The meeting was called to order by President Pat Culbertson at 3:05 P.M.

Proxies announced were:
- Dan Yarntell for Ann Doucet
- Sam Godber for Bob Groder
- Donna Mealy for John Konopak and Gary Rice
- Max Conrad for Sadik Artunc
- Deborah Normand for Sarah Liggett
- Ralph Kinney for Pratul Ajmera
- Jeannette Money for William Arp
- Bob Justic for Larry Farh
- Michael Abadie for Leslie Rosso
- Michael Fitzsimons for David Good
- George Strain for Tom Kriebilnik

The Parliamentarian, George Strain, announced a quorum was present.

Presentations by visitors:

President Culbertson introduced State Representative Carl Crane of District 70 who spoke to the Senate. Representative Crane thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak on the crisis facing higher education. He stated he believes what is happening to higher education in Louisiana is horrendous, causing a lot of anxiety not only in the higher education community, but also among many in the legislature. He indicated the situation is politically motivated with higher education being a political football. Comparisons with the current situation were made with political statements in 1984 when the administration said it needed $1 billion in new taxes or major cuts would be required in higher education as well as in other programs. Rep Crane reported they got almost all they asked for, but the next year LSU took its first cut and continued to receive cuts each year during the remainder of this administration. He mentioned he believes higher education was cut because it has popular support by the people. Rep Crane mentioned the legislature had the authority to address the problem during the last regular session if it had been brought before them. Then we went into the Constitutional Convention where no mention was made of the impending disaster facing higher education or the state. They adjourned on a Friday. On the following Monday, announcements were made that higher education was to be cut by more than $40 million. Rep. Crane indicated there is no consensus among the legislators at this time on what should be done and that the outcome of a much discussed special session will depend on how things are presented by the Governor. He said the mood of the legislature is not to turn over additional revenue to the administration without some assurance higher education will benefit. He reports the legislature will want to see a definite budget proposed before they agree to new taxes, and in response to a question later indicated he could not vote for new or increased taxes unless specific assurances are given on how the new revenue would be used. For example, he mentioned he does not think the legislature wants any money to go toward support or startup of casinos under the heading of economic development.

Rep. Crane said a big problem this year was in budget priorities as $147 million in enhancements or new programs were put into the budget during the last legislative session. These could have been considered for cuts, but they were not. He listed a number of these in his talk to the Faculty Senate and believed many were worthwhile projects, but only if the state could afford them, and, in his opinion, for many of these items there was weak justification or lack of clear need considering the state's financial situation. Though popular perception is that some of the lottery proceeds were to be directed to higher education or education in general, this was supported by some legislators, lottery profits were never intended to be designated to education. In summarizing expenditures from the lottery proceeds, he stated the estimated lottery revenue for 1992 would be $140 million. He listed a number of agencies and the dollar amounts they were budgeted from this source. One item was $518,000 designated for the Elaine P. Nunez Community College in New Orleans and this was the only lottery money that went to higher education. Thus he said it is apparent higher education was not a priority item for lottery proceeds, and one could come to the same conclusion looking at the overall state budget.

After his talk, questions directed to Rep. Crane included:

- Are the Baton Rouge area legislators working together to present a united front in the legislature and, for example, pointing out the economic impact of these cuts on the Baton Rouge community? Rep Crane: Yes, a meeting of this group is scheduled for the near future.
- Will the legislature allow the Governor to set the format or agenda if there is to be a special session? Rep Crane: A lot will depend on how the governor sets up the call for a special session, but he anticipates the legislature can add amendments to get what they want out of this.
- Can health and higher education be protected in the constitution like other state programs? Rep. Crane: He states he does not believe only health and higher education can be cut. He believes enhancements and new programs can be cut even by executive order. Regarding prospects for constitutional protection of health...
and higher education funding, he does not believe it can happen at this point. It was reported that 2 years ago, the state Senate defeated by one vote such a bill, but it is not likely to happen during this session unless a call is broad enough.

-- Will the proposed realignment of higher education in the state help or hurt LSU? Rep Crane: As things emerge from this, there may be some reduction in overall costs in higher education.

-- Why do you think there is a committee in the legislature to help higher education? Rep Crane: Despite what you think, the legislature is aware of the importance of higher education.

President Culbertson introduced Dr. Doug Braymer and Bill Silvia who spoke to the Faculty Senate concerning the $60 million that appeared as a surplus in the University hospital in Shreveport, and then disappeared as far as higher education was concerned. Bill Silvia stated that prior to 1991-1992 the Medicaid/Medicare funds that contributed this $60 million were significant, but not nearly what it is now. For some years, they were allowed to channel profits from this revenue source back into the system to improve the hospital. The term "disproportionate share" associated with this hospital revenue relates to extra federal money for treating more than the usual number of indigent patients because of the additional costs this imposes on hospitals, and therefore, hospitals should be reimbursed for this. This hospital was losing money for a while, but under improved management it has become one of the best hospitals of its type in the country.

Late in 1991-92 when state funding for CAMH was cut, some money from the Shreveport hospital was transferred to help LSU. It was reported that if the hospital adds 31 more beds this would generate $8 million additional revenue, but the concern there is that if this were done the hospital might not get to utilize the additional revenue.

A concern of Mr. Silvia's was that even though higher education is not going to get any of this $60 million, in the future higher education may be forced to become more and more reliant on this type of funding that would not be a stable base.

After his presentation, questions directed to Mr. Silvia included:

-- Why has not the President's office tried to give us more information on the budget process for the University? Mr. Silvia: We came to talk with you as soon as President Culbertson called us. We try to give as much information as we can at Board meetings.

-- Why has not President Copping taken more public positions on the problems facing the University such as those done by Chancellor Davis who has been out beating the bushes and taking the heat? Mr. Silvia: President Copping just takes a different approach in working with people and addressing problems.

-- Will a new configuration of the higher education boards help LSU and funding of higher education in general? Mr. Silvia: It could, for example, it might lead to eliminating some duplicate programs to help funding in general, but having one board runs the risk of having all of the other state universities sitting at the same table as LSU and siding against the flagship university.

-- What is the latest on restructuring the higher education boards? Mr. Silvia: The judge seems pleased with the plans we are submitting, but the various higher education groups in the state have not as yet come to any final agreement. If and when they do, the judge can accept it, reject it, or restructure as he sees best.

-- In case of financial exigency, what restructuring model are you considering? The faculty generally does not like the "Georgia" plan. Mr. Silvia: There is no detailed plan right now, but what keeps other universities in the state from asking for equal funding? Mr. Silvia: Each school should be funded based on its mission and LSU will be the only Doctoral I research institution.

-- In response to the comment that legislators are elected by the population and take positions that will get them re-elected such that higher education is not a priority to the legislature, Mr. Silvia replied we do need to make changes in higher education and become more efficient, and as we do this we need to ask the legislature for more support.

President Culbertson introduced Bob Dillemuth, Assistant Director of Building Services and Joel Hebert, Assistant Director of Landscape Services, who talked about the effective recycling program at LSU, and some of the improvements implemented, and how the LSU community can cooperate to make it a better program.

President's Report:

Regarding the report on Institutions on Faculty Governance the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is now beginning to meet on a regular basis with various campus groups such as college policy committees looking for a two-way exchange of information and improving the work of all interested faculty groups.

The Executive Committee has formed an ad hoc Faculty Senate Crisis Response Committee. Erwin Poliakoff of this committee reported to the Senate the purpose of this group is to find ways to make people aware of the crisis in funding of higher education and find effective ways for faculty to respond to crises such as this. They are working on public relation type activities and will need to raise money to implement and support some of these activities. For example, this committee may ask for $20.00 donations to fund some of their work.

President Culbertson reported on the Chancellor's response to Faculty Senate Resolution 92-06. A handout was made available that on one side had the written response of Chancellor Davis and on the other side the action statement from Resolution 92-06. The Chancellor has responded in writing and some action along these lines has already begun. For example, the Executive Committee met for 2 hours earlier today with Provost Haden. Senator Collier reported on this meeting. Most of the conversation with the Provost pertains to the way the University administration would approach any restructuring that might occur. The Provost had made several models on how funding cuts might affect the structure of the University, but the desire of the Executive Committee is that the faculty will be involved with the outline for the criteria by which decisions will be made. It was announced that the Executive Committee will be meeting often with the Provost and the planning committee that includes representatives of various college policy committees. The University has a Strategic Planning Committee as well. All of these groups will be looking at various models.
In response to a question about how far efforts have gone in this work, it was mentioned that no units or programs have been identified as yet that might be cut. We're still in the phase of developing the criteria by which those decisions would be made.

The University has formed an outside action committee with James Carville who just completed playing a major role in President-elect Bill Clinton's campaign. It was also mentioned that contractors in the state will help lobby the University's position with the legislature.

President Culbertson explained the thinking now is that the document needs to be sharpened and refined. What we have now as an exigency plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors a few weeks ago as an umbrella document to allow the Board to approve an exigency request, but we need to still come up with a document specific for this campus.

New business: President Culbertson brought up for consideration a resolution from Senator Strain concerning teacher evaluation. President Culbertson referred to an LSU Today article on the response to a teaching survey on the LSU campus. This survey reported that 57 out of 60 department chairs at LSU think teaching plays a role in salary, promotion, etc while two thirds of faculty do not believe this.

Senator Strain presented background information on the resolution. Two persons spoke against mandatory supervisor and peer evaluation. Senator Feldman said this is a bad time to bring this up as there is too much stress on faculty now. Susann Dorman who worked on this survey reported that about 75 percent of faculty would agree to peer evaluations, but that many thought student evaluations made a contribution, but are not sufficient. It was agreed the Senate delay a decision on this resolution until the committee preparing this teacher evaluation survey makes its final report.

Senator McGehee returned the Senate's attention to Resolution 92-06 pointing out some faculty members are looking to the Senate to confirm or suggest whether or not the Chancellor's written response to this resolution was acceptable in terms of faculty now making a decision about a donation to the University from their salary as requested by the Chancellor. Senator McGehee proposed we make a simple declaration, if the Senate so agrees, that we have received a satisfactory response in writing from the Chancellor. This topic was opened for discussion.

Senator Malcolm Richardson noted that the Chancellor has responded honorably, but believes our role in the decision making is not yet defined and states he does not find this particularly satisfactory. President Culbertson asked the Senate as we continue to meet with the Provost who is implementing the Chancellor's response, will this be sufficient for the Senate if the Executive Committee continues to find the interaction with the administration sufficient, or, what specifically does the Senate want to see happen?

Senator Malcolm Richardson said his previous statement in the Senate called for faculty representation on the Board of Supervisors, for faculty to be more involved in major financial decisions made on campus, and other definite actions. There was additional discussion on this with a suggestion by Senator Kinney that we accept the Chancellor's actions at this time and that we can always come back and suggest other action if we see problems in the future.

Senator McGehee responded that based on the resolution, he thinks good faith is an issue. The Chancellor responded to our resolution in the manner we requested. The role of the Senate now is to get the text of the Chancellor's response to the faculty. We should not suggest to the faculty how they respond to the Chancellor's request for a 2 percent donation, just that the Chancellor has responded to our resolution, the Chancellor's request for a 2 percent donation, just that the Chancellor has responded to our resolution, and we believe it is in the interest of the individual faculty waiting for some signal from the Senate to know about the response and make their decision.

Senator McGehee offered Senate Resolution 92-08 (check #): "The Senate should notify the faculty of the Chancellor's statement which we find satisfactory in the promise that it holds for the development of appropriate faculty participation in planning."

Senator Kinney seconded the motion. There was discussion about inclusion of the word "satisfactory" in the resolution and about the "participation" of faculty. After additional discussion of these concerns, a motion was made by Senator Kinney to suspend the rules to allow a vote on the resolution during this meeting and this motion was approved. There was additional discussion pertaining to the words "participation" and "satisfactory," and other points about the motion, but it was offered for a vote unamended and passed by a vote of 27 to 10.

President Culbertson announced with Senator Miles Richardson's concurrence, we would hold Resolution 92-07 offered by Senator Richardson at the last meeting for consideration at the next meeting. The Senate adjourned at 5:12 P.M.