

**LSU Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**3:00 P.M., Wednesday, September 10th, 2008**  
**Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union**



**Attendance**

*Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (Senate President, English)         | 2. Andrew Christie (Vice-President, Accounting)               |
| 3. George G. Stanley (Secretary, Chemistry)          | 4. Pratul K. Ajmera (Member-at-Large, Electrical Engineering) |
| 5. Priscilla D. Allen (Member-at-Large, Social Work) | 6. William H. Daly (Past President, Chemistry)                |

Parliamentarian: Charles N Delzell (present)

*Senators present:*

- |                       |                      |                       |                         |
|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Fred Aghazadeh     | 2. Mary Aime         | 3. Pratul K. Ajmera   | 4. Linda Allen          |
| 5. Priscilla D. Allen | 6. David Baird       | 7. Sue G Bartlett     | 8. Henry D. Bellamy     |
| 9. Michael Bowman     | 10. Renee Casbergue  | 11. Charles N Delzell | 12. Josh Detre          |
| 13. Susan Dumais      | 14. Bruce E Eilts    | 15. Robert K. Goidel  | 16. Wanda Hargroder     |
| 17. Scott W. Harris   | 18. Andrea Houston   | 19. Paul L. Hrycaj    | 20. Boryung Ju          |
| 21. P. Lynn Kennedy   | 22. Jeremy King      | 23. Joan M. King      | 24. Jeff S. Kuehny      |
| 25. Katia Madsen      | 26. Ronald F. Malone | 27. Heather McKillop  | 28. Alison McFarland    |
| 29. Jorge F. Morales  | 30. Carol E. O'Neil  | 31. John Protevi      | 32. Steve Ross          |
| 33. Kelly Rusch       | 34. Michael Russo    | 35. Edward Song       | 36. James R. Stoner Jr. |
| 37. Beth N. Tope      | 38. Muhammad Wahab   | 39. Edward Watson     | 40. Susan Weinstein     |
| 41. Paul Wilson       |                      |                       |                         |

*Proxies for absent Senators:*

George Stanley for Andrew Christie, Richard L. Kurtz, Erwin D. Poliakoff  
Bruce Eilts for Hollis Utah Cox  
Dee Jacobsen for Lisa Johnson  
Larry Crumbly for Joseph Legoria  
Muhammad Wahab for Su-Seng Pang  
Alex Cohen for Jeffrey Tiger  
Charles N Delzell for Dottie Vaughn  
Edward Watson for Richard White  
Larry Rouse for School of Coast & Environment

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

- |                          |                             |                        |                         |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Jacqueline Bach (4)   | 2. Brittan A. Barker (7)    | 3. Jennifer Curry (1)  | 4. Juhan Frank (3)      |
| 5. Jennifer L. Jolly (5) | 6. Frederick G. Ortner (10) | 7. Keith Robinson (10) | 8. Cristina Sabliov (1) |
| 9. James Sullivan (19)   | 10. Yi-jun Xu (1)           |                        |                         |

*Guests Attending Meeting:*

Guests were introduced and urged to sign in on the attendance sheet. Guests attending the September meeting included:

Michael Martin, Chancellor  
Astrid Merget, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor  
Joey Abel, MSW Student  
Ben Clark, Student Senate Speaker  
Robert Doolos, University Registrar  
Renee Myer, Chancellor's Office  
Brian Voss, UCIT – ITS  
Erica Warren, Daily Reveille  
Jordan Blum, The Advocate

**Consideration of Minutes from Previous Meeting (May 1, 2008):**

Motion to accept by Kelly Rusch, seconded by Larry Crumbley. Unanimous vote to accept/approve.

**Presidents report (Kevin Cope):**

Summer Activities of the President and Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC):

- **General Info:** Faculty Senate web site up and enhanced; new committees listed on web site; committee's are all filled – thanks to Louay Mohammad (Civil & Environmental Engineering); will be putting emphasis on some of the committees: Benefits, Budget and Planning; new = Sustainability, Campus Safety; Executive committee prepared a Faculty briefing book for the new chancellor; Judith Schiebout (Natural Science Museum) interacting with Rusty Jabor about ways to improve display cases about campus and displaying LSU info/etc.
- **University level:** briefing on LSU Lab School and issues about professors getting their kids into school there; night-time parking instituted; interdisciplinary committee asked for an extension on their clock, which was granted; discussions with the Provost about upper administrator evaluations – PS-111 committee is working with the Provost to further refine; pushed for better PR and info on Dean's searches and search committees; raised the question about the bus system, waiting for details; revision of Flagship agenda – progress at a university advance meeting; Pratul Ajmera (FSEC & Electrical Engineering) worked with Brian Voss and Brian Nichols on a new IT privacy policy for the campus (round of applause from audience); two faculty forums with the new chancellor to discuss various issues - first on Wednesday, October 1 (topics to be announced); received a number of complaints about the lack of a Memorial Day holiday - no resolution due to state limit on number of holidays.
- **System Level:** Kevin is working with the Council of Faculty Advisors, that meets during LSU Board of Supervisors, on getting more cooperation with other faculty senate presidents in order get some common goals enacted; also visiting faculty senates at LSU system schools around the state to offer advice and consultation on various issues; House bill 179 – paid time off/sick leave, advisory committee will work with Marianne Caillier (Assistant Vice Chancellor) in HRM to develop a new and better bill; Regents requested a mission statement for LSU - Provost Merget, with some assistance from the FSEC, worked to prepare the document and got it submitted to the BOR; the Southeast Conference (SEC) is trying to raise its academic profile and is supplying some money for faculty senate presidents to get together to discuss academic/athletic issues. Kevin is actively participating in this.

**Q&A, Discussion Summary:**

Jim Stoner (Political Science): Is the LSU mission statement posted?

Kevin referred the question to Astrid Merget who replied that it should be posted on the BOR web site.

**Presentation by Chancellor Michael Martin:**

- Thanks for the welcome to LSU and community! Dynamic and great university. 18 yrs ago he was faculty senate president at Oregon State University. Mike complained about many things as FS president. He believes in shared governance.
- Quick observations: Hurricane Gustav – not in job description! Worked closely with emergency operations folks, he was very impressed with their efforts. Approximately 4300 people remained on campus to help during Gustav. PMAC and Field House used for emergency issues. Power loss at PMAC forced moving some people to local hospitals during Gustav. After Gustav, he walked around campus and saw all the clean-up efforts. Damage in tens of millions of dollars. Still evaluating - but campus is in generally good shape.
- On radar screen: to significantly revise, re-energize, and push the flagship agenda. Updated flagship agenda an important moment in our history. Establish what LSU's agenda is and refine it. Participated in the Advance meeting to discuss the new flagship agenda.
- BOR reviewing and updating funding formula for colleges and universities. Actively participating in this discussion and pushing to have it treat LSU properly.
- He just attended a meeting on Forever LSU campaign. How do we complete the campaign? \$540M so far. Lowest hanging fruit already harvested?? Need to work hard to complete. Endowments, professorships, new buildings - all important. He would like to eventually push the endowment to \$1B.
- Reenergize our presence in Washington DC. Fight for our fair share of federal funds. Earmarks are not necessarily bad. We should fight for these and other funds, partnerships to build a great university.

- How do we restock the faculty pipeline? Think about strategies for recruiting and retaining new faculty. Dual career opportunities, grow your own, other ideas? This topic is very important to him.
- First 5 weeks learning how LSU works, learning about "tribal" issues, meet biggest and potential donors, and experiencing one of our biggest hurricanes. He heard a lot of questions about whether we should have started classes on Monday after Hurricane Gustav, but he thinks it was the right decision. Important for LSU to get rolling again.

**Q&A, Discussion Summary:**

Jim Stoner: Concerning the funding formula, what are the major elements?

Mike: Number of students, retention rates. We would like to add components that reflect our research mission, e.g., parts of the NRC ranking criteria such as number of postdocs. We also anticipate a general growth of our student population along with an increase in their quality. Increasing the research component of the funding formula is an important goal, not that we don't think teaching is important.

Andrew Christie: The funding formula does not distinguish between undergrads and grad students.

Mike: That is correct. We need to try and get the formula to give higher weight to graduate students and upper level courses. And research, of course. We simplified and resubmitted our funding formula suggestions this afternoon.

Andrew Christie: Our retention rate is not as high as we want, but we are dramatically better than anyone else in the state

Mike: Exactly! Our ACT scores are increasing and so that should improve even more. But we need to watch out for just comparing percent increases in retention rates. Some of the other schools may show large increases in their retention rates, but still significantly lower than ours. Given our fairly high retention rate, we can only hope for moderate increases. So we need to work to get the BOR to look at more than just simple % increases.

Fred Aghazadeh: Are you going to visit other colleges?

Mike: Yes I will. I also invite you to meet with me.

Pratul Ajmera: We badly need an improvement in our physical facilities. What are your ideas?

Mike: I am still learning how the state funds things. More private money via naming opportunities around campus. Need to be very creative how we raise money. We also need to fund the basic infrastructure needs.

Lilly Allen: Improving our retirement benefits - will you be our champion?

Mike: Yes! We need to be both competitive and humane. I think the health care package is fairly good. But we need to keep pushing for improvements in benefits overall.

**Presentation/Update by Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Brian Voss on Moodle:**

- Moodle startup this fall did not go as smoothly as planned.
- Initial problems (Sun, Mon, Tues): out-hosted to Moodlerooms. Huge increase in load caused problems. They tried to put new hardware into place too late (Sunday). Bug in Moodle code that was affected by the large load. LSU developers found the bug and fixed it.
- Tues: Moodlerooms installed more new equipment that caused more problems. 4 new systems installed, one of the systems had the old buggy code.
- Lingering problems with roster issues. Hurricane affected this. They will try to resync rosters tonight. About 59 sections affected. Other bug issues found and will be updated this weekend.
- \$\$ savings from Blackboard put into new people to help with Moodle and faculty. Faculty resource center opened in library across from CC's Coffee.

**Q&A, Discussion Summary:**

George Stanley: As a Moodle beta testers I brought up a number of problems with layout of menus, weird grading system, etc. I didn't see hardly any of the suggestions I made implemented.

Brian: We do have access to the source code so we can make changes. Let me find out about these issues and we will get back to you about those problems.

Ronald Malone: On the other hand, I would like to commend you and I find Moodle fairly easy to use.

Andrea Houston: I would also like to commend your people, they are marvelous and I personally haven't had any problems. But my students have had problems accessing materials such as Word, PowerPoint documents. Course = BADM 1000-section 2.

Brian: I will get back to you about this.

Wanda Hargroder: Are online tutorials available?

Brian: Yes, via GROK.

Wanda: How long should we wait for help when we submit a problem to your help desk? I find the Moodle grading scheme to be bizarre. Course = KIN 2509

Brian: We should be fixing things promptly. We will find out why you are not getting faster turnaround on your help requests. But you might also try the Moodle Faculty Center over in Middleton for some personal help.

Jim Stoner: I am part of the Moodle Development Advisory Committee. There is a process for suggestions and changes in Moodle. You can check the development tracking web site for additional information: [lsu.edu/its/moodledev](http://lsu.edu/its/moodledev)

Edward Song: We would like simpler interface in Moodle for doing basic things. I need to communicate with my students, the grade book feature, posting grades to my students, and the class roster. Make the basics easy to use and then add more features.

Brian: Moodle is very flexible, but that same flexibility can make it complicated.

Ed Song: The Moodle/Faculty help desk in Middleton is awesome. What about help video's in GROK?

Brian: Yes, we are growing GROK to include multimedia and videos.

### **Presentation by Roger Lane (Biological Sciences), Chair of the Benefits Committee:**

Issues brought up in PowerPoint presentation:

- Retirement system lowest we could find anywhere.
- 6.77% retirement contribution. Lower than Social Security (7.5%). Remember that we don't get SS.
- Health Benefits appears to have expensive contributions relative to other institutions, but more research necessary. Changes in health insurance apparently made without much faculty input.
- Equity and Raises: equity discrepancies in Salaries need to be addressed. Politics can play an unfortunate role in pay raises (or lack thereof). Suggested a college committee that could review pay raises.
- Patent Royalties: 60/40 (LSU/PI) split. But LSU is subtracting legal and patent costs before any royalty/licensing payouts to the PI.
- Legal Benefits: No legal insurance available to faculty. LSU can use state funds in legal actions against faculty, but faculty do not have access to such state funds for their defense or for handling issues not resolvable by the grievance route.
- Tuition for Dependents: None outside of TOPS. Believes that this is an important benefit for the retention of high quality faculty. Tuition exchange agreements with other schools?
- Reasons to address benefits: Fairness to long term faculty; recruitment of high quality new faculty; and retention of highly successful existing faculty.

### **Q&A, Discussion Summary:**

Heather McKillop: You identified significant faculty salary inequities. Is this antidotal or do you have some other data supporting this?

Roger: Mostly antidotal from Benefits Committee members.

Heather McKillop: Shouldn't there be a committee to look into this to determine if these salary inequities are real or not. Another issue is that raises are a % of existing salary. Why is this? This is unfair for faculty/staff with lower salaries.

Roger: There also aren't any inflation adjustments, which leads to salary compressions.

Larry Crumbliss: We passed a Faculty Senate proposal to put faculty salaries online. What happened to that?

Kevin Cope: I don't know about that, but we will look into it.

## Old Business:

### Second reading of 08-11:

**Faculty Senate Resolution 08-11:  
Transparency and Integrity in PS-36 Faculty Appeal Processes  
Introduced by Senator Charles Delzell,**

on behalf of the Committee for Academic Freedom and Professional Integrity,  
of the LSU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP)<sup>1</sup>.

**Whereas** the right of faculty members to appeal negative tenure, promotion and reappointment decisions by administrators is an integral part of the principle of shared governance in academia; and

**Whereas** the right of students to appeal grade decisions by faculty members is regulated by LSU's General Catalog (Grade Appeals) and PS-44, which explicitly stipulate that decisions during the appeal process must be explained in writing; and

**Whereas** PS-36 [see VII. APPEAL PROCEDURES (for Nonreappointment, Promotion and Tenure)] grants faculty members the right to appeal negative tenure, promotion and reappointment decisions by administrators by submitting "a written petition of appeal, including specific issues of dispute and desired resolution", it is silent about the obligation of administrators to explain their negative decisions (if any); and

**Whereas** LSU's administrators commonly refer to the current wording of PS-36 to support their contention that they do not need to provide any explanation about the reasons for their decisions; and

**Whereas** the refusal by administrators to explain the basis of their decisions renders the appeal process a meaningless and empty exercise for faculty members, because they do not know "specific issues of dispute"; and

**Whereas** a transparent, fair and meaningful appeal process for faculty members is part of good university management practices in the same manner as it is for students;

**Therefore** be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend that LSU's administrators follow the implicit intent of PS-36 and provide detailed, accurate and substantive explanations for their decisions in appeal processes, as well as respond to "specific issues of dispute" raised by faculty members in their appeals; and

**Therefore** be it further resolved that the Faculty Grievance Committee review any appeal by faculty members who have not been told the reasons for a negative employment decision by administrators; and

**Therefore** be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend that PS-36 and PS-36-T be amended by inserting the following sentence:

"At each successive level of the appeal process up to and including that of the Provost, a negative decision by an administrator or an overruling of a recommendation of the Faculty Grievance Committee will be explained in writing and will address all of the issues raised by the appellant or the Faculty Grievance Committee at that level."

In the current, 1997 version of PS-36, the above sentence will be inserted after the second sentence in section VII; and in the proposed new PS-36-T (the draft of March 8, 2006), the above sentence will be inserted after the second sentence in section X.

<sup>1</sup> Committee members: Charles Delzell (Mathematics), Brooks Ellwood (Geology & Geophysics), & Dominique G. Homberger (Biological Sciences; Committee Chair).

### **Q&A, Discussion Summary:**

John Protevi: Do other universities have similar policies or do their administrators give written reasons for negative tenure decisions.

Chip: I don't know what other universities do.

Joan King: Why doesn't this go up to the chancellor?

Chip: Appeals do go up to the chancellor. Provost's office handles almost all the initial tenure decisions.

Lynn Kennedy: Does this information go into the candidates file?

Chip: I believe that all this would go into the file.

Lynn Kennedy: Would there be negative consequences for the candidate?

Chip: The person in question has already lost tenure based on the initial negative decision, so I don't think there would be any further negative consequences.

Carol O'Neil: Shouldn't this feedback to the candidate happen during the original tenure decision?

Chip: The Chair and Dean already have to give written reasons for a negative decision. The Provost doesn't. Perhaps we want to re-write this resolution to include the original tenure decision.

[Back and forth discussion on possible re-writes]

Chip: Too much re-writing to do here. Perhaps something for the PS-36 committee to consider.

Kevin Cope: The final version of the new PS-36-T is almost approved, thanks to Bill Daly and others. I would urge that any changes to PS-36-T should be kept simple and to a minimum.

[Discussion on possible changes and additions to resolution]

George Stanley: Does this mean that you will rewrite and bring the revised resolution for the next meeting?

Bill Daly: Language in the new PS-36-T covers the appeal process and this type of situation. So I hate to see too many changes in PS-36-T since it is so close to being approved.

Chip: I am happy to table this till next month. Please E-mail me with any comments or suggestions.

Jim Stoner: I second the motion to table the resolution.

**Passed unanimously**

## **Second reading of Resolution 08-12:**

### **LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 08-12: Proposing an LSU Policy Statement on Comprehensive Whistleblower Protection, And Establishing a University Ethics Office at LSU**

**Introduced by Charles Delzell,**

for the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Whistleblower Protection Policy:<sup>1</sup>

**Whereas** on May 8, 2006, the Faculty Senate adopted Resolution 06-08, "Comprehensive Protection of Whistleblowers at LSU," creating an ad hoc committee that was charged with:

- (1) reviewing all LSU policies on misconduct, and on retaliation against whistleblowers, and
- (2) recommending changes to such policies, and/or devising a new comprehensive policy,

that

- (a) would prohibit retaliation against anyone at LSU (whether faculty, student, or staff) who makes a good faith allegation of any form of misconduct at LSU, and
- (b) would charge one or more appropriate University officials with providing such protection; and

**Whereas** in 2007 the above committee was appointed, and it eventually drafted a proposed policy, entitled: "PS-115: University Ethics Office, and Comprehensive Whistleblower Protection at LSU,"

**Therefore be it resolved** that the Faculty Senate, after making its own revisions to the above draft, endorses the draft, and proposes

- (a) that the LSU administration adopt it as a policy statement, and
- (b) that the administration create a University Ethics Office as described in the draft (Section VII).

<sup>1</sup> Committee members: Charles Delzell (Math), Steven Hand (Biological Sciences), Lois Kuyper-Rushing (Library), Brenda Macon (Arts & Sciences), Joanne McMullen (Extended Learning), Jennifer Normand (Human Resource Management), Wayne Parent (Political Science), and Michael W. Wascom (Environmental Sciences; Committee Chair).

**Q&A, Discussion Summary:**

Jim Stoner: Who is currently responsible for this at LSU?

Chip: Sexual Harrassment = HRM; Violence-Free workplace = HRM; Research Misconduct = Research Office/Vice Chancellor; Student Misconduct = Dean of Students

Pratul Ajmera: There is also the possibility of a grad student reporting misconduct of a professor. There is almost no protection for these students. It is very important that they be protected.

Bill Daly: Does this office replace the ombudsperson?

Chip: No, the ombudsman acts more as a mediator, not the final arbiter. This new office would be where you go for justice. We do need both the ombudsperson and this new office/mechanism.

George Stanley: Will this office replace the other complaint/reporting mechanisms?

Chip: No, just for things that fall through the cracks.

George Stanley: Or if you don't get satisfaction via the other routes/offices?

Chip: No, this is not meant to overrule the existing mechanisms/offices.

Kevin Cope: Who would comprise this ethic office/committee? What about funding?

Chip: One officer (university ethics officer) and a committee. Faculty and staff representatives, perhaps even student representative on the committee. The committee members would have staggered terms and be elected from their respective senates. University Ethics Officer reports directly to the chancellor. Our committee feels that the University Ethics Officer is not one of the current vice-chancellors (unless it is too expensive - then OK for one year).

Edward Song: Why not just direct everything not student related to HRM?

Chip: HRM serves, I believe, at the pleasure of the administration and generally takes the side of the administration.

Pratul Ajmera: It is difficult for HRM to fight against retaliation, especially when it happens in a department.

Ed Song: The procedure for sexual harassment goes through HRM, why isn't that a problem?

Pratul Ajmera: What if you go to HRM and then you are retaliated against. What do you do next? You have already gone to HRM.

Bill Daly: This discussion points out why the faculty should have a lawyer to represent the faculty. When you get into situations this complicated it is important to have a lawyer to help.

Chip: [discusses whistleblower cases involving Tiffany Mayne vs. LSU and Albert Cunningham vs. LSU; rulings against each due, in part, to lack of LSU whistleblower protections]

Jim Stoner: I think you are talking me into not supporting this proposal. I am skeptical about adding another layer of bureaucracy to solve this problem.

John Protevi: You are not asking that this resolution language be inserted into employment contract.

Chip: Some of this would - the first three general principals.

Ron Malone: I feel that there is some need for some institutionalization for this.

Larry Crumbley: I call the question.

Kevin Cope: First we need to close the debate. [vote passes unanimously]

Kevin Cope: Now we can vote for the resolution.

**Vote passes with a few dissents.**

---

**New Business****Election of new faculty senator to FSEC:**

Renee Casbergue (Education) and David Baird (Architecture) were the nominees. Both made a short statement.

Ballot voting occurred. **Renee Casbergue** was elected.

**Short Address by Michael West (Chief of Staff for the Student Government Association)**

- Update on Student Senate meeting to discuss change of official make-up Saturdays due to Gustav. Student Resolution passed out.
- Emphasis was on leniency for Saturday classes and changing the Saturday's chosen for make-ups to days that do not have football games.

No significant questions or discussion.

**First Reading of Resolution 08-14:**

**Faculty Senate Resolution 08-14**  
**“An Ad Hoc Committee on Executive Search Procedures”**  
**Sponsored by Charles Delzell et al.**

*Whereas* it is in the general interest of the University community to insure that searches for major administrative officers are conducted according to best standards and practices; and

*Whereas* the LSU Faculty desires to work together with the administration to insure transparency in all such searches; but

*Whereas* on May 21, 2008 the Faculty Senate Executive Committee listed several “serious shortcomings of the Chancellor Search process,” and other faculty members have identified similar shortcomings (man of which apply as well to the 2004 search for the previous chancellor and the 2007 search for the LSU System president), among them those relating to:

- (a) A complete lack of transparency, based on an alleged need for or right to confidentiality that is rarely mentioned during faculty searches;
- (b) The naming of a single finalist who is presented to the LSU community on the eve of a quick appointment;
- (c) Circumventing the intent of Louisiana’s Open Meetings law by transferring control of the search to an outside search firm and a small subset of the Search Committee or upper administrators, so that the finalist is disclosed at a late date even to many on the Committee;
- (d) Absence of any comparative assessment that the Search Committee itself, faculty, and students can perform among several candidates;
- (e) Failure to bring the candidate to campus at times when faculty are available;
- (f) Lack of bargaining power for LSU when negotiating salaries and other benefits if there is only one viable candidate;
- (g) Lack of accountability of search firms and consultants, either of their past performance, or the vetting they do of the candidates, and of their fees and charges as expenses; and

*Whereas* negative reactions by the local newspapers or public to the unnecessary secrecy and to failed searches or failed appointments does not merely reflect on the individuals and the poor judgment of the search firms and the few upper administrators involved but tars LSU itself and its reputation and standing;

*Therefore* be it resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses its dissatisfaction with problems in administrative searches of the kind noted above, both in recent searches and in searches conducted in earlier years; and

*Therefore* be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate calls on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to appoint a committee of limited size to investigate, report on, and make recommendations on good practices in conducting searches for senior LSU officers. The charge to such a committee shall include:

- (a) Examining national searches, best practices and standards;
- (b) Recommending ways to encourage quality applicants while upholding the transparency expected of LSU as the state’s premier institution of higher education and with the spirit as well as the letter of the state “Open Meetings Law”;

- (c) Finding ways to affirm the primacy of the Search Committee over any informal, secretly appointed subcommittee thereof, and over any outside consultants; and
- (d) Timely completion of a report to the Faculty Senate, preferably within six months of the establishment of the committee.

**References:**

1. "Summary Report on Interview Visit by the Candidate for the chancellor's Position with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee," May 21, 2008.
2. *Advocate* "Opinion" page staff, "Our Views: LSU Secrecy Bad Policy," *Baton Rouge Advocate*, May 23, 2008 (<http://www.2theadvocate.com/opinion/19199164.html>).

Motion to admit to debate: moved and seconded

**Q&A, Discussion Summary (shorter than usual due to time running out and hot temperature in room):**

Question: Other than the open meetings law, do you have any other standards in mind. Is there some reference to best standards?

Chip: I don't know of any. I saw something on that UCLA posted about their search procedures.

David Baird: If I recall when Emmert was hired it was a very open process. What has changed not to make it an open process?

Chip: I don't know.

Jim Stoner: Michael Martin stated during his interview that he would come for an interview if he was one of two candidates, but not one of three. CEO-type mentality/attitude, odds of success. One thing that has changed is the ease of finding out info on the internet. This increases the likelihood of negative feedback from the home institution if someone is discovered looking for another job.

John Protevi: However things have changed, we should insist on transparency. If folks don't want to apply, fine.

**First Reading of Resolution 08-15:**

Kevin Cope requests to suspend the rule so a vote on this resolution can be taken today after only the first reading.

Larry Crumbley moves to suspend the rule. George Stanley seconds.

Unanimous vote to suspend rules and vote today.

**Faculty Senate Resolution 08-15**  
**"Commendation of the Emergency Operations Center"**  
**Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee**

*Whereas* Hurricane Gustav inflicted extensive damage on both the Louisiana State University campus and the Baton Rouge community;

*Whereas* the LSU Emergency Operations Center set an example of coordination, compassion, communication, and overall competence that was exemplary for all emergency personnel who aided Baton Rouge during the aftermath of a devastating storm;

*Whereas* the organization and quality of the LSU response to Hurricane Gustav drew plaudits from students, staff, and faculty members;

*Whereas* the artful presentation of response efforts through internet pages, telephone systems, and other media relieved stress and suffering not only in the LSU community but throughout the hurricane-afflicted region;

*And whereas* the actions of the LSU Emergency Operations Center elicited national attention and applause from both professional crisis managers and ordinary citizens;

*Therefore* be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate commends the Emergency Operations Centers for its exceptional work during and after Hurricane Gustav and congratulates all its members on outstanding service to the University and all its members, friends, and supporters;

*And therefore* be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate will include this commendation in its minutes as a perpetual expression of appreciation for the meritorious and generous actions of the Emergency Operations Center.

Motion to debate. Approved.

Suggestion: Coordinate this resolution with Staff Senate. Kevin states that this is in progress.

Larry Rouse: centers should be center

Motion to admit to debate. Jim Stoner moves.

Unanimous vote approving.

**Meeting adjourned.**