Sep 2009 14:39 -0500 From: BASC Dean's Office <bascdean@lsu.edu> To: Broadcast_BASC_Faculty@gateway.lsu.edu Subj: Nomination of Faculty for Faculty Senate Election Parts/Attachments: 42 KB Application

Dear BASC Faculty:

This memo targets the selection of candidates for the upcoming election of Faculty Senators for a two-year term, for we have three individuals who will end their terms this month, and due to the recent outcomes of a faculty census, we now have an additional seat in the Senate.

In order to proceed with the election, we must first nominate five candidates who will participate in the election later this month.

This nomination process will occur through the use of PAWS as a portal for data collection.

The link for you to go to for selecting the five (5) nominees can be found at:

<http://appl027.lsu.edu/comp/surveyapp.nsf/survey?OpenAgent&id=facultysen2>
<<http://appl027.lsu.edu/comp/surveyapp.nsf/survey?OpenAgent&id=facultysen2>>

You will need to enter your PAWS information and then you will have access to the data collection form for the nominees. You can only enter data once. Please refer to the pdf document attached to this email for a list of eligible faculty in BASC.

Please complete the nomination process by September 11, 2009.

Second Reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-16. "Stoppage of Budget Scenarios that Degrade Morale and Appeal for Increased Leadership by Boards of Higher Education"

Sponsored by Ken McMillin and the FSEC; read by Ken McMillin

(Reading waived and moved into discussion for the following month - unanimously)

Whereas the Louisiana Legislative and Executive branches have failed in the performance of their constitutionally assigned duty to demonstrate fiscal responsibilities and have instead produced a deficit budget this last fiscal year; and

Whereas revenues continue to decrease this year, even after expected sources of budgetary income were stifled by repeal of revenue-generating legislation over the course of the last two years; and

Whereas state support for higher education was cut \$280 million and support for the Louisiana State University A&M campus was cut \$42 million during the past two years; and

Whereas the Louisiana Legislature has repeatedly and irresponsibly failed to provide sufficient financial support to the four-year colleges and universities and these institutions are now threatened with an estimated additional \$34.7 million mid-year budget cuts to these institutions this year, cuts that will greatly decrease the abilities of these institutions to fulfill their mission statements and to fulfill the mandated goals of the newly passed GRAD Act; and

Whereas Louisiana State University is the largest employer and has a great economic multiplier effect in the Baton Rouge and surrounding areas, and the state; and

Whereas 4-year degrees lead to employees that are more highly trained and intellectually qualified to have higher earning power and greater economic contributions if graduates remain in the state; and

Whereas a highly educated and motivated workforce and transfer of technology from the university helps to maintain competitiveness of Louisiana and national companies; and

Whereas having educated potential employees and university intellectual property available to entrepreneurial startup companies are major attractors for new businesses and economic growth in Louisiana; and

Whereas the Louisiana Board of Regents and the Louisiana Board of Supervisors have not convinced either the academic community or the community at large that they have served as advocates for higher education and have merely passed on the budget crisis handed to them by the Louisiana Legislature, not even questioning the wisdom of an across-the-board, percentage-based cut to the otherwise unequal four- year institutions of higher learning in this states; and

Whereas the numerous budget cut “scenarios” that have been required of college and university administrators over the past two years have not resulted in any meaningful direction or guidance to the institutions, have wasted valuable time and human resources, and will likely need to be repeated again since the Governor’s Office has not identified the next level of specific budget cuts; and

Whereas each of the budget cut “scenarios” and administrative announcements of program reductions and layoffs of instructors and staff have continued to erode the morale of our administrators and faculty; and

Whereas these budget cut “scenarios” are causing students to question whether they will be able to complete their degree programs while fostering a general sense of futility about the health of higher education in this state; and

Whereas such a loss of confidence may translate into our students resuming their migration for education and employment into states that are perceived to be more friendly to higher education;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU A&M Faculty Senate strongly recommends that our administrators stop engaging in these destructive exercises that, if fulfilled, will lead to the demise of LSU; and

Therefore be it further resolved that the Louisiana System Board of Regents and Board of Supervisors accelerate their efforts as advocates of higher education by interacting with individual legislators and collectively with the Louisiana Legislature to forestall such drastic budget reductions that the Louisiana flagship institution would be so devastated that it could not return to the top tier of research universities until the celebration of its Tercentennial or beyond; and

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU A&M Faculty Senate urges the Governor and the Legislators to provide leadership in securing adequate funding for the State’s higher education system including its Flagship university for its citizens’ well-being and for the State’s economic prosperity.

Second Reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-17. “Appeal for Increased Leadership by the Governor” Sponsored and read by Ken McMillin.

Whereas the Governor has constitutional responsibility for submitting an operating budget and capital budget to the legislature each year; and

Whereas the Governor is required by the Louisiana constitution to use means so the total appropriations for the year shall not exceed anticipated revenues for that year; and

Whereas this specific provision of the constitution was violated this past fiscal year by incurrence of a \$108 million deficit; and

Whereas the Governor’s Office has indicated that higher education authorities are not meeting his expected educational goals of graduation rates; and

Whereas Governor Jindal believes that universities are delivering less value than student deserve and has asked feedback on how the state can save money and improve the educational experience; and

Whereas the Governor appoints members to the Board of Regents and to the various Boards of Supervisors; and

Whereas the Boards of Regents and various Boards of Supervisors determine educational policies and their implementation and hire and fire higher education administrators; and

Whereas the Governor’s office has indicated that time cannot be found in the next two years to schedule a meeting with LSU student leaders or with the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates leaders while the Governor continues to travel outside the state; and

Whereas the Governor has avoided directly answering the LSU Student Government President's request that he return to Louisiana and address the serious problems of the state and its universities; and

Whereas other components than graduate rates determine a quality education and graduation rates can be easily obtained by reducing the rigor of higher education requirements;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate affirms the request by the Student Government to the Governor for his leadership for higher education in Louisiana; and

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate demands that the Governor and his staff provide each management board with specific guidance by the end of this calendar year on the desired programs and activities to be eliminated at each institution to meet the budgetary restrictions anticipated in the next fiscal year.