Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 16, 2012
Student Senate Room, LSU Student Union

Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:
1. Kevin L. Cope (President, English)
2. Ken McMillin (Vice-President, Animal Science)
3. Joan King (Member-at-Large, Food Science)
4. George Stanley (Secretary, Chemistry)
5. Bill Daly (Past-President, Chemistry)
6. Larry Rouse (Member-at-Large, Oceanography)

Parliamentarian: Louay Mohammed

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

Guests:
Fred Aghazadeh    Thomas Rogers    Patti Exner    Robert Doolos    Taylor Cox
Gil Reeve

Consideration of the Minutes

Moved and accepted conditionally

President’s Report
- The Task Force on the Graduate School is meeting and addressing a variety of issues: election of faculty to the Graduate Council; and other organization issues.
- The HSS Faculty Senate has passed a resolution supporting LSUnited.
- We have not had many Chancellor Forums this year due to the fact that financial issues usually lie at the State level. But the Student Government is holding a convocation on April 26 @ 6:30 PM. Chancellor Mike Martin and System President John Lombardi are the scheduled participants.
- The new Director of the LSU Museum was announced the other day. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee was not informed of this and the procedures used to pick the new director. We will be discussing this with the Provost in our next meeting.
• President Lombardi has agreed to speak to the State Faculty Leadership Council on a variety of issues concerning pay raises and intellectual property. A bill has been introduced to the state concerning IP issues.

• Recently we got an e-mail about mandatory state ethics certification and instruction. We are investigating this further and the need for university student workers, janitors, and even faculty to do this.

• There are a number of hot topic issues occurring in the UL system ranging from tenure to intellectual property restrictions. We are keeping a close eye on these.

• The state-wide common course numbering system is proceeding, but not without a number of problems. I’m keeping a close eye on this and have forwarded a number of problems and issues to the BOR.

• Modifications to the General Education requirements are being examined at the state level.

• Issues related to the retirement plan are being debated in the legislature right now. We are also keeping a close eye on what is happening.

• The Southeast Conference Council of Faculty Advisors made up of Faculty Senate Presidents is being re-established. I’ll keep you informed on how this proceeds.

Q&A Summary:

Pat McGee: The 3% extra that they are proposing to make faculty contribute to the retirement fund may be dedicated to the unfunded liability. But there is a lot of confusion about this and what will actually come from this revamping of the retirement program.

Ken McMillin: Can you update us on the status of the various upper level searchers?

Kevin: I’ve heard a rumor that the Provost announcement might be coming in a few days. Vice-Chancellor for Research and Economic Development search is not going especially well. The CIO search has been suspended. The Music School Dean committee is meeting. SeaGrant will be an on-campus competition.

Interim Report of the Task Force on Plus-Minus Grading (Mandi Lopez)

The committee has met twice and considered four main questions that sub-groups were assigned to address. The direction of the committee was to provide information to the Faculty Senate to help the voting and ultimate decision. This plus/minus issue has been addressed by almost every other university in the US. So we have been able to borrow quite a bit of research and information from other schools.

Q&A Summary:

Stephanie Braunstein: What have other schools done?

Mandi: Most schools use the plus/minus system.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workloads (Wes Harrison, Chair)

A copy of our report is on the back table and will be posted on the FS website. Our charge was to study the standards and practices of other universities concerning defining faculty workloads as a campus-wide policy. If we determined that such a policy was a good idea then to potentially draft one. The committee consisted of Teresa Buchanan, Gerald Knapp, and George Stanley. I met with Jane Cassidy to collect information about workload policies that the various LSU colleges were generating. Those policies, however, were eventually put on hold by OAA until strategic planning could be completed and a new Provost was selected.

We collected information from a 11 peer institutions on what their faculty workload policies are. LSU does have a very general faculty workload policy as described on the first page of the report. Two universities use a very detailed and complicated formula for determining faculty workloads: Texas A&M University and the University of California system. The table in the report lists the “rigor” of workload policies at these 11 schools. 1 = a very general policy, 2 = in between; and 3 = very rigorous policies that are highly defined.

There is a great deal of diversity across our peer universities and within LSU colleges that makes it difficult to develop a single workload policy with many specifics (like TAMU and UC system). Our recommendation is that revising the current campus policy to make it more specific would be very difficult and should be left to colleges with input from their respective faculty. We do believe that workload assignments be more clearly defined for untenured junior faculty. Adjustments should be made for the following: chairing graduate committees, teaching independent and service-learning courses; student club advising; chairing college or departmental committees that support the teaching mission of the university.
Q&A Summary:
Pat McGee: I was under the University of California system and most faculty in that workload definition system feel that the system is fair and flexible. So the UC system might be a good model for us to look at more closely. But I’ve heard that the TAMU system is arbitrary and not very flexible. So you should be careful linking the two of them.
Wes: Thanks for your comments on the UC system faculty workload system. In the College of Agriculture we have some unique issues due to the linking with the Ag Center.
Kevin Cope: Some of the colleges have less functional policy committees than others. Would you be willing to propose to OAA that the colleges “beef” up their policy committees to tackle the workload issue?
Wes: OAA has indicated to me that they have told the colleges to do this.

Election of Faculty Senate Officers
The slate of candidates for the various Faculty Senate Committees was only delivered to me recently, so I’d like to propose that we post the slate of candidates on the web site and have the election next month. This will give you more time to consider the candidates and their qualifications.
The Faculty Senate Executive Committee nominations are:
President: Kevin Cope (elected by acclaim)
Vice-President: Ken McMillin (elected by acclaim)
Secretary: Joan King (elected by acclaim)
Members-at-Large (2 to be elected): Stephanie Braunstein, Louay Mohammed, and Larry Rouse (nominated from the floor)
All three member-at-large give brief statements with their backgrounds and desire to serve.

Paper ballots are passed out for the member-at-large vote: Stephanie Braunstein and Larry Rouse are elected.

Old Business
Second and final reading of Resolution 11-23 “Grade Exclusion Policy” introduced at the request of LSU Student Government (read by Thomas Rogers, SGA)

Faculty Senate Resolution 11–23
“Repeat Course Credit Policy Revisions”
Introduced at the Request of LSU Student Government

WHEREAS, Louisiana State University has expressed an ongoing commitment to be recognized nationally as a Tier I research university and state flagship public institution of higher learning; and
WHEREAS, the current repeat course credit policy does not accurately reflect the withdrawal policies in place at universities deemed our regional and national peer universities; and
WHEREAS, when a student finishes a class with a passing grade, that student still may not fully understand the material covered in that class; and
WHEREAS, currently, if a student passes a class with a “C” grade or higher, he or she is not allowed to take the same course again without obtaining specific approval from the Dean of the Department; and
WHEREAS, the current system thereby allows for a possible penalty to students who do well in a class, at the same time giving advantage to those who did not pass;
THEREFORE, be it resolved that all students should be able to retake the class under the following conditions:
1. The second attempt grade will be shown on the student’s transcript next to the first attempt grade
2. The second attempt grade will be the one factored into the GPA equation, even if it is lower than the first attempt grade
3. The second attempt hours will not count towards graduation credit hours
4. The second attempt hours will count towards scheduled semester hours
5. A student may retake up to three classes but cannot exceed more than 11 hours
6. No time limit is imposed on when a student may re-take a course
7. Standard W regulations apply when dropping the second attempt
8. A student’s eligibility for retaking a course more than once will be at the discretion of the dean of the course’s department
9. Students found guilty of academic dishonesty are not eligible for a re-take.

WHEREAS, classes at LSU are scheduled to meet five days a week;

WHEREAS, classes at many institutions such as Southeastern Louisiana University, Southern University, University of Louisiana at Lafayette (4.5 days), and diverse departments within LSU such as Business Administration, Finance, Horticulture, and Construction Management have a 4-day class schedule;
Whereas, considering that MWF classes meet for 150 minutes per week and TT classes meet for 160 minutes per week, and each class period may require up to 5 minutes of setup time, 15 minutes for MWF versus 10 minutes for TT;

Whereas, 15 minutes per week or 225 minutes per semester of extra teaching time per a 3-hour course would be gained by switching to a 4-day class system;

Whereas, switching to a 4-day teaching will allow the faculty to have a full day of uninterrupted research time and would reduce energy and facility use cost of unused class rooms;

Therefore, be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate herby recommends to the LSU Academic Affairs to investigate the feasibility and possible implementation of a 4-day (MTWT) class system at LSU.

Q&A Summary:
Bill Stickle: I’ve taught Tu-Th classes since I’ve been here and love that schedule. But my question to the administration is do we have enough class rooms to handle our courses.
Fred: That is why I’m asking academic affairs to investigate this.
Kevin McCarter: How will this affect lab classes?
David Lindenfeld: I’m hesitant to impose this on the entire university.
Wes Harrison: I wonder about the PR ramifications of the public viewing faculty only working 4 days.
Fred: Some other schools do this and don’t have many problems.
Guillermo Ferreya: If furloughs come down under this system then Friday’s would be the logical choice.
Robert Doolos: We do not allow departments to schedule M-W classes for general purpose classrooms.

First Reading:

LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 12-7
Use of Cellular Phones for Personal Conversations within Academic Buildings
Sponsored by Graham Bodie

Whereas the use of cellular phones in American society has proliferated to the point where their use is not only ubiquitous but seemingly non-problematic; and

Whereas LSU is very much like the larger American society in the former regard; and

Whereas LSU is a place of higher education with numerous academic buildings erected for the sole purpose of advancing knowledge; and

Whereas students and faculty face myriad potential distractions that can potentially thwart learning and productivity; and

Whereas the use of cellular phones for personal use inside academic buildings distracts both students and faculty inside of classrooms and out; and

Whereas patrons of the LSU campus have ample other, more suitable places to hold conversations on a cellular phone than in the confines of an academic building;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate recommends a policy that prohibits the use of cellular phones for personal use in the public use areas of all academic buildings.

Q&A Summary:
Pat McGee: I see this as unenforceable. But I also think that singling out cell phones is problematic.
George Stanley: I was fine with your resolution to quiet the talking vending machines, but I’m opposed to this resolution.
Vince LiCata: Perhaps you can modify this to encourage the placement of signs outside of classrooms or faculty offices to keep the noise in these areas down.

Adornment at 5:02 PM