

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
3:00 P.M., Thursday, September 9, 2010
Student Senate Room, LSU Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (Senate President, English) | 2. William Daly (Past-President, Chemistry) |
| 3. Pratul Ajmera (Vice President, Engineering) | 4. Lilly Allen (Member-at-Large, Social Work) |
| 5. Ken McMillin (Member-at-Large, Animal Science) | |

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

Senators present:

1 Linda Allen	2. John Battista	3. Dana Bickmore	4. Stephanie Braunstein
5. Aaron Clopton	6. Josh Detre	7. Kerry Dooley	8. Bruce Eilts
9. Bruce Eilts	10. John Fletcher	11. Kristopher Fletcher	12. Forrest Guy
13. Joseph Francis	14. Craig Freeman	15. Stephen Gaunt	16. Wes Harrison
17. Dominique Homberger	18. Andrea Houston	19. Jennifer Jolly	20. Joan King
21 Jeff Kuehny	22. Ed Laws	23. Joseph Legoria	24. Michael Leitner
25. Mandi Lopez	26. Louay Mohammad	27. Kevin McCarter	28. Patrick McGee
29. Reem Meshal	30. Donovan Neila	31. Rebecca Owens	32. Suresh Rai
33. Larry Rouse	34. Michael Russo	35. Cristina Sabliov	36. Bhaba Sarker
37. Joseph Siebenaller	38. Kresimir Rupnik	39. George Stanley	40. Dianne Taylor
41. Stauffer, Suzanne	42. Padma Sundar	43. Phillip Tebbutt	44. Justin Walsh
45. Wanjun Wang	46. Hsiao-Chun Wu	47. Yi-jun Xu	

Replacements for absent Senators:

Richard Keim for Andrew Nyman

Larry Crumbley for Edward Watson

Represented by Proxy - Not Voting:

1. Craig Freeman for Kathleen Bratton	2. George Stanley for Renée Casbergue
3. Jennifer Jolly for Jennifer Curry	4. Kevin Cope for Kristi Dykema
5. Kevin Cope for Susan Dumais	

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

- | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Philip Adams | 2. Mary Catherine Aime | 3. Gabriel Beavers | 4. Michael Bowman |
| 5. Alison McFarland | 6. John Protevi | 7. Frederick Sheldon | 8. William Stickle |
| 9. Gail Sutherland | 10. Sue Weinstein | | |

Guests Attending Meeting:

Sydni Dunn - Reveille	Bill Thompson -Western Illinois Univ.	Paul Wilson
Patti Exner	Gina Costello	Charles Delzell
Lois Kuyper-Ruby	Will Hires	Richard A. Walker-Jones
Dudley Fricke	Gregory Mills	

Consideration of the Minutes from April 2010

Motion to accept minutes (Stanley; Freeman second) - Passed unanimously with minor corrections.

President's Report

LSU-BR News:

- I will split my comments into two segments: regular and budget situation.
- LSU Campus: Moodle course management software has a new module to track student progress and notify counselors, student, etc. about lack of student progress in a course. Privacy concerns were initially raised about sending student grade information to counselors. This option needs to be turned on; it is off by default. We welcome comments over the next few months if any problems are encountered.
- Commencement Speaker procedure has been modified and improved to allow more faculty input.
- PS-1 has been modified to clarify interim and temporary appointments. Thanks to Pratul Ajmera for spending time on this.
- PS-44 and PS-70 have also been modified and this will be discussed later.
- PS-111 has also been updated concerning administrator evaluations. Provost Hamilton, in fact, is currently doing a Dean evaluation in Engineering. He will attend the next FS meeting to report on the status of PS-111.
- 150th Birthday celebrations have semi-fallen apart. Difficult to celebrate in these tough budget times. Prof. Daly is working to continue this.
- IT governance procedures are now coming into play. Committees are appointed and work is beginning.
- Football ticket lottery was another big success and included instructors. Looks like this will be a permanent event.
- The number of ribbons and medals that students wear at commencement has drawn some attention and discussions with Academic Affairs about this are ongoing.
- Student Government Association has sought permission to post past syllabi, past exams, and past teacher evaluations. FS is talking with them further about this. They will attend a future meeting to discuss this further.
- Discussions concerning improvements of freshman orientation are also on-going.
- The new vice-chancellor for student services seems to be doing a banner job with a good increase in the size of the freshman class.

System/State News:

- The system office and supervisors want to see cohesive plans for any university re-organization of academic units.
- The house bill that would have transferred all university oversight to the Board of Regents was defeated.
- The house bill concerning the Vet School was also defeated.
- There are still issues and problems with the Teachers Retirement System. At a house meeting the person representing TRS opposed the points that Kevin brought up at that meeting. Video of this testimony is posted on the senate website. The Louisiana senate seems more amenable to our position on this issue than is the house, and will take up the issue next.
- Progress has been made on developing a portable two year program in business to be applied to a business degree here. This will be significant in recruiting students as this is the program with the most demand.
- No current commissioner of higher education. Tom Layzell is acting as a consultant and discussions between Kevin and him regarding lack of faculty input are ongoing.
- The ALFS meeting is on Saturday, Sept 11 at the Lod Cook Center in the Cook Conference room. Tom Lazell will be the guest speaker. Light refreshments at 12:30 PM, talk starting at 1 PM, discussions afterwards.
- Kevin Cope spoke at the University of New Orleans Forum on Higher Education, with good press coverage.

Discussion:

Justin Walsh: could you tell us more about the TRSL system and that meeting?

Kevin: Franklin Foil introduced a very modest bill (HB 341) to allow certain faculty to re-enter the system as new participants. The TRSL folks were strongly opposed to this despite that fact that this would cost the system little. The argument was that when faculty signed agreements to opt out of the state retirement plan it was "irrevocable." The house committee is very unsympathetic to higher education, and dispatched with this in a matter of minutes.

Louy Mohammad: What was their logic for this?

Kevin: That faculty should know better than to sign such an “irrevocable” agreement. Also that this was not an option available to K-12 teachers, and that this would put an administrative burden upon TRS.

Pat McGee: Any progress on improving the optional plan retirement benefits and the possible breaking of the original social security agreement that was tied into this.

Kevin: We keep trying. This is an uphill battle. There are still new avenues we are pursuing.

Wanjun Wang: They are contributing under the social security level, which they are not supposed to be doing. Do they offer any explanation for this?

Kevin: They have hand-waving arguments about this that do not hold water in my book. They are playing semantic games.

Wanjun: If they signed a legal document about this aren't they breaking the law by not contributing enough?

Kevin: Yes, in my opinion. They use this unfunded liability as a reason for decreasing the contributions to the optional retirement plan. But the TRSL plan is facing financial insolvency around 2018, so they aren't in that much better shape.

Pat: Has anyone contacted Social Security about this?

Kevin: That is the next step after the lawyers. Also the Internal Revenue Service.

Announcements:

Faculty Club Event on Sept 10 @ Chancellor's Residence (4:30 to 6:30 PM)

Lilly Allen announces Faculty Club reception at the Chancellor's Residence. This is to promote membership in the LSU Faculty Club

Annex President's Report / Update on Budget Crisis

The budget cut exercises originate from either the System Office (23%) or the Governor's office (38%) and not from our campus. These are percentages of state funds - not the entire LSU budget that includes funds from many other sources. These are based on several assumptions that may or may not come true. The first is that it will be what the state government is currently claiming. The second is that the cuts will be uniform across the LSU system. This second assumption is most likely not accurate. The budget-cut exercises are real in one sense, but artificial in others. There are certain areas on this campus that cannot be cut by either of these amounts.

What is the Faculty Senate doing? We are trying to maintain the criteria established by the Chancellor and the Right-Sizing Committee to protect the core of the campus academic mission. (These criteria are published on the Faculty Senate website.) We are sponsoring a Chancellor Budget forum with a new format for Q&A. There will be a panel of faculty, staff and administrators to ask anonymous questions to the Chancellor from those submitted to the Faculty Senate. We are also maintaining pressure on the state with regards to benefits and especially the Teachers Retirement System (see earlier Q&A).

There was a move at the ULL system to rewrite faculty contracts to allow quicker dismissals, with as little as 90 days notice required even for senior tenured faculty members if a program is determined to be "unsustainable." Kevin participated in some of the meetings and was strongly opposed to it. This effort was headed off, at least for now. It will come up again at the next supervisors' meeting. If successful it could have moved over to the LSU System.

We are working with the BOR on discussing "low completer" programs and providing more information concerning this topic.

We are also exploring early retirement and “buyouts.” Discussions with regards to faculty reassignments in case of exigency or campus closures are also ongoing.

Attempts to bring legislators and other government officials to campus to see what we are doing are ongoing.

We have pushed the Chancellor to take a more aggressive public stance on budget cutbacks.

Finally, we have revised the exigency procedures and the LSU administration has accepted them. They are being circulated to some of the other systems as a model for their exigency procedures.

Discussion Summary:

Rebecca Owens: I'm concerned about the number of instructors that might be dismissed or not renewed. What were the criteria used to send the original dismissal letters to instructors? Which might not be renewed and why?

Kevin: From what I understand seniority had a role in this with regards to the order of the renewal letters being sent. I believe that the administration indicated that all instructors will be renewed. The exigency procedures do allow random dismissal of faculty or instructors (i.e., negative cherry picking). Remember that the majority of legislators do not have a college degree.

Faculty Senate Chancellor Forum – Tuesday, September 28, 2010 @ 3:30 PM in Shaver Theatre

We have gotten 70 some questions so far just over the last few days for the forum. So please attend and send in more questions.

Stop the Tenure Clock Information – Mimi Ruebsamen (HRM)

Many faculty did not understand the possibilities about stopping (extending) their tenure clocks due to family, medical, or other situations that disrupt the faculty members progress towards tenure. Provost Merget assembled a committee to look into this and come up with a clear policy about this. The new PS-36 does have a brief discussion on stopping the tenure clock, but we prepared an addendum with more details about this, which was e-mailed to all faculty members on campus. These procedures have been put into place and posted on HRM and other web sites. We believe that this is important for faculty retention and recruiting.

Information on Difficulties with Office of Group Benefits and Medical Coverage for dependents between 21 and 26 years old – Emeritus Vice-Provost Frank Cartledge

I am a member of the Faculty Senate Benefits Committee, but I am speaking informally about this. Our health benefits policies will allow us to keep dependents on those policies between the ages of 21 and 24 when they are full-time college students. The new health care law extends this to all dependents up to the age of 26, which the state of Louisiana has agreed with and passed a law to cover the gap between the start of the Federal law. But the state exempted the Office of Group Benefits from this and the OGB decided to delay following the Federal Law age guidelines until the next renewal period in July 2011. There is a considerable group of LSU faculty that have dependents between age 24 and 26 that the OGB will not cover. The other group is students between the ages of 21 and 24 that are not full-time students (e.g., students that graduate in Dec, 2010).

The OGB does not have any legal obligation to cover these students in this transition period before federal law takes effect. They could do this and it wouldn't cost them much, but they decided to dig their heels in over this.

Kevin: We are looking into dropping out of OGB over this, but there are financial costs involved in this that makes it difficult. We are also continuing to push OGB over this issue. In the short term we probably can't get OGB to change their minds. According to Eric Monday there are over 300 faculty and staff being affected by this OGB stance.

Presentation by Michael Russo and Western Illinois Professor Bill Thompson regarding collective bargaining.

This summer we interviewed the various teacher unions and we decided to associate ourselves with the Louisiana Association of Educators. The LAE is the state organization of the National Teachers Association and was selected because of their enthusiastic embrace of the challenge of organizing the LSU campus. In the coming year there will be a sustained effort to established a local affiliate of the LAE here at LSU. If you or anyone you know has any questions, you or they may contact any member of the committee. We are listed on the faculty senate website. You may recall that a while back the university administration presented a plan to drastically restructure the university. You may also recall that the faculty spoke up in nearly universal opposition after the plan was revealed. The plan was put on hold in the face of that opposition. That is what a unified faculty can do. A unified faculty can make a difference. Now we have a choice. We can continue to be bystanders and watch with scholarly chagrin as the state eviscerates higher education, or we can become activists and work for positive change. It's now our move. Here to address us in more direct terms about the difference a unified faculty can make is Dr. Bill Thompson, and friend and former LSU colleague who is now active in the faculty union at Western Illinois University.

Bill Thompson (Western Illinois): Presents background on WIU, which is a unionized campus. 86% of the faculty at WIU belong to the teachers union. The union is a form of shared governance, which gives faculty a greater voice in academic matters. There is a myth that unions are run by people outside of the campus, which is not the case at WIU. We have a board of faculty and academic support personnel that manages the union. We also have a Faculty Senate and we work together on many issues. The contract that we negotiate is legally binding on both parties (faculty & administration). The union has leverage that the Faculty Senate does not have. The Faculty Senate makes recommendations, but due to the contract the union makes legally binding agreements and thus has more power.

There are a number of myths about the contract and financial issues. Negotiating compensation is the most important function the union serves. The contracts impose a minimum salary but do not impose a cap on upper salaries. When faculty members are hired, they can negotiate the highest salary they can get. After a faculty member is hired all raises are contractually mandated and the same. Raises, however, don't apply to faculty members that are already above specified pay levels when raises are negotiated. The contracts do allow leeway in raises when financial situations demand that. But we also negotiated a variety of benefits such as no furloughs, elder benefits, longer parental leaves, etc. The state or national unions that we are involved with do not tell us to do anything. Our contracts provide clarity and a set of rules that both faculty and administrators live by. Our union actually has very good relations with our administration and some of our union members have moved up into our administration.

Our contract contains procedures for tenure and promotion, but each department defines its own criteria that are part of the contract. Our contracts, of course, do not solve all problems and issues. We still have grievance, disagreements, etc.

Discussion Summary:

Pat McGee: How much of your dues stay local?

Bill: Most of the dues go upstream to the state or national union. Our local union account has about \$28K and we do have full control over that.

Justin Walsh: Louisiana is a "Right to Work" state. How does that affect organizing a union?

Bill: What that means, I believe, is that you can't force non-members to pay dues. At WIU all faculty pay union dues regardless of whether they are part of the union or not.

Senator to Michael Russo: How did you decide to go with NEA (National Education Association – Louisiana Association of Educators is the state arm)?

Michael: We found them to be the most interested and willing to work with us.

Election of New Faculty Senator to Faculty Senate Executive Committee

I would like to request that we postpone the election of the new Faculty Senator to the FSEC for at least a week. This is because we do not have all the new senators elected from all the colleges as yet. We can then carry out an election of the new executive committee member.

Michael Russo moved, seconded by Larry Rouse. Passed unanimously.

Draft Revision of PS-44 – Policy Governing the Assignment of Grades & Grading Authority – Pratul Ajmera

Pratul presents the revisions to PS-44.

Additions Deletions

PS 44 ~~Grades~~ Grade Assignment

GENERAL POLICY

Grading policies, as aspects of the total educational policy of the University, are determined by the faculty subject to the authority of the Board of Supervisors. The grading system is described in detail in the current issue of the General Catalog, for both undergraduate and graduate students. The instructor as the head of the college or university class is the sole authoritative arbiter with respect to the evaluation of students and their work in his/her class. This policy reaffirms this role while also providing options for the very few special cases in which alternative measures must be taken to ensure that students receive the fair evaluation to which they are entitled.

ASSIGNMENT OF GRADES

It is the right and responsibility of the instructor in a course to determine and assign the final letter grade for each student in the course beyond the final date for withdrawing with a W. Individual instructors are expected to assign all grades equitably and consistently in accordance with the standards established by the faculties of the various colleges, and schools or departments. There is no "University curve" or other table of numerical equivalents of letter grades to which a faculty member must adhere. If, in a course including the one having multiple sections, there is a need for consistency in grading standards and practices, then the faculty of the relevant unit will establish and promulgate those measures and rules. In the absence of such published standards, complete authority for grading abides with the instructor of the course.

~~In extraordinary circumstances which make it impossible for the instructor to fulfill the responsibility of determining a course grade, the administrative officer having immediate jurisdiction (usually the department chair) shall assign the grade.~~

~~In such cases the grade of P (Pass) may be given to undergraduates for work of at least C quality and to graduate students for work of B quality or better.~~

At the beginning of each semester, faculty members must distribute written course syllabi in all courses, both graduate and undergraduate, which must clearly state the relative weight of the component factors of the final grade. Additionally, in 4000-level courses in which instruction of undergraduates for undergraduate credit and graduate students for graduate credit is combined, syllabi should clearly set forth any different expectations of performance by students in the two groups (beyond the expectation of a 2.00 minimum gpa for undergraduates and a 3.0 minimum gpa for graduate students).

At any point in a semester, the instructor should be able to explain, on request, a student's standing in the course, **that is** grades assigned to that point, the basis for the grades, and the weight of these grades in the final grade. Following completion of the course, the student is to be provided, on request, a review of his/her examination, an explanation of the final grade, and the method by which it was determined; this review is to include an accounting for all other unreturned work. Faculty members are expected to keep all unreturned student work and grade books for at least six months following termination of a course. If faculty leave the University, permanently or temporarily **during this period**, their final examinations, all unreturned work, and grade books are to be deposited with the department chair to be kept for at least six months following termination of a course.

In extraordinary circumstances such as medical leave, departure from the university and other unforeseen reasons during the semester, that make it impossible for an instructor to fulfill the teaching responsibility, the administrative officer having immediate jurisdiction (usually the department chair) will determine if a substitute instructor is needed for the remainder of the semester and if the original instructor is unable to assign grades for the course. In the event the original instructor is unable to assign grades for the course, the administrative officer will assign an instructor of record for the remainder of the course. The grades from that day onwards will be assigned by the new instructor of record for the course. The final grades must equitably consider the student performance on record prior to the new instructor's assigned date to teach the course. In no circumstance, the new instructor will change the grades on record (other than computation or oversight errors) on any item such as assignments or tests, which were neither graded nor administered by the instructor. As far as practical, the new instructor shall retain the basis for grades and their relative weights as distributed in the course syllabus at the beginning of the semester in determining the final grades. Any deviation for the basis of grades from the original syllabus must be clearly stated and distributed at the beginning to the students and to the line officer. In the rare event when it is not possible to assign a new instructor of record, the line officer, after consultation with a committee of full professors in the department offering the course, shall assign the grade of P (Pass) to undergraduates for work of at least C quality and to graduate students for work of B quality or better and a grade of F (Fail) for work not meeting these standards.

The above procedure shall also be followed in case of a rare situation in which an instructor is removed from his or her teaching duties during a semester by administrative intervention. The reason for administrative intervention may arise due to serious causes resulting in suspension of academic duties under other university policies or for non-performance or for serious under-performance of teaching duties. The latter includes situation where an instructor is hopelessly ineffective in teaching the subject matter to the students to a degree that his or her removal is the only option left for the benefit of the students' learning of the course material. The line officer (usually the chair of the department) must address any concern with the instructor first and must always respect his or her academic and pedagogical freedom in the class room. If the perceived problem continues to persist, the line officer shall consult with a committee of full professors in the department to counsel the instructor. If the committee of full professors agrees that the situation cannot be resolved and warrants further action, the line officer will contact the dean of the college or school. The dean will meet with the faculty member and the chair. If they are unable to resolve the situation, the dean will approach the provost. The dean shall present the reasons for such intervention in writing to the provost and the faculty member concerned. The provost will make the decision on whether administrative intervention is appropriate or not after consulting with the faculty member concerned.

BASIS OF GRADES

Grading must be based on work that is assigned and evaluated equitably and fairly, with no special consideration given to individual students unless justified by disability (see PS-26) or excused absence (see PS-22). Individual students should not, for example, be allowed to take on "extra credit" projects, spend extra hours in laboratories, or present themselves for re-examination or special examination unless the same options are available to the entire class on the same terms.

While it is appropriate (and indeed inevitable) that the instructor should exercise subjective judgment in determining grades, particularly in "borderline" cases, the judgment should be based solely on academic considerations. Grades must not be utilized as coercive or punitive measures reflective of a student's behavior, attitude, personal philosophy, or other personal characteristics except as those qualities relate directly to the student's level of mastery of the course material.

Assignment of grades should result from the application of academic standards and the objective measurements of students' course and classroom performance. In no case should the assignment of grades be influenced by extraneous situations, whether institutional goals, retention and graduation objectives or any other measure unrelated to the subject of and assessment within a course.

CHANGING GRADES

Once submitted to the Office of Student Records and Registration, a grade may not be changed except as follows:

1. Completion of an I grade
2. Correction of an error in computation
3. Through the academic appeal procedure (see [Grade Appeals - LSU General Catalog](#))

If the academic appeal mechanism is followed, appropriate correspondence must accompany the change-of-grade form.

Pratul: We welcome any comments and suggestions you might have on this.

Discussion Summary:

Joan King: Who defines “ineffectiveness” of teaching?

Pratul: This is a process. If the chair gets enough complaints from the students about the teacher, that is the first step. Then it moves on to the faculty committee, etc. Please also note the section we added right before the “Changing Grades” section at the end.

Dominique Homberger: Where are the “published standards” for a course listed?

Pratul: That is up to each department. I would presume these would be written down somewhere in the department.

Dominique: My question is about “published”. I’ve heard that there are un-written standards with regards to the number of D’s & F’s that can be assigned in a course.

Pratul: This needs to be written down in my opinion.

Kevin: Published in the legal sense can also pertain to “common knowledge”.

Pat McGee: This seems targeted to sciences and engineering. So I might suggest generalizing the language to include the humanities.

Dominique: I wonder about how often hopelessly ineffective instructors happen.

Numerous Senators: It certainly happens.

Old Business

Second and Final Reading of Resolution 10-10: “Final Examination and Grade Assignments” – Kenneth McMillin

Red by Ken McMillin

Whereas the LSU faculty and the university encourage student participation in public service; and
 Whereas military obligations such as Louisiana National Guard member activation for the Gulf of Mexico oil spill and other valid reasons for absences from class are clearly defined by university policies (PS-22 Student Absence from Class); and
 Whereas it is university policy that final examinations are required in all courses except when inappropriate for an entire course due to its nature and an exception is approved by the appropriate department chair and dean/director (2009-10 General Catalog); and

Whereas final examinations must be given during the published dates for the final examination period, as given in the LSU Registration/Schedule of Classes bulletin (Spring 2010 pages 7-8); and

Whereas it is the right and responsibility of the instructor in a course to determine and assign the grade for each student in the course beyond the final date (April 1, 2010 for Spring 2010) for withdrawing with a W (PS-44 Grades); and

Whereas special consideration can be given to individual students when justified by disability or excused absence (PS-44); and

Whereas the Board of Regents alternate guidelines for assigning grades contradict established University policies;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate reasserts the rights of each faculty member to make decisions on grading and grades by cooperating with students unable to complete courses due to valid absences while complying with university regulations regarding awarding of “W” grades in courses, authorization of deans for incomplete grades in courses, requests to change final examination dates, and changing the relative weight of component factors of the final grade for individual students.

This was initiated because we received a broadcast e-mail from higher administration informing us that the Board of Regents instructed us to give special privileges regarding absences and exams if we had La. National Guard members who were activated. This is to reassert that individual faculty members still have obligations to comply with university policies. You’ll see from the minutes of the last meeting that during questions, the LSU administrator did admit that the instructions from the Board of Regents conflicted with university regulations. This is to reassert that, yes, we have rules and regulations and that we as faculty will try to accommodate students, but within the rules and regulations with which we all agreed for assigning grades.

Discussion Summary:

None.

Resolution Passes unanimously.

New Business**First Reading, Resolution 10-11: “Concurrence with the Revision of PS-70 – Naming of University Facilities” – Background Information by Paul Hoffman, Sponsored by the FSEC.**

(Kevin summarizes and does not read due to lateness of meeting, but summarizes.)

Whereas the naming of University buildings, venues, and other facilities presents an opportunity for LSU to form productive friendships and alliances with individual, corporate, and organizational donors;

Whereas the wise denomination of structures, objects, and spaces on the LSU campus creates as well as advertises a long-term if not permanent association between the campus and the person, organization, event, or activity that a public facility commemorates;

Whereas the LSU faculty takes a vital interest in both the dignity of the campus and the selection of donors who are worthy of commemoration and who are able to match the naming honor received with magnanimity of an appropriate amplitude;

Whereas the physical plant and architectural corpus of the University comprise an indivisible canon of “Tiger spaces”—a single conceptual, aesthetic, and economic unit that makes a single grand impression and that reminds visitors and supporters of the coherence of all aspects of our educational as well as extra-curricular University programs;

Whereas the Committee on Naming University Facilities, although an advisory panel to the Chancellor, has frequently sought counsel from the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the Chancellor has expressed a desire for a more coherent policy on the naming of facilities than is available in the current version of PS-70;

Whereas, under the wise leadership of its Chair, Professor Paul Hoffman, the Committee on Naming University Facilities has prepared a thoughtful and thorough revision of PS-70, a revision which takes into account the present economic conditions under which universities labor while also codifying the respect that members of the faculty and community feel toward our institution and its campus;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate affirms its support for the revisions of PS-70 recommended by the Committee on Naming University Facilities and asks the Chancellor to implement that new policy.

Paul Hoffman: LSU devised its naming policy in 1958. There are functional names and things named after individuals, usually outstanding people that impacted LSU. But in the last 20 years LSU has moved to soliciting donations (big and bigger) and naming facilities, labs, offices, building, academic units, etc. after the donors. PS-70 doesn't address this last category very well. The new PS-70 revisions address this. There is a list of everything on campus that does not currently have a “name” associated with it. A key revision of PS-70 addresses how to deal with donors and rules about naming facilities. No naming is final until it is approved by the Board of Supervisors. That has always been true, but it will be emphasized in the revision. In the past individuals would make promises to donors about how a facility would be named. This should not be allowed. We are also specifying “sun-set” provisions for the naming of facilities. For example, if a named building or lab is renovated a new naming opportunity should arise. So time limits on naming facilities would be laid out. If a “name” goes away, there should be a plaque listing the old name and thanks to that donor.

What about academic units that don't have time-spans? If an academic unit merged or dissolved the name can change. So we are trying to cover as many bases as possible. We also want to try and ensure that facilities are named for honored or distinguished people as well as considering financial donations.

Once again, a key principle is that only the Board of Supervisors can approve a name. We are developing a standard routing form for these naming events.

Discussion:

Justin Walsh: You may want to reconsider putting up plaques honoring old names. Vanderbilt had an issue with a named building.

Adjournment moved at 5:50 PM by George Stanley, seconded by acclaim.

