LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
3:00 P.M., Monday, April 13, 2009
Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union

Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:
1. Kevin L. Cope (Senate President, English)
2. George G. Stanley (Secretary, Chemistry)
3. Pratul Ajmera (Member-at-Large, Electrical Eng)
4. William Daly (Past-President, Chemistry)
5. Priscilla D. Allen (Member-at-Large, Social Work)

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

Senators present:
1. Mary Catherine Aime
2. Charles N Delzell
3. Jennifer Curry
4. Josh Detre
5. John Fletcher
6. Lisa Johnson
7. Wanda Hargroder
8. Dominique Homberger
9. Paul L Hrycaj
10. Jeremy King
11. Jennifer L Jolly
12. Boryug Ju
13. Kennedy P Lynn
14. Joseph Legoria
15. Joan King
16. Jeff Kuehny
17. Richard Kurtz
18. Joseph Legoria
19. Ronald Malone
20. Jorge Morales
21. Su-Seng Pang
22. John Protevi
23. Steve Ross
24. Lawrence Rouse
25. Kresimir Rupnik
26. Kelly Rusch
27. Mike Russo
28. James Stoner
29. Jim Sullivan
30. Muhammad Wahab
31. Edward Watson
32. Paul Wilson
33. Yi-Jun Xu

Proxies for absent Senators:
Ed Watson for Andrea Houston
Kevin L Cope for Heather McIllopp
Kevin L Cope for Beth Tope
Tim Slack for Susan Durrans
Joan King for Cristina Sabliov
Joan King for Carol O’Neil
Richard Kurtz for Henry Bella
Steve Gaunt for Bruce Elits
Steve Gaunt for Bruce Olcott
D. Homberger for Sue Bartlett

Senators absent without proxies + (# of absences without proxies):
1. Brittan A Barker (14)
2. Linda Allen (2)
3. Michael Bowman (3)
4. Renee Casbergue (1)
5. Andrew Christie (1)
6. Juhan Frank (9)
7. Richard White (2)
8. Erwin Poliakoff (8)
9. Keith Robinson (17)
10. Edward Song (3)
11. F. Sheldon (3)
12. Susan Weinstein (2)

Guests Attending Meeting:
Patti Beste (University Registrar’s office)
Anne Manino (University Registrar’s office)
Joe Alleva (Athletic Director)
David Madden (English)
Jordan Blum (The Advocate)
Ryan Buxton (Reville)
Colorado Robertson (outgoing SGA President)
Megan Hanna (sponsor of SGA “W” resolution)
Astrid Merget (Executive Vice-Chancellor & Provost)
John Hunter-Walker (student SGA representative)
Consideration of the Minutes from March 2009

Paul Wilson was present at the March meeting.

No other corrections or revisions; motion to accept by Pratul Ajmera, seconded by Beth Tope; passed unanimously.

Presentation by Joe Alleva, Athletic Director

- It has been almost a year since I came to LSU. I love coming to work and I find that people here don’t appreciate how good LSU is, especially considering the current budget problems.
- We have had a lot of success this year. All of our teams have gone on to post-season play. LSU is the only SEC school to have teams in a Bowl Game and the men’s and women’s basketball tournament.
- We are the first school in conference history to win 10 football championships, 10 basketball championships, and 10 baseball championships (conference championships).
- We do not receive any money from the state or students – only one of six schools in the country that can say that.
- We returned $4.3 M to LSU and that is not including $7.8 M in tuition and fees for scholarships, nor $1.2 M in merchandise sold that went back to the university.
- Over the last 5 years over $2 M has been donated to purchase thousands of new desks for classrooms. Over the last 5 years over $3 M has been donated to improve campus beauty, including replacing of sidewalks.
- Over the last 5 years over $15 M has been returned to the university for operations. Last year over $4.5 M was given for the purchase of a new band hall. $1 M was given to the Chancellor to use at his discretion.
- So in just the last year over $9 M has been contributed back to the university.
- After years of careful planning by Skip Bertman the new baseball and softball stadiums have opened.
- We expect our student athletes to excel in academics and sports.
- Kevin brought up the issue of faculty access to tickets. 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. Faculty can get into many athletic events for free just by showing their ID card (woman’s basketball, gymnastics, softball, baseball).
- I have an excellent group of coaches and athletes and am very proud of them. I would like to thank you and open this up for questioning.

Q & A Summary:

John Protevi: Your athletic accomplishments are great. Economically speaking the NCAA has made brand names very valuable. Can you comment further on that?

Joe: I would like to think that athletics and the success of our programs has made an important contribution to the LSU brand name. At Duke when we won a basketball championship undergraduate applications doubled and merchandise sales nearly tripled.

John: I agree. But the entry to the NCAA is only for universities and in the case of public universities, public money.

Joe: No doubt.

Michael Russo: The Chancellor has told us that he will tax the athletic program.

Joe: We are taxed to the tune of about $4.3 M a year and I went through all those numbers for you. We will do all we can to help the academic side of the campus. But, there is a limit to how much we can contribute without raising ticket prices and hitting the fans up more.

Ron Malone: Is your department still healthy and how do you feel about the next few years?

Joe: I am concerned about ticket renewals, but so far they have been very good. The new baseball fields are dependent on a revenue stream from ticket sales and so far that has also been very good. Transportation costs are going up and that is a concern. Airline baggage fees, for example, really add up for our teams. Coaches salaries are also increasing and that is another market-driven factor that we don’t have much control over. Advertising money has gotten tighter and that could cause problems down the road.

Joe Legoria: Have you heard about schools talking about dissolving the NCAA and trying to do better with income streams rather than having the NCAA spread it out?

Joe: The main sport where that type of discussing is going on is basketball. Football is different.

Mike Wascom: What do you think about the NCAA rule allowing contact with 7th graders for recruiting basketball players.

Joe: I think it is ridiculous.
Senator: What do you think about the BCS playoffs?
Joe: I am against them because how do you pick the number of teams playing and align it with the current bowl structure. A 4 team playoff might be doable. I like a BCS-Bowl + 1, similar to the Superbowl of college football, which would generate a lot of money.

John Protavi: What do you think about the pluses and minus of the Vanderbilt move a few years ago about renaming the athletic director position?
Joe: I am still the guy in charge of athletics, so it was just a name change and not much else.
Senator: I got my Ph.D. at Penn State and they have done very well at leveraging success in athletics to improve academics. Can we do more of that here?
Joe: I think we are doing that, but could do a lot more. So I think we are in the early stages of doing just that.
Larry: Doesn’t the Tiger Athletic Foundation drain $ away from academics?
Joe: No doubt to some extent. TAF exists to support athletics and many of the athletic facilities have been built via TAF funding. But I think that LSU can package big donations better to favor everyone.
Larry: That sounds like a tax to distribute the money.
Joe: Yes, that could distribute money around to help athletics & academics.

Wanda: I would like to bring up the salaries of coaches. Do you think they are out of hand? Wouldn’t it serve academics across the board, and universities, to say stop the [salary] madness?
Joe: The problem is do we want to win? I had to hire a new basketball coach and could have hired a lot of people for a lot less than Trent. But could they have lead the team to the playoffs? What is the price of losing vs. the price of a high-paid coach that wins? Unilaterally we can’t just cap salaries. I do think they are out of wack.

Joan King: TAF is one of the barriers to getting tickets. Why can’t anybody buy tickets without being a TAF member?
Joe: You can for some sports, just not football.
Joan: I still don’t see why you can’t sell some football season tickets without the TAF fees? Other schools do this like Ohio State. TAF seems to control everything.
Joe: TAF only controls a portion of the football tickets.

Kevin: The food service in Tiger Stadium is amateurish. Any hope for improving the quality?
Joe: We are looking into that. It is important to provide good service.

Dominique Homberger: I feel that market forces should be driving this. It is people that drive salaries. We should take responsibility for these things. You agree that salaries are out of wack. If we feel so, why don’t we do something about it. What kind of message are we sending our children, we need technically trained people. But faculty get paid a lot less than most coaches. I’d like to hear a solution.
Joe: I disagree with you about market forces. Who decides how much Frank Sinatra is worth for a concert?

Dominique: People.
Joe: And that is what I call market forces. We need to hire the best and we need to pay market prices for the best coaches.
Boryung Ju: What do you think about our football team this year?
Joe: We have 4 new excellent coaches that we paid market value for. So I think we will do a lot better this year.

President’s Report – Kevin Cope

- First I would like Lilly Allen to talk about tomorrow’s reorganization plan:
- Lilly: There will be a special Provost-Chancellor Forum about the reorganization tomorrow, April 14, at 3:05 PM in Howe-Russell 130. We encourage all of you to attend and enter in the discussion about this. Light refreshments will be available.
- Moodle Survey: nearly 250 replied to the survey and the results are sobering. There is significant confusing about Moodle and its terminology and interface. We have reconvened a group to discuss this further with the Moodle developers.
- We would like to thank Academic Affairs and Vice-Provost Stacy Haynie for a new web site for faculty orientation.
- We have meet with our friends at the AAUP on the general principles of dealing with financial emergency issues. We have reached common ground but hope it won’t be necessary.
- We have two new proposals, one from Pratul, for interim appointments and furloughs. We will be meeting with the Provost later this week to discuss these further.
- There has been a big stir about a recent personnel change [Ivor van Heerden] that appeared in the paper this weekend. We will look into this and report on it in due course.
- The Association for Louisiana Faculty Senates (ALFS) meeting is on Saturday, April 25 at 1 PM in the Lod Cook Alumni Center. Sally Clausin will be the featured speaker.
- The SEC Academic Leadership group composed of Faculty Senate Presidents and other leaders has just approved a constitution and will associate with the SEC Academic Leadership Group.

**Q&A Summary:**

Jim Stoner: With regards to the personnel issue you mentioned, although I do not believe that we should discuss personnel issues, we need to take this very seriously. This could be an important and dangerous academic freedom issue.

Kevin: We are treating this very seriously and are investigating.

Mike Wascom: There is a lot of silence about this personnel issue and with the legislative session coming up soon I believe this could become an issue.

Dominique Homberger: I would like to support the previous comments. It just doesn’t look good. Is there someone from the university that can come and discuss this with us.

Kevin: Yes, but we need to find out who the appropriate person is to address this issue. We will certainly look into this.

Dominique: Shouldn’t the Chief Academic officer address this?

Kevin: We will get back to the senate about this.

Boryung Ju: I think we should talk about the reorganization now and not tomorrow.

Kevin: We can start discussing this when we get to new business.

Pratul Ajmera: Do you believe that the FSEC should make a statement about the previously discussed personnel matter? This statement is important and should come in a timely manner. Do you have an idea about the time-frame on this?

Kevin: The next FSEC meeting is on April 16 and we will certainly discuss this then. We need to collect more information on this matter.

Paul Hrycaj: What about PS-111?

Kevin: We will meet with Ravi Rau about this at our April 16 meeting.

---

**Report on Revised “W” Policy as Formulated by the Student Government Association and Approved by the Admissions, Standards, and Honors Committee (ASH) – Colorado Robertson**

Kevin: Let me introduce Colorado Robertson and Megan Hanna to discuss the SGA resolution modifying the W policy.

Colorado Robertson: We had a semester-long discussion on this and modeled this on the University of Florida plan. This provides more flexibility for students to use their “W’s”. Megan will discuss this further.

Megan Hanna: We would like to have roll-over “W’s” and have informally talked about this for several years. I headed up the SGA committee to formulate a detailed plan. We are one of the very few schools in the SEC that does not offer students more flexibility with their “W’s”. We based this on the 3:2:1 tier system from the University of Florida. The largest number of appeals comes from the sophomore and junior classes, so we planned this policy to give those students more flexibility. We consulted with a number of faculty and university organizations on this. We are very happy that ASH approved this as well.

**Q&A Summary:**

Senator: How many W’s do you have right now?

Megan: Right now it is limited to hours. You have 3 W’s to use during your first 24 credit hours. Then you have one every 30 hours. No roll-overs right now. We really wanted to do 3:3:1, but are happy with what we proposed.

Jim Stoner: I am really surprised that ASH approved this. In the old days students would take many W’s not understanding the effect on their academic work. I do not want to see a return to the situation of rampant run-away W’s that we had before the current W-policy.

Megan: I spoke with a number of people in UCFY about this. UCFY is proposing a new PAWS page along with CATS will keep students informed about the number of W’s.

Colorado: We are proposing the same number of W’s as the current policy, just the ability to roll them over and give students more flexibility.

Lilly Allen: Do you look at W’s as either you use them or lose them?
Megan: I have two W’s and think that my transcript looks wonderful. I jumped into 18 hrs of coursework and got overwhelmed and used a W to drop a class.

Senator: So you don’t think that there are enough W’s?

Megan: No, we are proposing the same number of W’s, just the ability to roll them over.

Bill Daly: When this program was designed the first three W’s were associated with 30 hrs of coursework. But many students are coming in with 20-24 hrs of credit from high school. This was a problem with the current W policy and the student’s proposal fixes this.

Kevin: This will now proceed to Academic Affairs unless someone wants to proposal a resolution to stop or amend this proposal.

(No comments from the Faculty Senate)

Faculty Senate Officer and Faculty Senate Executive Committee Election

Outgoing Secretary George Stanley moderated the election of the Faculty Senate officers and members-at-large for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC). Nominees from the floor for each position were solicited, but none were advanced.

President: Kevin Cope was the only nominee and elected by acclaim.

Vice-President: Andrew Christie (current Vice-President) and Pratul Ajmera (current FSEC member-at-large) were the candidates. A written ballot election was carried out (thanks to Jim Stoner for counting the ballots) and Pratul Ajmera was elected Vice-President.

Secretary: Renee Casbergue (current FSEC Member-at-Large) was the only candidate and elected by acclaim.

FSEC Members-at-Large: Andrew Christie and Lilly Allen (current new Senator representative on FSEC) ran unopposed and elected by acclaim.

The next New Senator representative to the FSEC will be elected at the September FS meeting.

Old Business

None

New Business

First reading by David Madden:

**FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 09–04**

“Supporting Major Improvements of the United States Civil War Center, Restoring it to its Former Prominence on the LSU Campus, in Baton Rouge, the State, and the Nation”

Proposed by Professor David Madden, Founding Director of the United States Civil War Center;

Whereas the United States Civil War Center, unique in the nation then and still, was started at LSU in 1989, with the total support of Chancellor Jim Wharton, its formal creation approved unanimously in 1992 by the Board of Supervisors and the Board of Regents, given its name and its mission in a unanimously approved resolution by Congress of the United States, as introduced by Senator Breaux, and in 1997, at Founding Director David Madden’s request, legislation was introduced by Senator Breaux that would create the Civil War Sesquicentennial Commission (2011-2015) in Washington, legislation that languished for a decade, but that Senator Landrieu re-introduced in April of 2008; and

Whereas the unique Mission of the United States Civil War Center was to study the War and Reconstruction from the perspective of every conceivable academic discipline, profession, and occupation, also from the perspective of African Americans and other ethnic groups, and civilians, with emphasis upon women and children, including the mission of leading the planning and facilitation of the Civil War Sesquicentennial (20011-15); and

Whereas The USCWC quickly became the gateway to all Civil War interests, winning many awards for its website, one of the first at LSU, with millions of hits from such places as Israel, NASA, and the U. S. military, as the only Civil War organization that set out to link to every other organization, to a total of over 4,000 links, with a national
park ranger in residence to begin the Civil War soldier’s and the Civil War cemeteries databases, reviewing by major historians of all books on the Civil War published each year (about 400), with one copy going to LSU Libraries, the editorship providing graduate assistantships to five graduate students in three departments, creating the only collection of books about the war written for children and a collection of Civil War fiction in LSU’s Special Collections Library, bringing many lectures and performances and two major conferences to LSU, including a three-day conference, uniquely involving 30 different disciplines from among LSU’s own faculty, an historic achievement in interdisciplinary studies, facilitating the creation and publication of 30 books for New York and university presses, offering a prize for the best Civil War novel each year, honoring Michael Shaara, author of the Pulitzer Prize winning novel, Killer Angels, made into the movie Gettysburg, creating a national board comprised of such leaders as Jeff Shaara, Ken Burns, Ted Turner, Pulitzer Prize winning biologist Edward O. Smith, Nobel prize winner in physics Glenn Seaborg, National Poet Laureate Rita Dove, and major historians, such as Shelby Foote and Gabor Boritt, director of The Gettysburg Civil War Institute, USWC’s sister institution in the congressional resolution, achieving all that on less than $30,000 a year of mostly donated funds (three hundred and forty thousand dollars having been paid on a million dollar pledge, being included annually, for those and many other reasons, on LSU’s list of 10 requests to our legislative delegation for financial support; and

Whereas following its removal from Arts and Sciences to the library most of the kinds of activities that produced its reputation ceased long ago, although the excellent book review and the database (though rather static) remain, among other features, to serve as a foundation for a restored, revitalized Center, causing the decline of the Center’s services to the nation and its reputation as an LSU institution, so that utter consternation and contempt is its present status at LSU and throughout the nation.

And Whereas a revitalized United States Civil War Center would restore its national reputation, and would be a perfect exemplification of the Flagship Agenda, especially of the interdisciplinary initiative; and

Whereas support among the faculty in multiple disciplines exists for the restoration of the USCWC, including faculty members and alumni, Faculty Senate President Kevin Cope, Dean of the Graduate school, Bill Worger, Bob Mann, Manship Chair, Mass. Com., former chair, CWC board; Former Chancellor Jim Wharton, former Chair, CWC board; Charles Barre, Alumni-Donor, former member of CWC Board; Gary Joiner, historian LSU-Shreveport, former member CWC board; Jack Hamilton, Dean School of Mass. Com.; Dick White, LSU, Lincoln Commission member; Susan Weinstein, English education; Carolyn Ware, folklore, English; Larry Crumbley, business School; Bill Grimes, Music School; Jim Stoner, Chair of Political Science Department, Member of Senate Library Committee; T. O. Perry, supporter of LSU and the Center; Virginia Grenier, International Students Hospitality, office in the Civil War Center building; Angeletta Gourdine, Director of African and African American Studies; among others;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate recommends major improvements of the United States Civil War Center, with the goal of restoring it to its former prominence, serving LSU, Baton Rouge, the state, and the nation.

Motion to advance the resolution to debate & approved.

Q&A Summary:

Joan King: Which department or person will be in charge of the center?

David: This resolution is just to support restoration of the center. We do not have anyone specific in mind right now, but do have 4-5 names that I would consider.

Joan King: Would it be left in the library?

David: I would like to see it moved from the library where it has declined. This morning I spoke to Bob Mann in the School of Mass Communication about this.

Michael Russo: How did it end up in the library?

David: The Dean of Arts & Sciences, who was in the History Department, proposed the library. At the time I thought it was a good idea. But pretty quickly it started to look like a bad idea to the Board members of the Center. By the way, the Board was dissolved without notifying them.

Chip Delzell: I have some editorial corrections. The third whereas: do you really mean every other Civil War organization?

David: Yes I did.

Chip: In the same whereas, later on the page, it seems to have Killer Angels’ as a title, which I don’t think you want. But there is also an open parentheses that needs to be closed.

David: Yes, you are right.

Chip: In the next whereas, you mention the excellent book review and database remain. Which book review? Is this ongoing?

David: This is the Civil War book review, which is online. The book review section is excellent and gets a lot of good attention.

Bill Daly: I would like to strengthen the therefore with: including assignment to a college with active interest in the center.

David: Very good.
Larry Rouse: I think the Therefore is too vague as well.
David: OK, we will strengthen it.
Steve Ross: I wonder why there are not any members of the History Department listed as supporting this?
David: The History Department supported the creation of the Civil War Center, but after that there was not a lot of support for the continuation and improvement of the Center. I would like to see active participation from the History Department.
Steve Ross: Was that when Carl Roider was Dean?
David: Yes.
Joan King: One more typo: the second Whereas, the second line, 20011 should be 2010.
Michael Russo: Other than the book review, which I am familiar with, if we went to the headquarters of the Civil War Center what would we find? Artifacts?
David: We have mainly collected books. I did have Jay Dardene to talk to Chancellor O’Keefe about having the state take over the Civil War Center artifacts. He did and most of the artifacts have gone to the State.

First Reading (by Kevin Cope):

**Faculty Senate Resolution 09–05**

“Limitations on the Choice of Classroom Clickers (“Student Response Systems”)”

Referred to the LSU Faculty Senate by the LSU Student Government Association

Whereas the Faculty Senate has previously endorsed the use of the TurningPoint brand student response system (colloquially known as “clickers”) for use in classrooms and other instructional settings at Louisiana State University;

Whereas that endorsement has been understood by students at Louisiana State University to constitute a provisional selection of this system, barring the discovery of technical difficulties with this equipment;

Whereas 5,000 or more students currently use TurningPoint “clickers” in classroom contexts;

Whereas requiring students to purchase multiple clickers with similar functions from multiple vendors creates an extra expense that yields minimal pedagogical or educational value;

Whereas the Student Government Association has expressed satisfaction with the TurningPoint system;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate reaffirms its support of the TurningPoint student response system as the sole “clicker” for use in LSU classrooms; and

Therefore be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate encourages colleges or departments that require the use of other brands to purchase and make available those variant, alternative clickers to students free of charge.

Motion to advance the resolution to debate & approved.

Comments by John Hunter-Walker (student SGA representative): In 2005 the Faculty Senate endorsed the Turning Point software system as a pilot program for use in classrooms and it was adopted by LSU shortly after. In Spring, 2008 Mass Communication started to use the iClicker hardware. The use of two systems makes it more difficult for students, not to mention any extra cost associated with purchasing different clickers. We would like the Faculty Senate to reaffirm support for the Turning Point system and hardware as the sole system in use at LSU.

Q&A Summary:

Danny Shipka (Mass Comm): Have you talked to any of the other schools, like the Manship School of Mass Communication, about why they are using iClicker?

John: No. But I have talked to students, and the clickers are more – well I am not sure how to describe it . . .

Danny Shipka: Maybe I should describe it because that is my class you are talking about.

John: From what I understand the SRS clicker has all the features of the iClicker. But the iClicker only has 5 buttons and is easier to use.

Danny: Some of the textbooks that we use come with iClicker technology at no cost to the university. The iClicker should have been bundled with the 500 textbooks, but the bookstore bungled the order and only got in 10 iClickers. When students complained the bookstore ordered another 15. So we are up to 25 out of 500 people. The cost was supposed to be $43 for the eBook and clicker, instead of the $93 + $27 for the iClicker. So there was supposed to be a considerable cost reduction if packaged correctly. I understand that the students would be upset about this, but to make the Manship School pay for all the clickers is not right.
John: That is what I have heard as well. As long as those clickers can be made available to students at no extra cost then I do not have a problem.

Danny: So if we do a package job where iClickers are bundled in with the price [of the book] then you don’t see a need for this resolution.

John: If students can get iClickers for no cost then I don’t have a problem. This isn’t a bill to ban clickers.

Danny: This resolution is banning iClickers.

George Stanley: Turning Point is a software system that allows you to build questions easily into PowerPoints. The clickers are hardware that communicates via radio to the computer-receiver. I presume that iClickers do not communicate or work with the Turning Point software.

Danny: iClickers have their own system that the publishers provide to us, free of cost.

George: Supposedly the university standardized on the Turning Point software so the students could use the same type of clickers and wouldn’t have to pay anything to use other systems, or juggle different clicker technologies. So there shouldn’t be any extra cost to students for other systems that you want to use.

Danny: But if we are talking about moving to a more virtual environment and the iClicker is bundled with the e-Book, then I don’t see the problem.

John: The problem is when students are forced to go to the bookstore to buy a clicker.

Larry Rouse: Is Mass Communications the only college using iClickers?

John: I have heard of some other classes that want to or are using iClickers. I believe that there are 4 different student response systems that are commonly available.

Andrea Houston: I use clickers in my classroom and students share them. After the class they sell it to other students. They can last as long as the batteries last. So I don’t think it is that big a deal.

Steve Ross: That could be a problem if some other professor in Mass Comm wants his students to start using iClickers.

John: Yes. This resolution isn’t designed to punish Mass Comm or any other school. We just want to avoid use of multiple clicker systems and the potential for increased cost to students that must purchase multiple clickers.

George: From what I understand now, the SRS/Turning Point system and the iClicker systems are incompatible with one another.

Danny & John: Yes.

George: Once again I thought that the university standardized on one system to avoid this type of problem. So I am sorta with the students on this issue. But if the bookstore hadn’t screwed up the order we wouldn’t have this issue either.

Rich Kurtz: The Physics Department has the SRS clicker bundled with the book. Couldn’t you do that?

Danny: Our publisher only supports the iClicker system.

Jim Stoner: If the faculty have made a choice of a book that comes with a different system then I think that we should weigh on the side of the faculty member. Especially since the problem was mainly caused by the bookstore.

**Update on Committee Assignments and Election of New Senators for 2009-2010 – Kevin Cope**

- We are working on arranging the election of new Senators.
- There has been great concern about the status of the library. The FS Library Committee has been resurrected and is headed by Jim Stoner.
- There is rumbling about the SGA wanted to put a cap on textbook costs. We are monitoring it.
- My e-mail has been running heavily concerning the topic of budget cuts and the legal status of faculty. The administration has lots of legal advice, but not the faculty. The Benefits Committee is working on this.

**Free Form Discussion about the College Reorganization**

Boryung Ju: We were not consulted on the reorganization of our program. That is the main problem.

George Stanley (question to the Senators): Was anyone consulted over the reorganization, especially those in affected departments/colleges?

Paul Wilson: No

Jim Stoner: The situation in Arts & Sciences was somewhat different. There was discussion about Math moving to Basic Sciences and the proposed name changes. So there was some consultation with us.
Andrea Houston: My Dean [Business] was totally caught by surprise. He had no idea. We are losing two departments [Economics + ?] and 20 faculty. That hurts us.

Lilly Allen: Our change [School of Social Work] is significant and our Dean supposedly didn’t know either, and I believe him.

Bill Daly: I am on the University Planning Council and it was basically presented to us as a fait d’complete. Nobody that I know was aware of what was going on with regards to the reorganization.

Pratul: The real problem is the lack of faculty consultation.

Boryung: My dean told me that there was no consultation.

Bill: What is missing is the rational for the reorganization.

Boryung: We are supposed to meet with the Provost and hear the logic and rational for the changes.

Paul Wilson: The Provost claimed in the paper that this was not budget related or driven. But I find that very hard to believe. I also don’t understand what the rush is, especially if it is not budget driven.

Bill: There is a tightening of the administrative structure so there must be some financial impact.

Paul: They are missing an opportunity. Perhaps if the Provost consulted with more faculty she might have actually gotten a fair bit of support for this.

Jim: I would have been very upset if there wasn’t any consultation. But there was some consultation in Arts & Sciences. On March 17 the Provost had breakfast with Deans, Department Chairs, and other administrators. At this time she made a number of comments about the possible reorganization, but did not provide any details. From what I heard a lot of Deans were caught off-guard.

Kevin: The presenting of the reorganization plan to the University Planning Council (UPC) is not real consultation. The mission statement of the UPC is visionary and not really set for this purpose. Bypassing the Faculty Senate on this is highly irregular at best.

Dominique Homberger: We were not consulted on this in Basic Sciences. We were told. I like mathematics, but do not like the lack of consultation. This bypassed faculty governance and that is the real problem. What is really disturbing here is lack of humility. Our administrators are not the only ones with good ideas. We as a faculty should be really concerned.

Lilly Allen: There are long-range implications of this reorganization for our school (Social Work).

Paul Wilson: We recently talked about the SACS accreditation process and how important it is. I have not heard anywhere how this restructuring will make us better or who will be accountable for this.

Senator: The Provost upset a lot of faculty in Social Sciences with her comments about how there is no “science” in social sciences. She should not be implying that science is monopolized by the departments now in the College of Science.

Joan King: The previous school I was at had a number of open forums to discuss a proposed reorganization at that school. Why didn’t we do that here?

Kevin: We have another FS meeting in May and that would be an opportunity to bring up a resolution concerning this reorganization. We can suspend the rules for an emergency resolution at that time.

Chip Delzell: Perhaps someone wants to draft a resolution depending on what happens at the faculty forum tomorrow.

Paul Ajmera: If the College of Arts & Science reorganization has been on-going for 9 months, the Provost sat in on a number of FS meetings between then and now and she said nothing about any reorganization to the FS.

Rich Kurtz: There are other things going on budget-wise. CCT and CAMD are slated for major cuts or elimination. There hasn’t been any discussion about this.

Pratul: Who are the people deciding these things. The reorganization might be fine, but where was the input and faculty consultation?

Andrea Houston: The budget issue is more dramatic. We are losing two departments and how will that affect our colleges budget relative to the other departments. What about centers, professorships, etc? We keep hearing conflicting stories.

Lilly: Some of this is to stir up the legislature. But a lot of faculty are getting worried.

Jim Stoner: Kevin are you moderating tomorrow?

Kevin: I am introducing the Chancellor and Provost.

Jim: There are many questions about the non-consultation. Others about the substance of the changes (e.g., should Economics move to Arts & Sciences). Others about the budget issues. The question is, is the forum part of the consultation? So although we didn’t have much consultation before the reorganization was announced, the forum could be a way for the Provost to save face and incorporate faculty input.

Bill: I presume that the Chancellor will turn things over to the Provost who has a presentation ready about this. This is the Provost’s plan.
Boryung: We got the impression that this was a done deal.
Kevin: We have many options besides a resolution, including censure or reprimand. Also the “nuclear option” of a vote of no-confidence.
George: Perhaps you can prepare some questions based on your e-mails to ask the hard questions that many of the junior faculty are afraid to ask.
Kevin: Yes, I can do that.
Joan King: Is there a time limit on the forum?
Kevin: Not that I know of, but there is a tendency to wind down after 75 mins or so when people start leaving.
George: I just want to say that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee knew nothing about this reorganization plan. Even Kevin was left in the dark about this.

Adjournment @ 6:00 PM
Moved by George Stanley, seconded by EVERYONE LEFT