

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
December 4, 2003
3:00 p.m., Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union**

Present: William Adkins, Claire Advokat, Pratul Ajmera, Priscilla Allen, Laurie Anderson, Frank Anselmo, Nick Apostolou, Lori Bade, Jack Beggs, James Catalo, John Chandler, Bill Daly, Louis Day, Chip Delzell, Yvonne Fuentes, Karola Gray, Linda Griffin, Brian Hales, Steve Hall, Maren Hegsted, Gregg Henderson, Laura Hensley, Dominique Homberger, James Honeycutt, Kelli Scott Kelley, Sigrid Kelsey, Don Kraft, Julius Langlinais, Tom Lynch, Carruth McGehee, Mary McGehee, William Metcalf, Carl Motsenbocker, Thomas Neff, Nancy Nelson, Kathy O'Reilly, Irvin Peckham, Glenn Pettifer, Sarah Pierce, John Pizer, Terrie Poehl, Witoon Prinyawiwatkul, Aravamudham Raman, Leonard Ray, Danny Reible, Milton Rush, Victor Stater, Robert Tague, Dek Terrel, Kalliat Valsaraj, Robert Ward, and Paul Wilson

Absent: Michael Cherry, Jon Cogburn, James Cowan, Ian Crystal, Louis Gagliano, Ji-Chai Lin, Robin McCarley, William Moore, Margaret Reams, Judith Schiebout, Joseph Skillen, Mark Slovak, Ed Smith, Jill Sutor, Kalliat Valsaraj, and Aimee Welch

Proxies: Paul Wilson for Carl Motsenbocker, Gregg Henderson for Bill Todd, Glenn Pettifer for Kathy O'Reilly, Laura Hensley for Dennis Landin, and Irvin Peckham for James Catano

Alternate Representatives: Tim Page for Patricia Allen, Manjit Kang for Larry Crumbley, Abul Pitre for Terrie Poehl, and Mike Mailander for Steve Hall

Guests: F. Neil Mathews (Student Life & Academic Services), Karen Denby (Academic Affairs), Robert Doolos (University Registrar), Vincent Wilson (Environmental Studies/ASH)

I. Call to Order by President Carruth McGehee
A. Reading of proxies and alternative representatives

II. Minutes of the November 7, 2003 Faculty Senate Meeting
A. Noted correction to SR04-01 to include the words "upper division" in final paragraph so sentence would read: "... one upper division undergraduate student.....". Minutes approved as corrected.

(Note: As requested, the following remarks are taken from the Faculty Senate Meeting cassette tapes and are presented verbatim in these Minutes).

III. Remarks from Chancellor Mark Emmert

We do not necessarily need to stay until 4:10 p.m. but I'll stay as long as you'll have me. I've always admired the parliamentary model in Britain where the Prime Minister, every Tuesday, stands

before Parliament and does question time. I've thought that American politics would look a great deal different if the President of the United States would have to stand before the legislature and deal with every policy question that might arise. If you've ever watched question time on C-Span or other public television programs, it's a wonderful device and you'll learn very quickly how well the Prime Minister handles issues because it's not necessarily a warm, fuzzy experience. It can be pretty rancorous, they shout, they yell but it's also a wonderfully democratic experience and I've always thought that we could, in America, learn from that and I'm more than happy to engage in this conversation with that spirit. If you want to stamp your feet, that's okay, we'll be as loud as in parliament, but that's fine with me.

I really had just three things that I want to talk about, one of which is more informational though I think it has, I know it has, obvious ramifications for where we want to move as an institution. You remember that some time ago, maybe three years ago, with this body and with a variety of others I broached the notion that maybe what we needed to do over a period of time was, what we clearly needed to do, was to bring in alignment our human and financial and physical resources with our enrollment including our mix of undergraduate and graduate enrollments. Over the past year when we were talking about developing the Flagship Agenda ideas that was a big topic of conversation and over the intervening several years since we first started talking about the need to match those resources to enrollment, I broached the subject in a number of places with political leaders and higher education officials at the state level with saying 'Look, you need to either increase our resources (financial, human, and physical) to match our growth curve or you need to let us keep all of our resources and move the enrollment down to where it matches the resource base.' This is met with so far with lots of interesting knowing nods and smiles but never a commitment to allowing us to keep our resource base constant while we let our enrollment slide. Instead we continue to develop the university as we have, we have increased, with the support of this body, the admission standards as we moved them up again this last year and intend that they'll go up again in '05 again with your support and advice as oversight of that process. But what I wanted to report on today, and Karen is sitting in the back and she can correct me if I'm wrong but, I wanted to let you know that the enrollment management folks – the success of the rising stature of the university in the state and out of the state – the positive public relations we've been experiencing and enjoying for the past couple of years are starting to pay very interesting dividends that I think we're going to enjoy a great deal but they, once again, raise the specter of what we want to do – stay the same size, grow, or shrink. Because what's happened now is that, year-to-date, the numbers I last saw Karen, year-to-date, Dec. 1 this year and Dec. 1 last year, our Freshmen applications are up 35 or 36%, something like that. The pool of students is academically stronger, it's regionally more diverse (35% non-resident applicant pool compared to 30% last year). This current class that we enrolled – the current freshmen that are here – we wound up with about 20% non-resident, 80% resident. Wasn't that about right [Karen]? Round numbers, yes. So we had a 30% non-resident applicant pool and wound up with 20% yield at the end of the day. While it appears it's up another 5% which I interpret to be a very good thing – a desirable thing – up toward some threshold we need to decide on sometime in the near future and it's also a more racially diverse pool and, it is a more gender balanced pool. There's a slight increase, I noticed, in male applicants. Women still

outnumber men but they're a little more closely aligned so one can't look at this pool, at least here today, and not feel very, very good about that. The quantity, the quality, the diversity and every way we measure those things is either about as good as or better than last year. So it looks like once again we're going to have a very large applicant pool. We don't know what the yield will be, of course, but the other thing that's encouraging is to have growth (and I may yield questions on this to Karen, who's much more experienced), but when you see growth in the first semester, first semester applicants. They tend to be stronger students because stronger students apply earlier. And so, to have growth early is a very good thing because we're getting the students who are actually shopping around for schools and as they shop around, they're looking at us. And that's very positive. The other thing I noticed in the data that I liked was that the pool is less Baton Rouge-centric. The proportion that's coming from the Baton Rouge metro area is down slightly (not with raw numbers, the numbers are up) but as a portion of the whole pool, they're smaller. So, again, we're reaching out to more of the state and more of the region. The largest non-resident applicant pool is Texas, again, that doesn't surprise me because of geography and sheer demographics. But then Alabama was second, a bunch of others clustered kind of together (isn't that right, [Karen])? I should have brought the data. But again reaching more broadly than to just our immediate neighbors, reaching out to multiple states, still largely a southern - south central part of the nation but a little bit better maybe. So, I think that speaks very well for what students and parents are seeing. I spent the morning in Houston with one of our major donors and, in chatting with them, and chatting with everybody I visited over in Texas, there's a very wonderful and very positive buzz in the Texas community about Louisiana State University and what's happening here and we're getting very, very good notice in the media over there and that's all working very nicely for us. The enrollment management people have been much more aggressive this year, especially non-resident leads and that's being matched by the results we're seeing. But what really is most encouraging is casual empiricism suggest that people's view of the academic quality of the experience here is rising pretty sharply and that's very heartening. We all don't like hearing this but it doesn't hurt to win in football. Its just sheer brand-name recognition that gets out there and probably has some modest impact on the numbers as well. Let me pause on that subject, Karen, any other thoughts that you might have on where you think we are here today, again knowing that it can change in a month's notice?

Karen Denby: No, sir. You're right, we are stronger in geographic diversity and gender diversity.

Chancellor: So those are all good things. Any questions or comments or observations?

Senator John Pizer: Well, I brought this up last time and the Provost didn't think it was a good idea, but it seems to me if we really want to close the gap even more in terms of the percentage of non-resident versus residents that apply and we really want to attract the best from all over the country, then we could, perhaps, some somewhat more liberal residency requirements where, perhaps, after one or two years we could say to these students that after one or two years, if you maintain a good average and have done everything on the up-and-up, then you would qualify for TOPS. It seems to me that

would be a way of attracting very good students to Louisiana and, perhaps, attract them to stay here and develop business and the sort of things we want to do. What do you think about that idea?

Chancellor: Let's take it in descending order of complexity. I'm a firm believer that the university needs to have a better, a more diverse geographically set of students. In my opinion, and it's just my opinion, we should shoot for something like a 70/30 kind of mix between in-state and out-of-state. Why do we want to do that . . . well we want to do it for a variety of reasons: 1) it makes for a stronger educational experience for Louisiana students; 2) it provides a stronger pool, from which to draw, intellectually stronger pool from across the country to bring to the institution and that's a desirable thing. Again, for Louisiana kids, its desirable. I think we want to do it because it is one of those hallmarks of strong institutions and it raises our national profile in a variety of positive ways. It is also, I think you're alluding to, while people don't recognize it in state government often enough, it's great economic development. As I say often, everybody in the state seems fixated on out migration. The reality is, as I read the demographics, we don't have a huge out migration problem, we have a terrible in migration problem (i.e. there isn't any). We don't really . . . everyone worries about the percent of young people leaving Louisiana to go to college when you look at it relative to the other states, its not that bad. Its bad because it's the highest level of academic attainment and those kids are leaving in grossly disproportionate numbers and we need to fix that by becoming a better university. But in terms of aggregate numbers its not that different from a lot of states. What we don't have, is we don't have enough people (as you're saying) moving in and, when you . . . there's a lot of good data that shows when you move into a state, there's a good chance you're going to stay there, there's a good chance you're going to fall in love there, there's a good chance you're going to wind up spending some portion or all of your life there. So, bringing in people from out of state is good for Louisiana. The challenge is, how much can we afford to subsidize non-resident students. It's literally an economics question. We now subsidize in-state students very, very heavily (i.e. almost completely). This current freshman class, the price was . . . \$700? What's the student writing a check for right now? \$720.00, I think it is – for the school year – everything else is being borne by the taxpayers. Everything else, that's a heck of a deal! And so, we, the tax-payers, of one of the poorer states in the union, are heavily subsidizing education. Well, that's okay, I think that's a social good, fits with all my personal values, and I think it's a good investment. The question is, do we want to do the same for non-residents. Our non-resident tuition rate is still relatively low compared to even some in-state tuition in some places and, I don't think, poses a detriment. I don't think students make decisions not to come here because of our tuition. I think that's all about quality and perceived value and as the perceived value of the university goes up, they'll pay whatever the market will bear. As long as we have strong student financial aid programs to cover the costs of need-based aid for students who have genuine, documented financial need, then I think we can take care of it that way. I think where you and I probably agree, we need much more aggressive non-resident scholarship offers so that we can offer those kids, one, two, three thousand dollar (whatever the right number is) scholarships. It's a market function, by hitting the right subsidy that moves from sticker price to base price, that encourages them to come but still letting that be a good subsidy for the university and for them. Am I making sense? So, my position would be, that we shouldn't allow them to get TOPS. We need to save TOPS

taxpayer dollars for Louisianians but that we probably need to figure out how to be more aggressive in scholarship funds – in setting the right price for their tuition – and then scholarships for merit and for need. And we're not there yet. We're significantly better than where we were 3-4 years ago but we're still not where we need to be.

Senator John Pizer: I guess the question would be then, at what point does a person become a Louisianian. You're from Seattle and I went to the University of Washington, and I, just by living there for one year consecutively, I was able to establish my residency. It only took one year. Perhaps we could raise it to two years and, don't forget, during those two years, if you go from 70 to 30, that extra 10%, you're going to bring to a lot more money into the state because they will be paying that out-of-state tuition. But then, at some point, we could stay, you've been here one or two years, you've established the state residency requirement, so you are Louisianians. But that's sort of a gray area . . .

Chancellor: Yeah, I think it is but surely something we can and ought to look into. There's a number of states that compete with us for Louisiana young people. They're very aggressive about that. Auburn University established residency seems to require walking across campus. And that's okay, if that's what they want to do. I don't think that's appropriate and, you have to remember at all times, that we are the worst state-funded public university per student of any of our kind in America. So, we need to worry about revenue from other sources and one of the other things non-residents do, is bring in cash to us – LSU – that we can use for our academic programs. Risa and I worked together at the University of Colorado system and the Boulder campus lives and dies on non-resident tuition. Then she went to the only place that was more dependent upon tuition revenue and that's the University of Oregon. I guess Vermont, where Dan Fogel went, is probably the most now. I think they only have like 15/16% of their students are residents. But we need to strike a balance of all those things. We're not there yet and your points are well taken.

Senator: You sort of set of a quandry which you didn't address between right-sizing and 35% more applicants.

Chancellor: Yes, of course I did and that's really why I brought the issue to us. I guess it does get to the tuition issue, not that we have too many students. I think we have too few professors and we have, in some cases, too few facilities mostly for those professors, not for the students. When we are looking at our enrollment and looking at our facilities we're only a little bit behind in classroom space and only a little bit behind in student sport space. We're not behind in academic areas – we're behind in rec centers, things like that – while we're not behind in classroom – a little behind in student lab space. It's a complicated policy question and here's how I look at it, I look at national norms. There are a lot of people that say, who are not at LSU, LSU is too big and they are sucking up too many of the good students, they need to share with the other schools – we have to pass them and educate them. Well, what are the national norms. The national norms say that the public higher education systems average in 49 other states average having 19/20% of their undergraduates go to a Research I university which is always the state's flagship university. In many cases there's two or more of those but in some

cases, there's only one. We're one of those states where there's only one. Well what percentage of Louisiana kids come to LSU – 19% – we're right on the money. We're exactly at the national average, or the distribution of our student pool to a university of our kind. So, when someone says there's too many students at LSU relative to our population, that's just dead wrong. We're at the only educational statistic that we're right at the average. There are WAY more at four year institutions and WAY too few at community colleges. That's where the scheme occurs in Louisiana.

Senator: The problem is that those students aren't really bringing in enough (tape did not pick up a portion of Senator's comment) in terms of its like the old joke, lose five dollars every..... how do you survive.

Chancellor: You make up on volume. And that's why this tuition policy issue is a problem for us. We're going to have to grapple with the tuition and fee policy at LSU. We need to get our per student expenditures UP. They've really only got, at the undergraduate level, two revenue sources – student tuition fee and state general fund support. That's it! So, it's a painfully simple equation. What we have found is, that as we've talked about, reducing undergraduate enrollment pool, nobody in state government has yet said we will increase your general fund support to replace the lost tuition. So, we need to find a model that holds us static. We need to find a model that increases our expenditures for student undergrads. So, I'm only being glib when I'm saying this but there's three ways to do it – stand still, grow, and shrink but in all cases we need more money. Right now the only way to gain more revenue of appreciable kind in the next year or two is gonna be with a tuition fee increase.

Senator: Well, to get to that point then, Roland Toups has been advocating that we increase the two-year college enrollment to something like 60% with (.....) high school graduates in the state and then raise the admission at four-year schools and reduce their level (....) and maintain LSU at the current level. But with a democrat now in charge at the governor's office and democrats in the house and the senate, how is that plan going to hold up?

Chancellor: Well, that plan is a Board of Regents' plan and they have authority over those policies and so far, everything the governor-elect has said in her conversations with me and others (and this is the second topical area I wanted to get to), there's no reason to believe that they're going to alter course in any appreciable degree. And, at the end of the day, it doesn't matter because its a fundamental issue of practicality and demographics. If you wanted to have a distribution like the rest of the country in terms of Research I, four-year, and community college allocations that looked normal, if you will, then you'd have to move 40,000 students out of 4-year institutions into 2-year institutions. If you shrink us by 5,000 undergraduates, which is the most anyone has ever talked about, you still have a 35,000 student problem. The reality is, you've got to eliminate LSU to make a dent in it. The fact is, while people like to take pot shots at us because we've been growing, we are not the problem. The other thing they miss is that most of our growth hasn't been in Freshman, its been in Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors because we're getting better kids. We're doing a better job and they literally do not flunk out — they're staying with us and they're graduating and so, the huge growth from the mid-

90's until now — our Freshman classes now are probably about where they were in 1987. So we just regressed to the mean, we didn't have this big explosive growth that everybody talks about. We started growing in the mid-90's and after that we had a huge fall-out. Now we've gone back up. Yes sir, we're bigger than we've ever been before, true, but that differential is in upper-classmen, not in Freshmen. So the real challenge for the higher ed. policy community in the state is how do we move a very large number of undergraduates from 4-year institutions to community colleges when you don't have a community college system and you don't have anybody to create one. That's the dilemma. There was a hand up over here, yes sir

Senator: A couple of years ago when they instituted Baton Rouge Community College it was primarily to relieve the Freshman class. As a matter of fact, that's what they've done and that's why we've grown in upper classmen.

Chancellor: Well our Freshmen levels have been growing and the Baton Rouge Community Colleges (.....). But many of their students are new students who wouldn't be in college otherwise, they wouldn't be at any institution so some of their students they're not taking from anyplace. They're just going there. With the advent of TOPS, one of the interesting things, when you think about it from a marketplace function (we'll have Dek give an Economics lecture on this), people now make decisions based on quality of judgments instead of price because we removed price from the equation because there is no price. So, if you're at community college and you're sitting there and you're eligible for admission at LSU as a Louisianan, the number of those that will choose the community college is probably zero because why would you do that? Its free and its free either place. So you're not going do it on price so the kids who can get into LSU, for the most part, are coming to LSU. Some are choosing other regional schools in the state but most of them who can come are coming and its had other interesting economic effects on the university like a rapid growth and interest in sororities and fraternities (especially sororities) because they once were expensive and now they're not because they're not paying tuition. So, what the heck, (that's all right, I like the sororities and fraternities), it would be nice if we would see, and we haven't yet determined yet, a greater increase in international study — study abroad because now they can afford to go to Paris or whatever. And, you know, see it in students with other interesting educational ideas but I think its mostly improving the quality of cars in the parking lot.

Senator: A couple of years ago, may have been 6-10, there was a study done where we were looking at the state universities and they're draw and basically, it was concluded that whether you were LSU or Northwestern you drew from within 50 miles of your origin. Have we changed that complexion?

Chancellor: Yes, very very much so. I can't speak to the other schools but I suspect it has not changed at any other schools but I don't know that. If it has, I would guess its changed most for Louisiana Tech who's done a number of very, very good things. But its changed very markedly for us and, as I said in my opening comments, this current set of applicants, the percent from Baton Rouge is

down 3 or 4 %. It has been turning down, and we're getting a much broader state-wide penetration into the market, especially New Orleans, which, you know, we didn't do very well even 5 or 6 years ago. There, we're doing much better in New Orleans, we're doing much better across the state. And, I think that's both the recognition of the good things going on academically, the impact of TOPS — again it erases cost from the equation or at least mitigates it — and then, just our rising profile as an institution. Karen's people are doing a good job — they're out there beating the bushes very well.

Senator: This is not relating to this general subject but its a numbers question. If you'd like, I'll wait until the end.

Chancellor: No, that's fine.

Senator: I'd like to go back just a little bit (turned tape here, lost some of the question but question centered around clarifying the correct count of faculty members for the Faculty Council meeting).

Chancellor: That very morning, I got the most current count from payroll and personnel and it was 1600 and some number, I forget.

Senator Comment: (tape did not pick up Senator's brief comment).

Chancellor: Well, I don't know, when I saw the 1600 number, they were using the precise definition of the Faculty Council. In that language, the language is a bit more tightly defined. Sort of a traditional academic definition. So, in the count that human resources gives us, it also includes, for example, the equivalent of all the Ag Center folks that get counted into that who may not be of that number. It includes Ag Center faculty who have extension appointments and that's probably not included in the number that you're looking at so that's where the differential comes in. I was surprised when I saw the 16 and a quarter — I thought it was (.....), because that's the number I've always used in my stump speeches. So, it is apparently by the definition that the regulations of this body uses and the Board's policy. That's the definition that ASH has always used. When we went back and actually look at 1987, when they'd done a similar Faculty Council vote — to make sure we got it right, because we wanted to make sure we had it right, the numbers. There were two numbers, you'd think it would be easy to say how many people you have working for you but it all depends, it was either 16 and a quarter (roughly, or 1650) depending upon which numbers youI'll have to get you the numbers.

Senator Comment: We have questioned the Provost about the number of administrators at LSU and how they fit into this. It would be nice to have those numbers.

Chancellor: I'll be more than happy to provide it to the Senate and you can distribute it.

Senator: Well, would it then also be appropriate to include those numbers in these sorts of pricing questions.

Chancellor: Yes, as long as you do an apple to apple comparison. Part of what you're referring to of course are, data that we use to compare ourselves to other universities. And so, the institutional research folks, Bob Kuhn's people do a better job than anybody I've ever seen. At working with other universities to get real apples to apples comparisons. We are unusual in that we have an Ag Center that's an independent entity. And then, of course, some schools have medical schools and people get counted many different ways. People use the word instructor for different things in different places. So they work real hard to try and get apples to apples comparisons and that's why we use those data because those are the best comparators that we can come up with.

Senator: So those numbers should be for fulltime people, in general, for Faculty Council standpoint.

Chancellor: Yes, but again I'm issued the hard data, you can see in all the categories the perspective. Anything else on the enrollment business?

Senator: Yes, I think the university (tape did not pick up opening comment). When I talk with my non-academic neighbor about it, they don't see it that way. They think the state university is for the state and that the money should go for premium out-of-state students. How do you view that?

Chancellor: Well, first of all, you need to explain to them the things we were talking about earlier. Most of the time... and I hear that often of course.... and I hear it mostly with international students in particular, if you want to get really serious debate you can talk about international students. And the conversation usually goes something like, well I guess its okay that they come but I sure hope they go home and I always say, you better pray that they don't. Because that's a huge part of the labor force and brain power of our future. What usually works, is two things, first to explain why its important for Louisiana to bring more people into Louisiana. And that all of these states that have been stealing our young people (Texas, and Georgia, and pick a state) for a generation now. Its about time we turned the tables on them and stole some of their young people. And that usually is a persuasive notion when we talk about it. The second though, is back to the pricing issue. We have to make sure that we're charging tuition so that we're not, in fact, subsidizing wealthy kids from Houston, just to give you an example, with taxpayer dollars from a guy or gal who is working for McDonald's in Breaux Bridge. You can't have that go on. So, you gotta make sure that you're charging enough for non-residents so they're at least paying their way or, you know, you feel good about the level of payment. And many of universities, like again Colorado, Colorado is an outlier because it sells those mountains. But Colorado balances its budget on the backs of kids from Houston, California and Chicago. That's how they pay their rent. They've done a good job doing that and the state continues to cut their state appropriations so, if they didn't do that, they would probably cease to exist. They would be a very weak institution. What you've got to do is you gotta make sure they understand that non-residents are paying more, and appreciably more money, and you've got to make sure that the academic standards for the non-residents are at least as high as, preferably higher than those for in-state students. The best example there is Chapel Hill. Now, to get into Chapel Hill as a resident is one thing, to get in as a non-resident is another. Its dramatically more competitive as a non-resident because they (.....) policy. I think....

they limit the number of non-residents. So, you're right, we have an educational job to do there but we can do it as long as we're not denying access to qualified Louisianans then I think that's fine. As long as we're still able to say look, here's our admission threshold, any Louisiana kid who jumps over that hurdle, we're going to take him, then I think we're okay. When we get to a point where we say, look, we can only take "x" number of Louisianans, then that debate becomes a bit more challenging one. Anything else on that subject? We're going to have to talk more about this as the year progresses and Karen, Provost and I can keep you updated as it moves along and we get a better sense of where the enrollments going to go. Obviously we do not want a 35% growth in freshman class — that would be a trauma that you don't want. And that's not going to occur but right now that's where the applications are, it's very possible.

Let me do what the President of the Senate didn't want me to do, and that's bring up one more time, PM-35. I don't know if we need to talk of this today but I just wanted to let you know that as Chancellor, and the Provost and I have chatted about this and she and I are very like-minded, and you need to recognize that this is quite literally my own personal opinion. This isn't anything other than Mark Emmert's view of the circumstances. I think that PM-35, in many ways, is an unworkable document and, if this body so desired, to have a discussion with the Provost and me on how that document needs to be modified, in small or in large ways, I would be more than happy to entertain that conversation. And, moreover, to champion whatever the result was in the system office. I'm not sure I have anything more then to say about that, then (CLAPPING).

President McGehee: How's tomorrow afternoon?

Chancellor: Tomorrow afternoon is fine as long as we do it in Atlanta, Georgia.

President McGehee: Never mind.

Chancellor: Quite seriously, though, as we've gone through this really sort of tortured debate. I was pleased it wasn't rancorous but it was sort of a hand-wringing debate about this issue. And, as I said in a couple of the public forums, I don't see this as an issue about where administrators and faculty should fight. We should actually be in agreement. It indicates that there are components in that policy that just, as I said, aren't workable, that don't make sense to my thinking as you consider how to implement on the ground in the departments, at the dean level, and all of the levels of administration. So, if this coming....and I know Carruth is just dying for this opportunity....if, in the coming semester, you wanted to spend a little bit more time thinking about how we would modify PM-35, please feel free to do so. Okay? I would not consider that an unwelcome debate.

And lastly, to some of the questions raised over here on the gubernatorial transition, let me state a few observations. First of all, I met with and talked with all of the candidates early, starting as early as this time almost last year, and continued to do so throughout the campaigns and then once the primary was over, talked with the two candidates, both of them, a good deal, as their campaigns wore on, about higher education in general and LSU in particular and shared thoughts and views on what was

desirable and how, from my point of view, a strong flagship research-intensive university is a very good thing for the state. And, I think as we've seen in the Advocate editorial, a very positive Advocate editorial, today, that message is being very well received around the state. People now are saying back to us, our own speeches. That means you know that they've heard, they are agreeing. We're getting that not just in newspapers but we're hearing it from politicians. I had one gubernatorial candidate start giving me my speech back, almost verbatim, it was really quite wonderful. And I said yes, I agree with everything — he lifted a whole bunch of phrases — it was great because it became part of the policy discussion and people understand much better today than they did twelve months ago. And I think that's a very good thing that's coming out of that whole process. We heard the governor-elect on the campaign trail and in debates refer to LSU as the state's flagship institution. She's already said to me "well that cost me votes in Lafayette" (she was joking, of course it didn't), but the fact is is that everybody understands the role of higher ed in general. We have to wait and see who she appoints to positions. I've had good conversations with some of the key people on the transition team as recently as this week already. I've met with a couple of them on different occasions, they're very anxious to hear what our thoughts and ideas are for all higher ed. and not just LSU. We'll probably have some voices on some of the policy committees they're putting together which will be useful. But what's also apparent is that this governor — doesn't matter who the governor was — this governor is one who inherited not very good budget, hey Tom? A budget that's gonna have some pretty big holes in it and she's going to have some challenges. Now we all hope that the federal government will come in and help us out on the Medicare side or somewhere on the healthcare side and I think that's a reasonable bet but its not a sure thing by a long shot. That would be more problematic for a lot of other states than us but nevertheless would be a problem for us. There are obviously (.....) The previous administration worked very hard to not have deficits and they sort of worked all of the slack out of the budget you can. They talk and give us this lecture about how one goes about doing that — its pretty much squeezed out, there's not a lot of give and slack. So, this half million dollar deficit everyone is talking about is really quite real and so they're going to have to cope with that. What's good is that they also have all said, and Kathleen in particular said, and has said since her election that she has education and healthcare as prominent issues that she has to solve. I think its unlikely that, as in the bad old days, we're going to be first on the chopping block when issues need to come forward. We have been talking to them thinking about this coming session and other sessions, probably one or two before the economy really changes appreciably. Talking and recognizing that we're not gonna see buckets of money coming over the transom — they just don't have it. Whether they love us or not is not the question — they just don't have it unless they change the tax structure and she's not gonna do that in one term. So we instead are gonna look at things that'll require authority and permission and blessing rather than hard cash. Now, don't get me wrong, we're gonna go in and argue for money like crazy. If there's money available we're gonna do everything we can to get our fair share coming to LSU but we shouldn't assume we're going to be as fortunate as we have been in the past years. So, I hope — or the worst would be if we stand still. So what kind of things can we pursue. Well, I've talked to you in the past about a large-scale state-wide investment in higher education infrastructure. I've pitched that to both finalists in the gubernatorial election both responded very positively. Governor-elect Blanco responded extremely positively and liked the idea a great deal. She doesn't

underestimate the complexity, has lots of good questions, but has, in fact, smiled and nodded and made a lot of positive noises in that regard. And many of the people around her feel the same way. My meetings this week with two of the transition leaders, they responded very positively about it. So I think we have a chance to have a very good hearing in that regard and continue to think it makes very good sense for all kinds of reasons: economic, financial, political, and public policy wise. All of those things line up very nicely for something on the order of 1.6 billion dollar investment. It would require basically doubling the amount of annual expenditures for higher education that occur now on an annual basis. The amount of money in increased debt service cost is not enormous, but its surely not free, and we know that so we're helping to try and work with them to find solutions to that. But, if one thinks in term of a political calculus, this governor could, in one term, create many thousands of jobs for people who do everything from design work to swing hammers. They could repair buildings that are returning to a state of nature and will be repaired anyway. Its not like this is an optional cost, that's the issue and part of the equation. Its not as if the PMAC building, PMAC roof is going to repair itself. You know, unless some of you are doing some really cool things in biology. You know, you're going to have to spend on it — if you don't do it, then its going to rain inside the PMAC at commencement. And so the state can't afford this, it has to pay for that. Either you could wait for the roof to fall in or you could fix it while its still relatively inexpensive to fix. So, the state's going to pay, its like maintaining your car, or your home, or anything else — its infinitely or, at least dramatically cheaper, to take care of your car than to fix it when the engine's froze up. So, we're making those arguments and we think we made good headway on that. It creates jobs now and creates jobs for the future because you're investing in the mechanism that creates wealth — higher education. Tomorrow, do you think you can borrow money cheaper? I don't think so, I think its as cheap as money gets in our lifetime. If you're gonna borrow a lot of money, borrow it now. You get to run for re-election having really only paid debt service on one year which is like — that first year, I think its like \$15 million dollars — its nothing. So you get to run for re-election having created a bunch of jobs, fixed a bunch of things all around the state, and made a really positive statement for public policy and spent very little money. I think that its a good idea. So I think we're making some ground headway there . We can chat about that a little bit more if you'd like.

I think the other thing is that we have a good opportunity that, in this last session, I mentioned it when the session was over, that we have now been mandated to go to the legislature this Spring with a state-wide tuition fee policy. We don't even have permission, we've been mandated to do it. It will maybe provide us with an opportunity to get out from under some of the 2/3 vote requirements for managing tuition and fees which will be a very sane thing to do. So we have to work on that and need to work on it as a system. We have some good ideas of what we want here. What we want here may be different than what they want at UNO or Eunice. And so, LSU's system gotta figure out what it wants together, then the whole state's gotta figure out together, and then have to go to the legislature. We would very much like to have a governor-elect on our side in that debate and I think we can make that happen.

And then finally, we want to ask for some management flexibility. We would like to get slightly increased authority to manage some of our own affairs a little bit better and not as much oversight. Some of those things — like Purchasing — has anyone ever had problems in Purchasing? Its a joke!

Purchasing authority limits when we can draw on capital construction — what capital construction we can do without having to go through state government. Any number of things, there's a whole array of management control issues that we again, those positive response to our arguments in terms of giving us flexibility. So those are three things that don't have any effect on this year's budget, that could be very positive for us, that the governor-elect and the legislature could provide for higher education — not just LSU — allowing them to do something good for education without them having to write a check this year. Those are the kinds of things we're looking for and we will, probably as early as January, Mr. Chairman, want to come back and have a conversation — maybe I'll ask you to identify some members of this body who could work with us on helping us develop some tuition policy proposals that we could take to the Board of Regents and then work with them on that — that fit into, again, with our flagship agenda. We had already in place, facilities planned, the 1.6 billion dollars — an imaginary number — those are projects already approved by the Board of Regents so they're all quequed up so we don't have to fight over money but we'd also want to talk about what we'd want to phase in here. Then again, they want to solicit (...) flexibility in these issues as we go into the session. So with that, let me pause and ask if there's any questions about transitions or gubernatorial elections. I think the other interesting thing is we're gonna have — especially in the Senate — we're gonna have a number of people for whom this will be their last session. Because they're term limited so its their last term and people in the House try to work with the Senate, people in the Senate, they're probably done we've never seen this before. So we don't know if they're going to act normal or sane or close to sane — or what they're gonna do and its gonna cause interesting dynamics I'm sure but it'll be exciting.

Senator: Two questions about politics, first you mentioned we may have some representation on some of these transition committees — its been very valuable in the past — do you know of any that are going to be for sure or likely?

Chancellor: I don't know of any for sure, but I know some that are widely being discussed right now but there's going to be three three key transition team committees: one on healthcare, one on economic development, and one on education. Those are the only three she's going to form — she's trying to put together about 30-person committees, in round numbers, and she's already asked for the opportunity to make suggestions.

Senator

: The other one was with the Board of Regents — continuity, big change, any idea at all?

Chancellor: I think it would be imprudent to speculate, but I assure you, we're unlikely to see dramatic change. And that's just me — change? Sure. But dramatic, I would doubt it — but you never know. The Board of Supervisors whose terms are up, there's just a couple of that are in those positions, we'll have to see. I stay way away from those debates.

Senator: This is really more of a comment. One of the things, when we work with state government on projects, I see that there are a number of research projects that seem to go out-of-state to consulting

firms or at other universities. This seems like a great opportunity to make sure that we make them aware of the types things we do at LSU, early on, before the capital outlay people are in place and start allocating projects to --they don't know you -- . we can save them money and they can also help fund grad. students.

Chancellor: I think that's a great plight and thank you for reminding me about it. I'll make sure that I talk to the governor-elect and the transition group about it because, obviously, we're the state's flagship — and that doesn't mean that other schools don't do good work, they do of course — but we also have geography working for us — we're here. And so, in any number of fields we can provide them with very, very good public policy assistance and variety of support in all subjects they care to deal with. We need to be ready, willing, and able to do that and they need to know and I will deliver the message. Anything else with the transition? Anything else on any other subjects that I might answer?

Senator: A few years back you had a program to emphasize certain areas at the university....

Chancellor: Yes, the Foundation of Excellence Program.

Senator: Has that met your expectations and when you do expect to redirect resources to that?

Chancellor: Well, the Provost and I had spent a lot of time this Fall actually chatting about that, just informally. So, once again, I'll just tell you my points of view — they represent just mine. The decisions around the questions that you ask can't be just mine to make. They need to be decisions that we make very collaboratively because I think they're very important. I think that the Foundations of Excellence initiatives have had some very significant impacts in a number of those programs. Its had, and I don't want to sit and name programs, but I think its had not as good impact in other places. Let me put it that way. I think we're at a point now where we have a chance — its been long enough for where we can assess real progress, and real direction, and its a good moment to do that. To say, okay which of these has worked and which has not performed liked we wanted it to and what went wrong — was it affordable or unaffordable — and then do we want to sort of reopen that issue. The Provost has, in a variety of forums, has talked about, also talked about cross-cutting in some horizontal issues that we may want to identify in addition to and not ruling out those vertical kinds of programs in the set initiatives. And I like that a great deal, so what I would hope is when we have the conversation about how do we assess progress and how do we decide to move forward — that we also, at the same time, have a conversation about — are there areas — as we've done with information technology — you know, which cuts across many, many disciplines — are there others (we've done the same on a lesser extent with biotechnology) — those were state-funded programs so they didn't originate on campus, per se, but we were aggressive supporters of them. Are there some that we want to identify that we want to have in this state, for support, for any number of kinds of support that we can get from the state and then for reallocation in general. Long winded answer. Anything else, any other subject? If there's no other questions, thank you very much, and if I don't see you, have good holidays.”

(Clapping)

(Note: End of verbatim section).

IV. Report from President Carruth McGehee

A. Question about the Faculty Council count is an issue which we will need to look at very soon for the distribution of Faculty Senate representation for next Spring's election and information will be shared with Faculty Senate. In addition, the question of the number of Administrators and information that was to be provided by the Provost, President McGehee will supply information in the Spring to the Faculty Senate.

B. Question of whether or not SR 04-03 (Constitutional Amendment) was tabled? President McGehee reported that the mail ballot on the Constitutional Amendment will be sent out the first day of classes, allowing three weeks for it to be returned. In addition, the ballot will contain the complete resolution on it and will provide a reference to the website where John Chandler's resolution, supporting materials, and a copy of the constitution (as it now stands), and page one of PS-50 will be provided.

C. Reported that the FSEC has been discussing the high drop rate at LSU with the Provost and the drop policy at LSU. Additional information on this topic will be provided in the Spring.

D. Problems/Matters of Blackboard at LSU

1. 8-page paper by Robert Ward on this topic will be provided on the website

2. Robert Ward's comments: Blackboard has an open-ended contract which means we don't buy the software; we are subscribing to it and using it every year. Subscription rate for 15,000 students for current year is \$56,000 with a 5% growth factor in the contract; next year growth factor will push the subscription cost to \$63,000 but will cover 25,000 students; Vice Provost feels costs are accelerating and would like to cap that cost increase by completely abandoning Blackboard and going to Semester Book because Semester Book is proprietarily owned by LSU; Semester Book is not technically as sophisticated as Blackboard or as effective; argument is that the price is reasonable and that Blackboard should be retained or some other system which is comparable; decision should not be made unilaterally by the administration, it affects instructional standards so therefore needs to involve ATAC in discussion and evaluation before decision is made, need faculty involvement.

Comments from Senators: faculty would be irate if we lost Blackboard.

Question from Senator: Could we take money from the contract cost and put into support development to improve semester book to get to the level we want? Robert Ward's response: No, it would cost more to get it up to the level we want.

Comments from Senators: Need to have a comparative analysis done involving ATAC (Academic Technology Advisory Committee) and ASAC (Administrative Systems Advisory Committee).

E. PS-36 Committee

1. Instructor Policy: The 11/13 draft needs a bit of work to make Section VI clearer; we'll probably have a Resolution to present in January.

2. Criteria for Promotion needs to be stated in PS-36 with examples of criteria; still to call

for rules of academic units which would have to give fuller expression to those standards; a draft will be forthcoming in the next semester.

3. LSU System Standard CV format is a problem; outside reviewers see it as problematic as well; difficult to understand and follow; some degree of standardization is needed and helpful but the current form is a problem; may be an issue to deal with in the future.

Comment from Senator: If Faculty Senate objects to it they should make their thoughts heard.

F. Questions/Comments by Senators

1. Senator John Chandler: Problem with recent Broadcast e-mail dictating that everyone taking must take an Annual Leave Day on January 2, 2004; would like to voice and get the Faculty Senate's opinion about it. Senator Chandler expressed his feeling that the university should "ask" faculty for a leave day, not "tell" faculty they must take a personal leave day.

President McGehee explained someone, in planning the school calendar, planned that opening day of the second semester be Friday, the 2nd of January. Situation should have been worked out earlier. Stating that economics forces us to shut the university down solves a lot of problems but it creates this other kind of problem for personnel of all levels. The FSEC will express concern about this matter to the Provost.

G. PM-35

1. Will have opportunity to bring up questions at the System office; three things in PM-35 to consider: 1) requirement of annual evaluations, 2) requirement that every campus have a policy detailing the due process procedure for dismissal for cause, and 3) everything else in document. The question asked should be what's the problem you're trying to solve? If there is a problem, the faculty should sit down, discuss and talk about it. We should feel encouraged about this because the Chancellor thinks its worthwhile to go and talk with the President of the System about this issue.

Senator Chip Delzell question: Does this policy involve the other campuses?

President McGehee: Ask the question if this policy just involves LSU campus or others as well; McGehee is a member of the FAC (Faculty Advisory Council through the LSU System) which meets every Thursday before the Board meetings, the question will be asked there.

Senator Dominique Homberger question: Where does this leave PS-109? If PM-35 is changed, should PS-109 be scrapped? In addition, what about SR 03-10?

President McGehee: Until PM-35 changes, PS-109 should not be scrapped. About SR 03-10, should we wait and see?

Laurie Anderson comments: Pointed out that President McGehee has compiled a list of 20 differences between SR03-10 and PS-109 and might be a good place of where to begin our discussions with the Chancellor and changes in PM-35.

Senator Leonard Ray comment: Find other institutions which might have another version of this document or similar to it to look at.

Senator Robert Tague comment: Faculty in his area are very upset about not being able to express themselves at the Faculty Council meeting because of a quorum not being present. How will the faculty be able to express their opinions about PM-35?

President McGehee: Take up matter in January and have discussions.

Senator Homberger comments: Should untable SR03-10 and work out problems therefore having ideas for implementation of PM-35. Would like to propose a motion to untable SR03-10. Is it a problem to untable it?

President McGehee: Not a problem to untable it, it takes a majority vote but the time of day (4:45 p.m.) is an issue/problem for today. During last six months, lots of input has come forth regarding the matter, complaints, and offered suggestions and ideas on the combination of both the documents. Committee would like to rewrite a new document with these ideas incorporated and bring a new draft to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Homberger comments: Experience is rewriting a completely new document is much more difficult.

Senator Claire Advocat: It wouldn't be a total starting from scratch — these documents working together (the eighteen points, many of which mention only a question of some phrasing between the documents).

Senator Chip Delzell: Was Douglas Braymer under the apprehension that the Louisiana legislature was going to impose such a thing as PM-35 on us anyone and, it turned out, that this was, perhaps, a misapprehension and that no one in the legislature was planning any such thing. If so, was all of this “one man's paranoia?” The question is what do other university systems do, there is the University of Vermont which does nothing. They have no PM-35 and so when we are speaking of models to emulate, why don't we emulate the University of Vermont? In addition, the University of Wisconsin at Madison which has no document either.

President McGehee: In Faculty Senate Minutes of Fall of 1999, Braymer did not state there was pressure from the legislature. But there was the question going around and which had to be answered of “what do you do when someone's not working?” Question doesn't seem unreasonable.

Senator Pratul Ajmera: Why don't we write a PM-35 that does not need a PS-109?

President McGehee: Suggested we might get to the point where a new faculty committee be formed and work with the system.

Senators Homberger and Chandler: Feel we should work with the Chancellor and allow him to work with us and take to the System office.

VI. SR 04-05 Dean's List and Chancellor's Honor Roll
(Committee on Admissions, Standards, and Honors)
(read by Vince Wilson)

— the Academic Standards and Honors Committee put this resolution together after addressing the issue about increasing our standards according to the Dean's List and the Chancellor's Honor Roll (see ADDENDUM to Minutes for complete text of Resolution).

Seconded by Jim Catallo. Will vote on Resolution at January 21, 2004 meeting. Discussion: Provost in document means our current Provost; Senator asked for explanation in rationale for 13 hours for one list and 14 hours for the other; Karen Denby and Vince Williams both explained that the

committee wanted one achievement (Chancellor's Honor Roll) to be a little bit harder as it carries greater distinction and that the hope would be that students actually complete 15 hours per semester instead of just 12; Senator questioned why LSU continues to require 12 hours per semester for a full load when it is impossible to graduate in four years by only completing 12 hours per semester; Karen Denby answered that TOPS does affect that as well as student aid; that LSU is, by offering this resolution, trying to sell the expectation to students from the beginning to complete 15 hours (not just carry) per semester without forcing it; Karen further informed us that there is a nationwide standard whereby 12 hours in a full load.

4:50 p.m. Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted,
Lori Bade, Secretary

ADDENDUM

(Note: SR 04-05 will be voted on at the January 21, 2004 FS Meeting).

The following is the original version of resolution as there were no changes made during discussion at the December FS Meeting.

Senate Resolution SR 04-05
Dean's List & Chancellor's Honor Roll
(submitted by the Faculty Senate Committee on Admissions, Standards, and Honors)

(Read by Vince Williams)

Whereas, LSU's Flagship Agenda sets as a goal a five-year graduation rate of 55% (up from 48.7% for the class entering in 1998); and

Whereas, increasing graduation rates will be related to many factors, including creating a climate with expectations of scholarship and progress; and

Whereas, with stronger students entering the university as a result of strengthened admission standards in 1990, 1995, 2000, 2002, and projected in 2005, LSU undergraduates can realistically be asked to meet raised expectations; and

Whereas, LSU undergraduates withdraw from classes at a high rate. In Fall 2002, the mean undergraduate course load on the 14th class day was 13.89, by the end of the semester the mean was only 12.41, and 11.2% of the grades issued that semester to undergraduate were W; and

Whereas, though TOPS only mandates that a student complete 24 hours a year (Fall and Spring), and full-time status only requires registration in 12 hours per semester, that rate of progress will very rarely lead to graduation in four years; and

Whereas, apropos discussions on addressing graduation rates, course availability and withdrawals, the Provost has asked the university community to change the message – that it is “OK” to take 12 hours – in printed materials, in advising, and in everything we do; and

Whereas, the Dean's List and Chancellor's Honor Roll to honor students' semester academic achievements that are currently awarded based on semester GPA's after completing at least 12 hours of LSU course work could become more of a distinction with stricter requirements;

Therefore, be it resolved that the criteria for recognition on the Chancellor's Honor Roll and Dean's List be upgraded as follows:

Chancellor's Honor Roll: undergraduate students completing at least 14 college-level hours at LSU in the semester/term, with a semester grade-point average of 4.00 and no “I” grades for the semester.

Dean's List: undergraduate students completing at least 13 college-level hours at LSU in the semester/term, with a semester average of at least 3.50 and no “I” grades for the semester.

Independent (correspondence) study courses will not be used in computation of the hours completed. Students will be recognized on one list at a time. Those completing 13 hours with a 4.0 GPA will achieve the Dean's List; those completing at least 14 hours with a 4.0 GPA will achieve Chancellor's Honor Roll distinction.

SEMESTER HONORS:
Dean's List Chancellor's Honor Roll

What if criteria was based on >12 semester hours earned?

	A&S	AGRI	BADM	BASC	ADSN	EDUC	ENGR	UCAC	UCFY	MCOM	MDA	Totals	% that would not have made it if more hours were required
1S/2000													
12 + hours	678	372	838	504	192	506	335	95	1856	145	89	5410	
13 + hours	478	302	405	443	88	380	277	47	1467	102	82	4071	24.75%
15 + hours	355	217	384	288	70	284	191	23	1125	80	66	3083	43.01%
2S/2000													
12 + hours	732	383	613	564	183	447	337	104	1653	166	96	5278	
13 + hours	549	325	366	471	91	337	288	51	1274	118	91	3961	24.95%
15 + hours	429	217	352	304	73	261	208	28	986	98	76	3032	42.55%
1S/2001													
12 + hours	717	384	543	506	209	420	347	183	1993	177	101	5580	
13 + hours	548	328	353	441	118	329	296	106	1557	121	85	4282	23.26%
15 + hours	413	218	341	309	92	247	184	74	1209	105	64	3256	41.65%
2S/2001													
12 + hours	758	390	687	542	186	426	379	195	1659	173	129	5524	
13 + hours	557	316	443	467	101	314	328	113	1324	115	122	4200	23.97%
15 + hours	429	222	427	292	78	251	228	84	1037	97	89	3234	41.46%
1S/2002													
12 + hours	871	361	630	611	245	492	360	446	1726	183	101	6026	
13 + hours	640	309	399	535	120	390	284	284	1342	119	85	4507	25.21%
15 + hours	496	201	375	367	93	303	193	226	1098	99	66	3517	41.64%
2S/2002													
12 + hours	934	377	691	650	285	506	425	468	1253	217	106	5912	
13 + hours	700	312	459	539	146	390	353	301	1018	139	92	4449	24.75%
15 + hours	542	246	439	341	124	299	238	225	847	124	66	3491	40.95%
1S/2003													
12 + hours	851	342	602	642	274	514	363	465	1435	203	98	5789	
13 + hours	649	296	385	559	136	400	294	292	1155	140	87	4393	24.11%
15 + hours	494	213	366	376	114	341	233	206	902	113	63	3421	40.91%
2S/2003													
12 + hours	939	399	631	623	315	468	373	499	1188	193	101	5639	
13 + hours	678	247	398	525	174	361	294	313	974	133	90	4187	25.75%
15 + hours	516	191	380	336	147	299	228	233	783	105	76	3294	41.59%