LSU Faculty Senate Meeting
3:00 P.M., Wednesday, January 24th, 2007
Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union

Attendance
Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:
1. William H. Daly (Senate President) 4. Michael Wascom (Member-at-Large)
2. Kevin L. Cope (Vice President) 5. Judith Schiebout (Member-at-Large)
3. Lois J. Kuyper-Rushing (Secretary) 6. Claire Advokat (Ex Officio, Immed. Past Pres.)

Parliamentarian: Andrew King (present)

Senators present:

Proxies for absent Senators:
Andrew Christie for Nicholas G. Apostolou
Hollis Utah Cox for Dennis W. Duffield, Jeremy Hubert
Catherine Lemieux for Juan J. Barthelemy
F. Clayton Breland for Henry D. Bellamy
Lois J. Kuyper-Rushing for Randall Hall
Su-Seng Pang for Ronald F. Malone
Mary J Sirridge for Suzanne Marchand
William H. Daly for Heather McKillop, Adelaide Russo, Beth N. Tope
Wayne Gauthier for Kenneth W. McMillin
Maud Maureen Walsh for Carol E. O’Neil
Richard L. Kurtz for Erwin D. Poliakoff, Kevin Smith
Kevin L. Cope for James R. Stoner Jr.
Steve Hand for Vincent J. Licata

Senators absent without proxies + (# of absences without proxies):
LSU Faculty Senate Meeting
3:00 P.M., Wednesday, January 24th, 2007, Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union

Highlights
-Introduction of Guests
-Consideration of Minutes
-President’s Report
-Report from Education Policy Committee on First Year Residency
-Comments on Student Position on First Year Residency
-Comments on Student Government Position on First Year Residency
-Old Business
-New Business--Faculty Senate Resolution on First Year Residency

Minutes

President Daly opened the meeting at 3:00 P.M. with a reading of the proxies.

Introduction of Guests
Guests were introduced and urged to sign in on the attendance sheet. Guests attending the January meeting included:

Jordan Blum, The Advocate
Donald Hodge, Graduate student
Hector Zapata, EPC
John Yaun, Residential Life
David Dessauer, Undergraduate student and Residence Hall Association President
Robert Doolos, University Registrar
Debora Schulze, Residential Life
Doris Collins, SLAS
Robert Rohli, Geography & Anthropology/Faculty Director of Residential Colleges
Frank Cartledge, Academic Affairs
Mark Kraner, Contractor Auxiliary Services

Consideration of the minutes– President Daly asked if there were any comments or corrections for the minutes of December 5, 2006. After minor corrections, Senator George Stanley moved for approval and Senator Larry Crumbley seconded. Minutes were accepted by voice vote.

President’s report
President Daly reported that the AAUP has a preliminary report on the New Orleans universities concerning financial exigency and Force Majeure. The report was critical of layoffs and program cuts. Force Majeure is still in place at the health centers, eighteen months after the hurricanes, which is more than enough time to change. President Daly stated at the last Board of Supervisors meeting that it shouldn’t still be in place.

President Daly continued by saying that the Executive Council on Enrollment Planning is now meeting on a bi-weekly basis to develop a strategic enrollment plan by the end of this semester. The plan will be implemented with the class coming to LSU in 2008.

President Daly gave a Provost Search update. The search committee has gotten a list of candidates from the search firm and will be reviewing the list in their next meeting. The committee is narrowing the list, but it is not too late to nominate people.
Earlier this year, President Daly charged the Education Policy Committee with looking into the details of the First-Year Residency program. What follows is an informative presentation reporting on the committee’s findings. A resolution will be presented at the end of this meeting. President Daly introduced Dr. Hector Zapata, Chair of the Education Policy Committee, who gave the following report.

Dr. Zapata introduced Dr. Doris Collins, Associate Vice Chancellor, and Dr. Robert Rohli, Director of Residential Colleges, to help with the presentation and any questions that may arise. Zapata explained that the committee believes the resolution should be consistent with the Flagship Agenda. The committee considered the Student Senate resolution and all the concerns listed in that document, and they searched for research concerning the academic benefits of residential life. The committee contacted peer institutions concerning this issue. The committee met in December with President Bill Daly, Dr. Neil Mathews from Student Life and Academic Services, Dr. Doris Collins, Dr. Debora Schulze, and Dr. Robert Rohli.

The committee decided to focus on two things in developing a resolution. The first is the Flagship Agenda. First, would a first-year residency requirement contribute positively toward the quality of the performance of undergraduate students and secondly, would a residency requirement positively influence campus life. The committee also looked at the expenses for the first year student. Expenses were outlined in the powerpoint presentation given by Dr. Zapata.

The committee wondered about peer institutions’ experience with a residency requirement. Other universities reported that such a program contributed to better academic performance. The committee considered the students’ concerns regarding the expenses involved in the plan. According to LSU’s Budget and Planning Office, total costs will be less for those staying on campus than those living in apartments. Staying at home costs the least, while apartment life is the most expensive.

Dr. Doris Collins spoke next. She acknowledged that the First-Year Residency Plan is a controversial topic. Residential Life is concerned with academic success for students, student retention, and the reputation of LSU in national rankings. The residency requirement will help reduce LSU’s high student/faculty ratio as well.

Right now, 60% of all first-year students live on campus, but after the plan is implemented, 80% of all first-year students will live on campus. The living-learning programs will make learning more holistic, enhance quality of life and is supported by Objectives 3 and 4 of the Flagship Agenda.

LSU has talked about such a plan for years. Until 1979 there was a residency requirement, it was discontinued due to overcrowding. Over ten years ago, previous Provost Dan Fogel decided LSU needed a residency program, but he wanted it to be for ALL first-year students, without exemption. His plan was too demanding. Also, there were problems with the current housing facilities, so LSU began to upgrade them. In 2003, Chancellor Emmert declared that the First-Year Residency program would be ready for 2005. The plan went to Faculty Senate, and a taskforce, and the main problem concerned housing capacity. Secondly, the master plan for housing had not been accomplished.

In 2006 Dr. Neil Mathews, Vice Chancellor for Student Life and Academic Services, reiterated that LSU needed a residency requirement. Another taskforce was formed with representatives from Enrollment Management, Dining, Parking, and Residential Life, and students and staff were included. The taskforce discussed exemptions and held informational meetings. The group decided on these exemptions from the requirement: students who are over 21, married students, those with dependent children, those who live with a parent or guardian, part-time students, those with medical needs, financial needs and those with “other compelling reasons.” It is one of the most lenient policies found in universities in the nation.

The rationale for the program is that there will be higher overall academic performance from students living on campus. The committee found that students living on campus consistently have higher GPAs, this has been true at LSU for 30 years, as well as higher retention rates and graduation rates.
Dr. Robert Rohli, Director of Residential Life spoke next. Rohli began by addressing academic benefits with a First Year Residency program. Rohli showed comparison data on GPAs for on- and off-campus first-year students from the 2005-2006 students at LSU. Presentation by Dr. Rohli (Click on this link to the presentation used by Dr. Rohli.) He showed that, as entering freshmen, the GPAs from high school were comparable for students living on and off campus. By the end of their first year, the on-campus students had significantly higher GPAs than those living off campus. Having higher GPAs will make LSU more likely to be in the 2nd tier of universities. Four percent more on-campus students were on the Dean’s List than those who lived off-campus. Retention rates have gone down in recent years even as entrance requirements have risen. He believes the retention rate will rise as a result of the first-year residency requirement. Another goal is to increase the percent of students graduating in four years or less. The data show that a student has a 50% greater chance of graduating in four years if they spend their first year on campus. He admitted that he doesn’t have cause and effect data, but the circumstantial data convinces him that the first-year residency program will benefit the academic performance of students involved.

Senator Perlis noted that the data Rohli is using compares rates of success for students who chose to stay on campus. Perlis asked if these data would apply to students who are forced to stay on campus. Rohli answered that even students who are forced to stay on campus do better, according to the research. Rohli noted that individuals have suggested that LSU recommend living on campus rather than requiring it, but he believes that is not a strong enough statement for something we believe is the right thing to do.

Senator Wayne Gauthier asked why the initial residency requirement was suspended. Rohli answered that Residential Life found that, by 1979, the facilities were not considered to be of adequate quality to require students to stay on campus. Gauthier continued by asking if this is a way to provide a greater revenue stream for Residential Life and LSU. Rohli says no, the requirement is to better the experience for students. Rohli noted that since he has been in this profession he has noticed a decrease in the quality of the undergraduate experience. It is difficult to get students to interact, he hopes that having a residency requirement will enhance this experience. Rohli also reported that in 2002-2003, 17-20% of LSU students lost TOPS after their first year, he assumes that number would be reduced with First-Year Residency requirement. He asked us to remember that we are talking about two 16-week semesters only.

Rohli continued by saying that in national research we see higher retention rates for freshmen, a positive impact on intellectual growth, inclusive racial attitudes and degree completion as a result of a residency requirement. By many measures, Louisiana is a most diverse state, racially, academically and economically. A first-year residency requirement will only improve students’ abilities to interact with other students who are not exactly like them. Outside the classroom learning will be enhanced.

Many institutions, both in and out of state, have this program, including many of our peer institutions. Eight of the other eleven Southeastern Conference schools have the requirement. The trend is toward having this requirement.

Dr. Rohli offered some comments on residential colleges. They will not be required for all students, this is only one subset of a way to meet the first-year residency requirement. There are several residential colleges on the LSU campus, more are being planned.

Dr. Collins commented that by 2008, considering our declining enrollment, there will be adequate capacity for all first-year students. She added that 41% (61% by 2009) of the facilities will be renovated or brand new. Renovations include the addition of faculty offices, classrooms, libraries, courtyards, updated the rooms and furniture within the halls. Dining has a master plan as well and many renovations are planned. Parking is expanding, there will be plenty of parking available, even though not right at the students’ doors.

Dr. Zapata opened the floor for questions. Senator Hugh Buckingham asked if the current report came after Fogel and Emmert decided to have the residency requirement. Zapata answered that this was a new report. Senator Jeff Kuehney asked about private room availability, and the hours for the dining hall. Mark Kraner, Director of Contracted Auxiliary Services, answered that Laville Dining Hall will come on line this fall and meals will be available from 7 am to 2 am. Meal plans can be used at various halls.
Senator Perlis asked if there is any discussion of unbundling the residential requirement from the food service requirement. This question has been addressed but it hasn’t been answered. Kraner said there are some apartments with meal preparation facilities, however most students will benefit from having the service provided for the student. Kraner confirmed that there will be meal plan exemptions for religious and medical issues.

Senator Gauthier asked about portion control, Kraner answered that there is no control for portions or choices but that the dining services will offer healthy choices.

Senator Mary Sirridge wondered, if it is such a great idea, why do we have force people to do it? Maybe we should offer a program that really appeals to students to make them want to be there. Senator George Stanley says students often need to be forced to do the right thing. He reported that he gives a quiz everyday at the beginning of class as a way of taking attendance. In student evaluations, his students respond that they hate the quizzes because it makes them come to class, but grades have gone up since he instituted this policy. This is another instance in which students are not given a choice in the matter, but the faculty member does what is best for them.

Comments on Student Position on First Year Residency -- Donald Hodge, Student Representative

Hodge began by saying he is speaking for the thousands of students who are against the first-year residency proposal. The Student Senate and 70% of the parents in Focus Groups are against this proposal. He expressed embarrassment at the information given today by other speakers because false statements included. He contended that the residency requirement is about money. The dining master plan is contingent upon having the residential program. There are no controls in place for higher costs on residence and food. He stated that the US New and World Report deemed LSU at the second tier (sic) school because the state doesn’t provide LSU with adequate faculty and per-student support, not because of the lack of a residency requirement. Although LSU claims residence halls will be 40% renovation by 2008, but that still leaves 60% without renovation. He stated that the renovated halls will go to upperclassmen because freshmen are given the last choice. Although exemptions are listed in the speeches given, Hodge stated that he wants to know exactly what the exemptions are, he has been told these will be decided later. Privacy will be violated if students must submit medical documents to qualify for an exemption. There is a host of civil liberty violations inherent in the proposal including the potential for search and seizure problems. He claimed that a majority of students and parents don’t want the requirement. He doesn’t want to see a monopoly on campus for housing and food.

Whitney Breaux, a Student Senator and Chairman of the Students Rights and Welfare Committee, spoke next. She reported having a good experience on campus, but she is an independent person and wishes to make up her own mind. Breaux said that the cost projections in today’s presentation were far from the figures seen on her fee bill. There are benefits to the proposal, but she wants it changed. She urged her audience to give students a choice, don’t take away options. She reported that Donald Hodge will send packets to the Faculty Senators with proposed changes to the resolution. She commented that Faculty Senators should be invited to live in the dormitory for a few days.

Senator George Stanley commented that we (those in Faculty Senate) have probably all lived in dorms during our education.

Comments from Student Government – Student Government President Chris Odinet

Chris Odinet, President of the Student Senate spoke next. His aim was to articulate Student Government’s stance on the issue to the university. The Student Senate Resolution has three main points of concern with the residency requirement.

1. Financial constraints would burden students
2. Civil liberties would be curtailed
3. Freedom of choice would be restricted, and students should be able to decide where to live.

Student Government believes that students should have a choice. The Student Government understands that there are academic advantages to having a first-year residency program, and that there is increased involvement and a better sense of community, but they still feel the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. The Student Government asks that the Faculty Senate join them in recommending that the Chancellor to reject this proposal.
Senator Christie asked Mr. Odinet if he believes that students should be able to decide about taking general education courses. Odinet answered no, Christie replied that he rests his case.

Odinet doesn’t negate social and academic benefits, but they don’t outweigh the disadvantages. He was asked what would make it more palatable to the student government. Odinet responded that they don’t want privacy violated by having to provide their reasons not to be there.

**New Business**

**Faculty Senate Resolution on First Year Residency-Hector Zapata**

Dr. Zapata began by explaining that the vote was not unanimous on the EPC, so drafting a resolution was difficult.

**First Reading of the Resolution:**

................................................

**LSU Faculty Senate Resolution**

**Educational Policy Committee Support for a First-Year Residency Requirement**

Introduced by Dr. Hector O. Zapata, Chair EPC

January 24, 2007

Whereas, the LSU Educational Policy Committee is committed to advancing the University’s Flagship Agenda and elevating the institution from a third-tier institution to a first or second-tier;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate is requesting input concerning the proposed First-Year Residency Requirement;

Whereas, the Educational Policy Committee of the LSU Faculty Senate has met with student leaders and administrators who were invited to provide evidence and arguments about the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed First-Year Residency Requirement for 2008;

Whereas, evidence presented to the Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee reported the following advantages of First-Year Residency Requirement:

- It will advance Objectives 3 and 4 of the University’s Flagship Agenda.
- Data from the Office of Budget and Planning show that students living on-campus their first year have higher GPA’s, a higher retention rate from 1st to 2nd year, and higher graduation rates for 4th, 5th, and 6th year time periods.
- National and regional data show positive academic benefits for students;

Whereas, having heard detailed presentations¹, having reviewed the materials presented by these representatives, and considering that the concerns expressed by the LSU Faculty Senate Special Committee on the Freshman Residency Requirement in 2004 regarding said requirement have been addressed, the Educational Policy Committee finds that the arguments in favor of the potential for improved academic performance outweigh the disadvantages of such a requirement.

**Be it Resolved**, that the Educational Policy Committee supports the implementation of a First-Year Residency Requirement.

**Be it Further Resolved**, that the Educational Policy Committee recommends that those who implement the First-Year Residency Requirement address the following concerns of the committee:

- The need for ongoing study of the effects of the requirement on student academic performance and the quality of student life at LSU, the results of which should be reported annually to the full Faculty Senate and to the Educational Policy Committee for review.

¹ See attached December 8, 2006 Educational Policy Committee minutes for a full list of participants
• The need for provisions for student preferences with regard to particular housing assignments, appropriate flexibility in meal plans, and enhanced recruitment based on the benefits of living on campus.
• The need for provisions for appropriate exceptions and appeals, based on economic hardship and other appropriate justifications.

Senator Perlis noted that this isn’t a resolution because it isn’t from the Faculty Senate, it is from the Education Policy Committee. Senator Christie says he’ll sponsor the resolution, and he endorsed it as his resolution. There will be a wording change so it emanates from the Faculty Senate rather than the Education Policy Committee.

Senator Perlis stated that he is more in favor of this resolution than he was before today’s meeting, but he wants a statement that allows students to opt out of the meal plan, with that change he could support it.

Senator Kuehney asked about the statement in the resolution, “Be it Further Resolved that the Educational Policy Committee recommends that those who implement the First-Year Residency Requirement address the following concerns of the committee.” He wonders to whom the words “those who implement the …Requirement” refer. The Provost answered by saying that the Provost is ultimately be responsible for the program and any questions related to it.

Past President Claire Advocat wondered if we have a sense about parents’ reactions to the requirement. Zapata answered this question by reporting that, in responses from other universities, parents like the plan, students don’t.

This question was raised: Which is true, does it cost more or less?

Dr. Debora Schulze replied that there are many of ways to calculate costs for on-campus and off-campus living. However, lots of the costs related to on-campus life are for the full-time in-house staff members living in the dorms, so you aren’t comparing apples and apples. She further explained that Ms. Breaux did pay more for housing because she was in a residential college program and there are more staff costs involved in such a plan, including salaries of faculty involved in the residential college program.

Senator Stanley stated that he believes that living on campus anywhere costs more than living off campus. But there are advantages to living on campus. He is bothered by the sense of entitlement, that education should be free, coming from both students and parents. He says we have to do what is right for students.

President Daly says that if you shorten the time a student spends at LSU to four years (by increasing graduation rates), that saves a full year of costs. Zapata reported that the Resident Hall organization voted to support the residency requirement.

Dr. Collins thanked the Senate for its consideration of both sides of this issue.

Senator Christie says he is bothered by the Student Governments focus on cost. Daly suggested we all consider the cost/benefit ratio in this situation.

Senator Jeff Kuehney encouraged the Senate to look at more than the bickering that is going on, we need to rise above and decide what our job is here. He stated that it is clear that the quality of education improves when students live on campus, and that should be our focus. President Daly reiterated this by saying that the function of the faculty senate in the case is to should consider pedagogical advantages.

Senator Sirridge commented that the honors students shouldn’t be in the grade statistics. Dr. Rohli explained that the same number of honors students live on and off campus, so that doesn’t affect the comparison.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.