Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Thursday May 9, 2013
Student Senate Room, LSU Student Union

Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:
1. Kevin L. Cope (President, English) 2. William Daly (Past President, Chemistry)
3. Ken McMillin (Vice-President, Animal Sciences) 4. Joan King (Secretary, Food Science)
5. Stephanie Braunstein (Member-at-Large, LSU Libraries) 6. Larry Rouse (Member-at-Large, Oceanography)
Parliamentarian: Louay Mohammed

Senators present (X = Present; A = Alternate; P = Proxy):

| 1 | X Fakhri Al-Bagdadi (Comp. Biomed Sci/Vet) | 22 | Neila Donovan (Comm. Sci Disord/HHS) | 44 | Jeff Nunn (Geology/Sci) |
| 2 | X Sibel Ales Bargu (Oceanography/C&E) | 23 | X Kerry Dooley (ChemE/Eng) | 45 | X John Nyman (Renew Nat Res/Ag) |
| 3 | X Austin Allen (Landscape Arch./AD) | 24 | Dorian Dorado (Foreign Lang Lit/HHS) | 46 | X Seth Orgel |
| 5 | P Melissa Beck (Psychology/HSS) | 26 | P Kenneth Fasching-Vamer (Ed T Pol Pract/Ed) | 48 | P Inrin Peckham (Eng/HHS) |
| 6 | David Bertolini (Architect/A&D) | 27 | Juhan Frank (Physics/Sci) | 49 | X Rosemary Peters (French/HSS) |
| 7 | X Dana Bickmore (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed) | 28 | X Stephen Gaunt (Pathobiological Sci/Vet) | 50 | X Suresh Rai (Elect & Comp/Eng) |
| 8 | X Graham Bodie (Comm Studies/HSS) | 29 | Jeff Gillespie (Ag Econ/Ag) | 51 | Margaret Reams (Environ Studies/C&E) |
| 9 | X William Boelhower (English/HSS) | 30 | X Gundela Hachmann (Foreign Lang Lit/HHS) | 52 | X Lawrence Rouse (Oceanography/C&E) |
| 10 | X Dorin Boldor (Biol Eng/Ag-Eng) | 31 | X Jong Ham (Plant Path/Ag) | 53 | X Roussell, Charles |
| 11 | X Stephanie Braunstein (LSU Libraries/Lib) | 32 | Richard Holben (Drama/Music & DA) | 54 | X Gary Sanger (Finance/BA) |
| 12 | X John Caprio (Bio Sci/Sci) | 33 | X Stuart Irvine (Philos Relig/HHS) | 55 | X Bhaba Sarker (Const Manage & Ind/Eng) |
| 13 | X Russell Carson (Kinesiology/Ed) | 34 | X Dorothy Jacobsen (Kinesiology/Ed) | 56 | X Andrew Schwarz (Info Sys Dec Sci/Bus) |
| 14 | X Paolo Chirumbolo (Foreign Lang/HSS) | 35 | P Jennifer Jolly (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed) | 57 | X Katherine Stamps Mitchell (Soc Work/HHS) |
| 15 | Aaron Clifton (Kinesiology/Ed) | 36 | X Joan King (Food Sci/Ag) | 58 | X Suzanne Stauffer (Lib & Info Sci/SLIS) |
| 16 | X Kevin Cope (English/HSS) | 37 | X Vince LiCata (Biological Sci/Sci) | 59 | X William Stickle (Biological Sci/Sci) |
| 17 | X Larry Crumbley (Accounting/BA) | 38 | X David Lindenfeld (History/HSS) | 60 | X Padmanabhan Sundar (Math/Sci) |
| 18 | X William Daly (Chemistry/Sci) | 39 | X Mendi Lopez (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet) | 61 | Judith Sylvester (Mass Com/Mass Com) |
| 19 | X Jeffrey Davis (Entomology/Ag) | 40 | X Ken McMillin (Animal Sci/Ag) | 62 | Carol Taylor (Chem/Sci) |
| 20 | X Charles Delzell (Math/Sci) | 41 | Reem Meshal (Phil & Relig/HSS) | 63 | Wanjun Wang (Mech Eng/Eng) |
| 21 | John DiTusa (Phys Astron/Sci) | 42 | X Louay Mohammed (C & Emron/Eng) | 64 | Christopher Weber (Polyisci/HSS) |
| 22 | X Carl Motsenbocker (Horticult/Ag) | 43 | X Carl Motsenbocker (Horticult/Ag) | 65 | Hsiao-Chun Wu (Elect & Comp/Eng) |

Guests:
Thomas Rodgers  William Demastes  Elissa Plank  Robert Doolos  Donna Love
Gil Reeve

Consideration of the Minutes from April 17, 2013

Motion by Larry Crumbley, seconded by many.
Approved unanimously with potential corrections.

President’s Report

1. Thanked everyone for attending financial educations seminar. Many people attended and were pleased. There is an opportunity to renew seminar for next year here and at the other campuses.
2. There are problems here and there with PS-36, regarding the process for promotions from Associate to Full Professor. Faculty Senate Executive Committee asked colleagues from engineering to develop suggested language to solve these problems.
3. There has been appointment of persons to university to head certain units but have not received terminal degrees in which there is an impact on student life to head certain non-educational units that have impact on student life and research. Some persons are doing this on emergency basis. We have expressed concerns to Provost as to when we might begin national searches for those positions.
4. There is a Suffix grading survey for collecting data for actual practice if we would transition to suffix grading. They are not collecting secret data and we encourage you to participate in the survey. There is a tracking device and so far nine courses have been participating and 57 students.
5. Problems continue with subcommittees for transitions teams. Especially with the academic subcommittee in which there have been only two meetings and no meetings north of I-10 or west of Baton Rouge. There is wide-spread discontent about the management of the transitions teams by the consultant group which has little experience in these matters.
6. Kevin Cope extended thanks to Mike Russo and his colleagues about statements at the Board of Supervisors (BOS) concerning issues at LSU. They have attended three BOS meetings thus far. BOS members have followed Mike Russo out the door which indicates the impact they are having on the board members.

7. Bell Whelan of SASCOC paid a visit to LSU last week. Only one chancellor from the LSU system and incoming President/Chancellor King Alexander attended meeting. She scolded the BOS for what they were doing and that the pace for transition was impossible. LSU A&M accreditation is hopeful to sale through. The media has already commented on Cam Cameron, incoming offensive football coach, whose base salary is $300,000 with a total salary of $1.6 million.

8. There is a high speed programming state wide conference at the Hilton Hotel by the Committee of One Hundred, which is a privately funded enterprise. The meeting is open to the public and registration is $40. Contact them at seeonehundredla.org.

9. Senate bill 117 came up two weeks ago, of which the goal is to create a panel to re-write the state-wide funding formula to be based on outcomes and productivity, most likely workforce development. LSU may be good with this due to IBM. Others point out that with aerospace engineering, most graduates landed up flipping burgers. The Faculty Senate was able to convinced the State Senate to have a codicil to the bill to add faculty to the committee. In the State house two members of the faculty were replaced by workforce people. The Senate was trying to put the faculty back in. The panel makes recommendations. It may be as many as five faculty on the panel.

10. The Alexandria meeting had 45 people attending, with Sandra Woodley and Jim Purcell. The next one is September 28 in Alexandria with Joe May, Community Colleges Sandra Woodley, ULL system, Ronald Mason, Southern University System but have not heard from the LSU system yet.

11. Judith Sylvester has prevailed with the anti-smoking bill which is moving at a good clip, in regards to banning smoking on higher education campuses.

12. Senate bill 7 is aimed at the defined benefits plan. The bill attempts to change the retirement benefit calculation to the last five years rather than the last three years of salary. This also ties the contribution to the retirement plan to the new calculation.

Q&A Summary:
None.

Presentation to the Senate by Robert Doolos on the occasion of his retirement

Robert Doolos

People think why does the registrar come to FS meetings. He learned at Registrars meeting that they were not doing enough for new and young registrars and that they need to remember that registrars are proxies for the faculty. They really do work with faculty and for faculty. They report assessments and check to make sure that students completed all items that faculty laid out for our degree programs. You do important work. It’s important for the registrar to know what faculty think and do. This helps with issues like the W grade policy, the F grade policy, the new grade exclusion policy and the online course wait listing policy that came from faculty, ASH and the Student Government Association. The wait listing policy is an example about how successful the register was in working with faculty on issues. In Fall 2011 we added 16,007 courses to schedules for more than 9,785 students. It has been a privilege to work with you and help make your lives a little bit better professionally.

Q&A Summary:
None.

New Business

First Reading, Resolution 13-10, “An Ovation for University Registrar Robert Doolos”, Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Faculty Senate Resolution 13–10
An Ovation for University Registrar Robert Doolos
Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Whereas ROBERT DOOLOS has served Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College for three-and-one-half decades;

Whereas ROBERT DOOLOS has encouraged, sustained, directed, or presided over countless initiatives that have improved the University in myriad ways;

Whereas ROBERT DOOLOS has, specifically, demonstrated leadership in such transformational projects as the automation of the Registrar’s office, the development of student progress tracking systems, the advancement of statewide articulation, the study of statewide common course numbering, the deployment of plus-minus grading, the emergence of grade exclusion policies, and the dignifying of commencement exercises;

Whereas ROBERT DOOLOS has mentored an abundance of proficient record-keepers who have gone forth to maintain the archives of both our and of other great institutions of higher learning;
Whereas ROBERT DOOLOS is accounted the kindest, gentlest, and wittiest of supervisors by a support and office staff that reflects his magnanimity;

Whereas ROBERT DOOLOS has surpassed any and all members of the LSU community with respect to his astounding lifelong record of attendance at Faculty Senate meetings and of support for faculty governance;

Whereas ROBERT DOOLOS’s service to the faculty has been outpaced only by the precision and efficiency that he has achieved in the Registrar’s office, often under trying or economically constrained circumstances;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate expresses its enthusiastic appreciation to ROBERT DOOLOS and wishes him the happiest, most enjoyable, and most productive of retirements;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate accords ROBERT DOOLOS a perpetual ovation;

And therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate will recall ROBERT DOOLOS to a Faculty Senate meeting in the fall semester of 2013 for the purpose of conferring a citation in recognition of his accomplishments.

Moved by Larry Crumbley and seconded by Stuart Irvine to move into discussion.

Moved to vote now. Larry Rouse moved. Seconded by all.

Resolution passed unanimously.

Q&A Summary:
None.

Report from William Demastes, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Excused Absence Policy

William Demastes

Thanked the committee to review PS-22, Charles Roussel from Economics, Jody Butcher from Communication Studies, John Lynn Associate Dean College of Sciences, Carry Hebert, Student Government Vice President and William Demastes.

PS-22 states issue about excuses absences but no suggestions about what to do about excused absences. The operating procedures are something that seems to need to be in place for technical reasons. The committee suggested information about make-ups. They considered implementing a policy statement about when a student misses a class that a make-up in-kind is mandated. The idea of exact one to one make-up considerations led to the committee agreeing that a one size fits all policy was impossible. The statement they derived is a make-up policy statement that it is the instructor’s responsibility to state a make-up policy that does not adversely affect the student’s final grade. They also said that this statement should be in the course syllabi. They suggested some arrangement for units to have a policy to follow. The make-up policy should be generated by the instructor and not adversely affect the student’s final grade. PS-22 should be followed up with something less formal called PS-22 Implementation Memorandum, Best Practices, Handling Excused Absences. There are many ways to handle these absences and the committee made some suggestions for differentiating make-up policies for major and minor assignments.

PS-22 STUDENT ABSENCE FROM CLASS

GENERAL POLICY

Class attendance is the responsibility of the student, undergraduate or graduate. The student is expected to attend all classes. A student who finds it necessary to miss class assumes responsibility for making up examinations, obtaining lecture notes, and otherwise compensating for what may have been missed. The course instructor will determine the validity of a student's reason(s) for absences and will assist those students who have valid reasons (see Make-up Policy).

Valid reasons for absences include:
1. Serious or infectious illness.
2. Serious emergencies involving members of the student's household (permanent or campus) or immediate family.
3. Special curricular requirements such as judging trips or field trips.
4. Court-imposed legal obligations such as subpoenas or jury duty.
5. Military obligations.
6. Hazardous weather conditions or effects.
7. Religious observances. See the interfaith calendar website (www.interfaithcalendar.org) for an updated calendar of holidays and primary holy days of the various religions. Faculty members are expected to be sensitive to the different religious traditions represented in the LSU community, and to assist students in making up examinations or other assigned work that may be missed due to absences required by religious observances.
8. Athletics and other events in which the student is representing the university in an official capacity.
9. Professional school and graduate school interviews which are not easily rescheduled.

The student is responsible for providing reasonable prior notification—at as early a date as possible—and appropriate verifiable documentation of the reason for the absence. Prior notice allows instructor and student to settle upon an appropriate plan of action, including agreement on the validity of the excuse. Should the instructor and student disagree over the validity of a reason for an absence, or the timing of the student’s notification, the student has the right to appeal the instructor's decision according to the general appeal procedure in PS-48.

In the following instances, the dean and not the instructor determines the validity of a student's reason for absence:
1. Group excuses for absence (see Operating Procedures)
2. For undergraduate students, a grade of Incomplete (I-grade) due to absences must be authorized by the dean. I-grades for graduate students do not require dean's approval.
3. A student who, because of illness or other valid reason, is absent from any final examination may take a special examination only with authorization of the dean of the student’s college.

MAKE-UP POLICY
It is the instructor’s responsibility to develop a make-up policy for excused absences that does not adversely affect a student’s final grade. It is the instructor’s obligation to include a clearly stated make-up policy for excused absences in course syllabi. In some cases, departments, schools, or colleges may develop policies in accordance with university requirements, which should then be followed by their instructorship. Because the nature of each course is different, practices for making up assignments may differ. Some practices include offering make-up exams, completing alternative assignments, or reweighting course grading to allow for missed assignments. Instructors may also consider instituting a maximum absences ceiling, a rate of absence above which the student is not likely to master material offered in the course. For further information on these matters see PS-22 Implementation Memorandum for best-practices suggestions.

OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR GROUP ACTIVITIES
Group activities which conflict with scheduled classes may be sponsored by the deans and directors of colleges and schools, the Director of Athletics, and the Director of the LSU Union, depending on the college or school. Approval of the individual student’s absence must be obtained from the dean or director of the college or school in which the student is enrolled before that student may be included in the group.

Group absences may be approved only in the following circumstances: A trip by a group of students in fulfillment of class or departmental requirements when the University controls time, route, and mode of travel. (See PM-4, Page 1, Section 1.a.) Travel by an individual or non-class group for the purpose of representing the University (including Student Government, Athletic Department, and LSU Union) and the University controls the time, route and mode of travel. (See PM-4, Page 1, Section 1.b.)

Authorized special duties at the University. Examples include: a. ROTC students participating in Alumni Day Parade. b. Band members participating in special campus program.

In any event in which group absences are requested, University regulations with respect to group insurance must be observed. Travel to or from an event in privately-owned vehicles is not covered by University or trip accident insurance.

Group Activity Forms and Due Dates
The Trip Travel/Activity Insurance Coverage Form (LSU TT1) and the Trip Travel/Activity Insurance Student Listing Form (LSU TT2) should be used for (1) requests for group excuses from class and (2) requests for trip accident insurance. These forms are available on the web site of the Office of Public Safety and Risk Management (www.lsu.edu/publicsafety). On the Public Safety web site, follow the links to the Office of Risk Management. On the Risk Management page there are links to information about Trip Travel/Activity Insurance and the Reporting Forms. No other format or form will be accepted. The original of each of the required forms, accompanied by an Internal Transaction (IT), must be submitted prior to the anticipated date of travel to the Office of Public Safety & Risk Management, University Public Safety Building.

Trip accident insurance rates are subject to change. To determine current rates contact the Office of Public Safety & Risk Management.

PS-22 Implementation Memorandum
Best-Practices, Handling Excused Absences
Key to PS-22 on Excused Absences is that excused absences should be treated differently from unexcused absences; specifically instructors must create “a make-up policy for excused absences that does not adversely affect a student’s final grade.” In some circumstances, departments and other units should consider instituting a uniform policy on excused absences, especially for courses offered in multiple sections. Whatever practice is instituted, instructors must post policies on course syllabi.

Absences of any sort, of course, do adversely impact learning to varying degrees in different kinds of courses. Interactive and participatory courses require attendance in ways that other courses might not. Instructors, however, should do what they can to minimize the overall impact of excused absences. Below are some best practices suggestions that will aid in avoiding adverse outcomes as much as possible.

1. To minimize the impact of group-sponsored absences, it is best to offer major assignments on Mondays and/or Tuesdays. This practice does not eliminate difficulties but does minimize them.
2. Proper documentation: Let students know that they should provide documentation of excuse that includes ways to independently verify its accuracy: for example the physician’s name, phone number, and business address.
3. If the instructor uses Moodle or a similar online tool, it is highly advisable that the course site include links to PS-22: Student Absences From Class, PS-26: Policy on Persons with Disabilities, PS-30: Student Privacy Rights, PS-44: Grades, PS-107: Computer Users’ Responsibilities, and Code of Student Conduct.
4. Consider including statements on syllabi indicating the absence ceiling a student could reach before the likelihood of mastering the material is seriously impaired. Though instructors cannot force students to withdraw from a given course, an instructor can inform students of the difficulties involved in passing, for example, an intensively participatory class (like a lab, speech course, or class involving regular student collaboration). Note that stating such an attendance ceiling can only be used to inform the student of relative difficulties attendant upon absences (of any sort) and cannot be used to force a student to resign from a class. For example:
   This course requires regular attendance in order to master the material at hand. More than 5 absences of any sort seriously jeopardizes a student’s likelihood of course mastery; a student who anticipates missing more than 5 classes should meet with the instructor as soon as possible to discuss options, including the possible need to drop the course.
5. Include a clearly-stated policy on course syllabi: what constitutes an excused absence, what are the student’s responsibilities, which assignments are handled in what manner. For Example:
   Student responsibilities: Provide documentation in advance of absence in order for the instructor to evaluate validity of excuse and plan of action. If not possible, student should provide notice of excused absence as soon as possible. Given current avenues of communication, students should contact instructor within 24 hours of an unanticipated absence.
It might also be worth noting: The last day before and the first day after official school holidays are considered to be the same as any other day on which classes are scheduled. Assignments are made for classes scheduled on these days. Students should take this fact into account in making travel plans.

6. Consider unusual circumstances not officially included as excused absences, such as automobile accidents, professional job interviews.

7. In the case of student athletes, it is often possible to have them take an exam while away on official business by working with the Academic Center for Student Athletes to secure an on-site location and proctor. This process is generally coordinated by the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) who works with FARs at other institutions to make arrangements. When possible, FARs will work to provide similar accommodations for non-athletes.

8. Let students know that if they feel they’ve received unfair treatment, they have to right to initiate the university’s appeal process at semester’s end.

Types of Make-up Policies. Note that many instructors distinguish between major and minor assignments. Minor Assignments like quizzes can and often are handled differently from major assignments.

Major Assignments:
1. Make-up exams offered as soon after a student’s return are considered by many the ideal alternative. However, this is not always the case, since not all exams are created equal. Intentionally or not, generating make-up tests can lead to irregular results and unintended outcomes. Still, when possible, generating an equitable make-up exam and offering it as near to the student’s return as possible is generally a best practice.

2. In cases where coursework is cumulative, simply allowing a student to skip an exam and rolling the percentage into the final exam may be the best option. The drawback here is twofold: the student has less opportunity to know his/her standing, perhaps having less information to determine whether to drop the course by the university drop deadline; and the student has a higher risk of suffering more significantly should he/she have “a bad day.” But in many cases choosing not to offer a make-up exam is actually a best practice.

3. Offering a variation of a make-up exam can sometimes suffice: for example, offering an essay exam in lieu of creating a multiple choice make-up exam. Drawbacks include the possibility that the format of an exam may impact student outcome. For example multiple choice exams require a greater degree of passive familiarity with the material than an essay exams.

Minor Assignments (Lab-work, quizzes, etc.)
1. Instructors may offer make-up quizzes to be completed soon after a student’s return.

2. An alternate but conceptually equal assignment may be substituted for the missed assignment.

3. Instructors may designate a make-up day toward the end of the semester to allow for the completion of any missed assignment.

4. Instructors may institute a drop policy for excused absences where a certain percentage of quizzes, labs or activities are dropped before the final grade is calculated.

Q&A Summary:

Fakhri Al-Bagdadi
Should the students who missed the exam take the same exam as their peers?

William Demastes
There should be an exam of exactly the same difficulty, format and basic structure as soon after the arrival of the student after the absence. It is not the ideal arrangement for some courses. The instructor should follow best practices, if the student and faculty do mutually agree that it does not affect the adversely students grade.

Evelyn Orman
A student handed me a stack of doctor excuses for absences for various dates for the semester. These are legitimate excuses on last day of class. How would a student make up these assignments at the end of the semester? You can’t give an advance notice for an illness. Should something be in PS-22 about when notification can be given?

William Demastes
Discuss with the students that there are multiple mechanisms of informing faculty of absences. They suggested modification of the policy that the student is responsible to notify as soon as possible, if faculty do not agree with the student then student may appeal by PS-48. We would impose upon faculty rights if we start dictating exactly how absences are managed.

Dorin Bolder
The website that is listed interfaith calendar.org is not working right now. Update or delete that or find out where actual dates can be located.

William Demastes
We can update that or locate actually where dates can be found.

Larry Rouse
Do you see that you would add this as an addendum to PS-22?

Kevin Cope
We can vote here with a full scale resolution and bring it to the Provost or we can meet with the Provost directly to present it as a body of recommendations.
Is this a revision?

William Demastes
Yes, we added a simple paragraph on the make-up policy. We could do it either way as Kevin Cope suggested.

Larry Rouse
I suggest we discuss it with the Provost with some kind of implementation.

Larry Crumbley
I thought we had a proposal a couple of months ago that was voted down. Someone did not want to give make-ups.

Charles Delzell
It was a couple of years ago.

Kevin Cope
The senate did not take action on that.

William Demastes
The policy should not adversely affect the final grade. There are options of alternative versions of the exam, essay versus multiple choice questions for example. There also can be re-weighting of grades for other exams. It can be argued by the faculty member that this does not adversely affect the student’s final grade.

Larry Crumbley
It is hard to make up exam questions due to online test banks. Fifteen to sixteen of the students in his class had the test bank.

William Demastes
The committee discussed it and there are variations between departments in being able to do make-up exams. In some cases it is impossible to do make-up exams.

Charles Delzell
The sentence about ‘adversely affect the grade’. Who are you quoting there?

William Demastes
That would be a new paragraph in PS-22 that would have that wording and if we go through process of approval otherwise we would delete that.

Suresh Rai
Is there another policy needed? It means there is no limit to absences.

William Demastes
We could have a committee sit down and do specifics, but right now it’s better to work it out between the faculty and the student. Item number 4 covers what you are talking about regarding a number of absences ceiling. We need to use common sense to deal with that problem; if the student misses 50% then maybe they should do a retroactive drop.

Larry Crumbley
For the ‘adversely affects the final grade’ definition, the student may argue that taking the final in place of the other exam would adversely affect the grade. I do not like that language.

William Demastes
Absences adversely affect learning. There is no question about that. We need to know if it adversely affects grades also. Someone could argue that the make-up exam could be unfair. These issues would have to go through an appeals process. We as faculty have to do our absolute best to handle the make-up.

David Lindenfeld
Page 2 number 2 where this comes up, states there are drawbacks; the language is such that it does not tie anyone to it.

Kerry Dooley
At the end of the day make-up issues get dumped on the assistant deans of the colleges. Were they involved with this?

William Demastes
There was someone from the College of Basic Sciences on the committee. This should be open to the community for input.

William Stickle
Your syllabus should state your make-up policy, which should take care of 95% of this problem.
Larry Rouse
Some say there are no make-up exams. You have to say something about excused absences.

William Demastes
That becomes something of a legal document.

Charles Delzell
We already have PS-22, and somewhat stated that it is in the catalog. Faculty should just have to say their policy is PS-22 in the syllabus.

William Demastes
PS-22 makes statements about excused absences and that faculty should deal with it. Students will ask for more direction and guidance and clarification as to what exactly the faculty will do.

Kevin Cope
Many who state that on syllabus, are the very ones who have reported that PS-22 is inadequate.

Larry Rouse
It is the responsibility for the faculty to say how they will deal with absences.

William Demastes
Contentious faculty members could say no make-up exams and feel within their rights that that is a legitimate practice and most people would agree that even under the current version of PS-22 that conflates un-excused and excused absences together. PS-22 says deal with the distinction and most faculty fail to do that.

Update from Marie Frank regarding progress on the new purchasing procedures and systems

Three big initiatives we mentioned last time were to adopt pilot procurement code, we purchased an e-procurement system, and become members of the advisory board for procurement so they could use the tools in spin and analytics. The big push was because procurement has evolved from writing out requisitions to entering it into a system and having online approvals. E-procurement is in the electronic world. Budget cuts have caused problems due to cost of technical systems. For the procurement code issue, the LA GRAD act allowed levels of autonomy. It will replace all the laws that govern procurement at a state level including information technology, procurement, and professional services. There is lots of red-tape to purchase items. The Act was signed in July of 2011. She thought it would go into effect of July 1 2011 but it did not. It will bring changes that make things easier. It will allow LSU to use other methods to compete for purchases. Now an invitation to bid with a request for proposal requires many approvals by the Division of Administration. The process takes 6 months. The pilot procurement (PP) code will allow LSU to decide what purchase solicitation policy to use. This will brings about savings. Reverse auctions are used throughout the USA, multiple terms and more than one year are options. The pilot procurement code will allow these new processes. They requested that the formal competitive level be $50,000 for purchases. Most SEC schools are using that level. The PP Code reduces bureaucratic processes. It now takes 18 approvals and 22 weeks to get contracts over $100,000 in place. The PP code will streamline processes. The code has been approved by Board of Regents, LSU Board of Supervisors, and Division of Administration. They wanted to make sure they were the initial qualifying institution and that they go forward with the PP Code and publish in the system. They published the notice of intent to use PP Code. Public scrutiny and inquiries can be done through May 30. They must go through the joint commission on education and joint legislative committee on the budget. Next they have to develop policies for procurement that will be in line with pilot procurement code and get it approved by the BOS. It will completely replace what they do now. They are optimistic it will be done by Sept 15. The next is LSU GoShop (formerly e-procurement). This will allow purchasing of goods and service from a web environment using cell phones for example. The LSU GoShop is a complete source to settle solution. Right now you go on the web and shop on your own, then do paperwork. Faculty will be able to shop online and assign the purchase to an accounting person directly. Contracts will be pre-negotiated. It will hopefully do away with the manual processes. Phase one implementation is this summer for catalog shopping on July 22. It includes particular enabled vendors, They enable the vendors website to shop, you can place the order and automatically requisition and place an order. Fisher Scientific, VWR, Dell, Office Max and other big IT companies are the vendors chosen for now. The schedule in May is for doing design and configurations. Andrew Brennon is the project manager. User acceptance and validation testing is done throughout the campus. By July 22 it will be in place. Hopefully the PP Code will be in place also. There will be multiple ways to retrain users. There will be online training for shoppers with a tutorial. The requestor will actually push it through the process and they will be trained in classroom settings. She showed a screen for an example with boxes for suppliers. The third initiative is sourcing and analytics. The will determine what the commodities are that we should look at for what you buy a lot. High spend commodities are office supplies and facilities supplies. Phase 2 of LSU GoShop will go into effect in Dec 2013 and include anything everyone would buy. The sourcing portion is if you actually have to bid something. There will be large bulk buying on contract to make them available university wide and will drive prices down. The office supply vendor will be announced next week and the university will be allowed to get huge discounts. It will bring about savings. They think they spend about $2 million in office supplies by all methods of payment. There is not a current grasp of how much spending is done. We will be able to know what exactly we are buying and be able to drive the prices lower. They are still in negotiation; about 50 items are higher than in the past so they are negotiating on pricing. Savings is expected to be over $300,000 per year. It’s important for you to know what you are spending on your grants and you will see what is being bought. Spending patterns can be looked at. They will make strategic decisions about how we spend. She is concerned about cost compliance. This will make it transparent and visible and not bill one department more than another. We are here to support the education of students through our educators and the research you do. It’s hard sometimes due to laws.
Q&A Summary:

Stephanie Braunstein
I did not see a library vendor. What we purchased are storage products of higher quality, acid free paper and materials. Do we have to justify those levels of quality?

Marie Frank
We would have to do a solicitation process if vendor cannot get what you need. We will try to help you not to have to do that.

Stephanie Braunstein
This is just at the LSU A&M campus right?

Marie Frank
There is a shared model for LSU AgCenter, LSU Eunice, LSU Alexandria, LSU A&M, Pennington Biomedical Center and LSU Law. The Grad Act was written on a per institution basis. They pleaded that all instructions use the PP Code through their office at LSU A&M.

Stephanie Braunstein
Then all libraries would be ordering these materials.

Graham Bodie
Once vendors are decided, if I can go to Best Buy to get a computer much cheaper do I have to write a justification? Like Shorts Travel for example, I have to pay a fee to get a flight. Will we have the same issues that we only can work with certain vendors? Which one of the companies will you chose to be proprietary?

Marie Frank
It will cause this issue. We will do everything possible to get the best price. The state contracts are more expensive. We are trying to spread the discounts across all purchases. We cannot meet a promotional sale. If the general standard price for the contract is more they will address that with the supplier. Most contracts will not have a mandate with it where you have to buy from them. There will be some items like office supplies to consolidate and drive the spending towards that vendor. They will pick and chose items to negotiate with. With high level equipment you need to have more options to use what you can spend. The justification will come only because we have to do it. They only decision to drive to one vendor is for office supplies. She is advising not to drive to one scientific vendor. For IT they might entertain administrative standards, but ITS would decide that.

Linda Allen
What is happening with university stores, will they be a supplier or going away?

Marie Frank
University stores is not going away, they will be different. Suppliers will deliver in 24 hours. The prices are less than what university stores can supply for office supplies. They are valuable for MRO for facility services and scientific supplies. They have become a warehouse store for university services. It depends if there is a need for that. They may decide to stock their stores with items needed on an immediate basis.

Louie Senator
I saw a quote for over $20,000 that the university can buy directly. If I want to buy a piece of equipment that cost much less than this I have to go through loads of paperwork. I have to submit lots of paperwork for construction and that goes through facility services. Their paperwork is less than ours for buying equipment.

Marie Frank
I do not know. If procuring through our office they will follow the same rules

Update from Randy Duran and Stephanie Braunstein regarding the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)

Eight slides were shown that covered a handout with front and back information. The committee wants to maximize feedback from the faculty. The QEP report is due November 1. The decision for the QEP is undergraduate research. In today’s world around the country undergraduates are job one. It is their assertion that when undergraduates are involved in research they become more deeply ingrained in the scholarly activity here. Undergraduates that do research go beyond passive knowledge to active modes of gaining knowledge. For our particular case our undergraduates can be a natural and valuable bridge to public private partnerships that can bring value to LSU. By involving as many undergrads as possible learning gains will be reinforced considerably. If we compare LSU as a flagship university we can offer undergraduate research that other universities near cannot do as well. Our undergraduates doing scholarly activities whether social or science activities will improve the efficiency of the university. They asked the faculty senate to help in the process and optimally advance faculty agendas for SACS in QEP. They want to make QEP more efficient, valuable and enduring to the institutions. The QEP must be student centered. The first request is most important, what is our definition of graduate research and the student learning outcomes to report to SACS. Vince Wilson would like faculty edits for those outcomes. The overall progress is re-affirmation by the Provost and Vice Provost. Faculty are involved in compliance, standards and data by Darryl Henry and the committee. The QEP team is lead by Carol O’Neil of which Randy is a member. Now there is a QEP implementation committee listed on back of the handout, which may be enlarged. The QEP is starting in 2014 to about 2019. They want to align what students do with faculty agendas and professional advancement. The committee is meeting two or three times a week for long periods of time. SACS will send a team in mid March 2014 to campus and they want to include
the Faculty Senate in the visit. The launch of QEP will be in 2014. They want help to develop and promote the program this year. They want the QEP to operate optimally and become institutionalized. The program would be multi-semester research or creativity programs for students that build with time. There are three themes to do this. These learning outcome goals align with AACU goals and other areas on campus like general education goals. They want students to value research, ethics and see a positive connection to LSU. LSU Create must produce measurable student learning outcome themes. They want to quantify how many students get publications and produce data that goes into grant proposals, and provide a boost to their professional development by winning awards, getting better jobs, etc. Overarching goals articulate alignment of student learning outcomes with faculty goals. The three thrusts are: 1) reshaping curricula sequences, ex. School of Architecture to expose students to undergraduate research. They want to identify more units interested in developing research curricula programs to enhance performance in their unit. This could enhance external funding. Undergraduate research is positively viewed by federal agencies; 2) a campus wide mentored undergraduate research program with focused efforts involving other units. For example they could take certain numbers of chancellor’s aid worker positions and direct them to research positions at the sophomore level for chancellor leaders. We are not good at recognizing faculty research efforts, for example, more space for greater numbers of graduate students. We need to recognize faculty input to research students are doing; 3) a showcase to present creative outputs and provide departments a way to show opportunities in the unit for research. This may help recruit graduate students into their programs. Students will progress through this mentored experience and capstone experience. They need a faculty liaison from the Faculty senate.

Q&A Summary:

David Lindenfeld
This is labor intensive for faculty efforts. You need to address teaching loads.

Randy Duran
One idea on the table is systematizing a recipe for how much mentored research would qualify for teaching a course. There could be a bank for a fraction of a course for instance.

Senator
How soon will you share these ideas?

Randy Duran
As soon as possible. We want your input and for you to form these ideas with us.

Elections for Members of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees

Done by paper ballot.

Results of Election:

BUDGET AND PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Robert Carney (Coast and Environment)
Michelle Massé (Humanities and Social Sciences)
Gus Kosoulas (Veterinary Medicine)

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
James Miller (Veterinary Medicine)
Andrea Millers (Mass Communications)
Joseph E. Power (Coast and Environment)

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE
Sarah Pierce (Agriculture)
Frank Anselmo (Humanities and Social Sciences)
Nicole Dahman (Mass Communications)
Carlos Riazuelo (Music and Dramatic Arts)

Old Business

Second and Final Reading, Resolution 13-03, “Defacement of Library Holdings: Education and Remedy”, Sponsored by Stephanie Braunstein, David Lindenfeld and Elissa Plank

Read by David Lindenfeld

Faculty Senate Resolution 13–03
Defacement of Library Holdings: Education and Remedy
Sponsored by David Lindenfeld, History; Stephanie Braunstein, LSU Libraries’ Faculty Senator; Elissa Plank, LSU Libraries, Middleton Library, Head of Circulation.

Whereas it appears that markings in library books (underlining, magic marker highlighting, marginal comments, etc.) are on the increase on the LSU Baton Rouge campus;
Whereas such markings prejudice any subsequent reading of a book by automatically directing the user’s eyes to the marked passages;

Whereas the removal of such markings already involves a significant expenditure of time and resources that could otherwise be used for furthering the mission of the Libraries;

Whereas markings constitute a defacement of library materials and thus reflect and encourage a poor image of the Libraries;

Whereas because library books are university property, such defacements thereby constitute violations of the Code of Student Conduct, which specifies property damage as an act of misconduct. Section 8.2.B.21 of the Code reads as follows: “Property damage - Vandalism, malicious destruction, damage, misuse or unauthorized possession of public or private property, including, but not limited to, library materials, computers, lab equipment, furniture, etc.”;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate direct the Libraries to undertake additional educational measures to reduce the practice of marking in library books; for example, providing consistent monitoring procedures for discovery by staff of damage to materials during both the check-out and discharge phases, creating electronic messaging on the Libraries’ web site to remind patrons not to deface library materials and warn them of the consequences of that defacement, and disseminating printed reminders (such as book marks, signs in the stacks) that also deliver those messages to library users;

Be it further resolved that, as part of such a campaign, the active cooperation of student organizations and faculty be enlisted. Faculty members whose teaching involves the heavy use of library materials should include such messages on their syllabi or other places in Moodle or other Course Management System software. Student Government should be encouraged to pass a similar resolution in support of the campaign, thereby allowing for the greatest opportunity for exposure of this information to library patrons at LSU.

Data from a recent log of time spent by student workers erasing markings in library materials indicate that on any single day, 5.5 hours of student time could be taken up by this activity. Furthermore, this statistic obviously pertains only to those materials that were identified as having markings; so if the rate of identification improved, the time spent erasing would increase in proportion.

David Lindenfeld
Regarding the question raised about being proper business of the faculty senate, this involves faculty so it should be of faculty concern not only as users of library books but also there are some cases in which faculty are offenders so it should be of faculty concern. The other question was the cost of this.

Elissa Plank
Depending on costs for book marks and signage, she met with the facilities manager for the library to see how much signs would cost that student government could pay for in a size of 18 by 24 inches for signs. She is in the process of determining how much it will cost. Two or three signs are needed one for each floor to catch students’ attention. They would need one in the foyer and on the third floor where art books are, and the fourth floor where photography books are. Student government is willing to collaborate with them on costs.

David Lindenfeld
Elissa Plank brought bookmark examples last meeting. The other issue is they have spoke to student government member Eliot Thompson and is currently in an exam right now, and Thomas was there but he had to leave. They are strongly supportive of this and plan to bring it up in the fall at a student government meeting.

Q&A Summary:

Kevin Cope
The Faculty Senate Executive committee met with the Provost about this issue and recommended a gentler approach on the matter.

William Stickle
What is the enforcement and cost for defacement?

Elissa Plank
Sticky notes are 50 cents a sticky note, others are as low as $5, if withdraw book, whether replacement cost of book or not then standard fee would be $50. It depends on what the library has to do.

David Lindenfeld
There are penalties in place, but we also want an educational campaign.

Stephanie Braunstein
It is better to try to take care of it in the before rather than after. Upgraded awareness would be beneficial.

Fakhri Al-Bagdadi
The fine should not exceed the price of the book new or used.

Elissa Plank
If replacement, it is a new one. If a new one they go by the price, we do not buy used ones which could be marked up. If no longer in print the fine is $70. The excess sticky note book was $74 and a fine. The time to remove these items in book costs and also it takes lots of time.
Fakhri Al-Bagdadi
Can a person buy a used book with no markings to replace your book?

Elissa Plank
They do not accept replacement copies from the patron.

Joan King
Call question. Seconded by Larry Rouse.
Two opposed to calling the question.

Vote on Resolution: Approved unanimously.

Second and Final Reading of Resolution 13-08, “Faculty Football Lottery”, Sponsored by Charles Delzell

Whereas on April 13, 2009, Athletic Director Joe Alleva addressed the Faculty Senate as follows: “We are going to make 100 season football tickets available to faculty—we won’t decide how they are distributed, that will be up to you to decide”—an offer that resulted in the annual Faculty Football Ticket Lottery,

Whereas the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors define “faculty” to be “full-time members of the academic staff having the rank of Instructor or higher (or equivalent ranks).”

Therefore be it resolved that each year a Faculty Football Ticket Lottery continues to be held, there shall be only one, single such lottery, open to all LSU faculty uniformly, with no segregation by faculty rank.

Q&A Summary:

Kevin Cope
There are a greater number of instructors in the lottery than there are faculty members. It will dilute the numbers of tickets available in the professorial ranks.

Vote on Resolution: Two opposed, resolution passes.

Second and Final Reading, Resolution 13-09, “A Written Protocol for Dual career Recruitment and Retention”, Sponsored by Jeff Davis and the University Council on Women

Read by Jeff Davis

Whereas the university Council on Women (UCW) originated through concern within the campus community about the status of women on the LSU campus and was preceded by the establishment of the Commission on the Status of Women; and

Whereas faculty senate Resolution 99-10 “Support to Administration in Creating a Permanent Commission on The Status of Women” helped to establish a permanent commission “consisting of faculty, staff, and student representatives to identify the needs of women on campus, to monitor changes in the status of women at LSU, to generate regular reports on its findings, to make recommendations regarding conditions at LSU that affect women employees, and to work with LSU’s administration to implement policy recommendations in a timely manner”, and

Whereas, UCW membership currently consists of 19 women and men representing LSU faculty, staff, and students; and

Whereas, the UCW has taken up a series of charges and written white papers and protocols on topics such as Stop the Tenure Clock, Staff and Faculty Mentoring, Childcare Affordability and Availability, Monitoring the impact of the budget cuts and university reorganization, and Dual Career hiring; and

Whereas, the purpose of a Dual Career Protocol is to demonstrate LSU’s commitment to recruit and retain outstanding university personnel, professionals and faculty while enhancing LSU’s commitment to diversity and inclusion; and

Whereas, the subcommittee on Dual Career hiring began research on the issues in 2008 and wrote a white paper on Dual Career hiring with recommendations in 2009; and
Whereas, the UCW updated the Dual Career Opportunity Protocol in September of 2011 and has made no subsequent updates or changes; and

Whereas, LSU has a history of making Dual Career hires for spouses and partners in the past but on an ad hoc basis and without the transparency of a written policy; and

Whereas many of our peer institutions and aspirational peer institutions have written procedures or are working on written procedures to address this important issue; and

Whereas, the AAUP recommends the institutions include “a clearly worded policy that covers all full-time appointments rather than rely upon ad hoc arrangements available only on select bases” and that policies “should also be available to all couples, not just those in heterosexual marriages;” and

Whereas, the AAUP also recommends the departments “must be free to refuse the appointment,” and those proposing such appointments must “consider departmental hiring priorities and programmatic needs;” and

Whereas, the Stanford report recommends that universities “develop a dual-career academic couple hiring protocol” and “should signal this in job announcements, recruitment materials, and university websites;” and

Whereas, the recruitment and retention of talented scholars and professionals is essential to the attainment of the goals and objectives as outlined in Flagship 2020; and

Whereas, on March 27, 2013, members of the UCW met with Provost Bell to discuss the Dual Career Hire Opportunity Protocol; and

Whereas the Faculty Senate passed resolution 13-01, Adopting a University Protocol for the Retention and Recruitment of Dual Career Faculty Members, which called for a written protocol but did not provide one;

Therefore it be resolved, that the Faculty Senate strongly recommends the LSU Administration consider adopting a Dual Career Procedure as outlined by the University Council on Women’s Dual Career Opportunity Protocol Draft from September 2011.

i UCW white paper, “Dual Career Hiring Report” (June 2009), see attached.
ii “Dual Career Opportunity Protocol” written by UCW (September 2011), see attached.

Q&A Summary:

Dorin Bolder
Is there a specific draft protocol?

Jeff Davis
Back in 2011 it was given to the Provost and then it went to legal persons. There was a draft protocol that could be finalized and it could be changed to fit the university’s legal needs.

Charles Delzell
I did not see the protocol on the UCW or Faculty Senate websites. I would like the protocol draft to be publically available.

Jeff Davis
It probably should be in the Faculty Senate and UCW websites.

Vote: One abstention, passed.

Larry Rouse moved to adjourn and it was seconded by everyone.
Adjourned at 5:25 PM