President’s Report:
- Strain appointed to Higher Education Transition Team
- Report from Higher Education Transition Team
  - System Restructuring
  - Funding Stability
- Report on Gender Equity Sports Lawsuit Settlement
- University response to SACS Report
- Report on activities of Faculty Advisory Council for Board of Regents
- Council of Louisiana Colleges and Universities Conference February 29-March

Invited Guest:
Provost Jenkins elected not to deliver the second in a series of ‘white papers’ he planned to deliver because of potential changes in higher education proposed by Governor Foster.

Old Business:
- Senate voted to approve Mass Communications Curriculum Change
- Resolution 95-01: Drop/Withdrawal Policy amended and returned to ASH Committee
- Resolution 95-02: Pass/Fail and Advising (Passed)
- Resolution 95-03: Repeat Policy (Defeated)

MINUTES
Faculty Senate Meeting
January 12, 1996

The meeting was called to order by President Strain at 3:05 pm. Proxies were announced. Guests present included Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost Williams Jenkins; Associate Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Laura Lindsay; Carolyn Walker (Academic Affairs); Robert Doolos, Registrar; Lisa Harris, Director of Undergraduate Admissions; Louis Day and Ronald Garay (Mass Communications); Erik Monday, Student Body President; Alan Fletcher, Chair, ASH; Paul PaskotI, Courses and Curricula; Kristine Calongne (LSU Today); Monica Martinez (Revilla); Mary Boudreaux (Staff Senate); Neil Kestner (Chemistry); Erwin Poljakoff (Chemistry); John Glascock (Finance); Gregory Griffin (Chemical Engineering); Karl Roider (Arts and Sciences); R. Eugene Turner (Oceanography); and Joy Irwin (Business Administration). President Strain noted a correction for the December 4 minutes to delete the phrase “that was distributed last month in Alan Fletcher’s interim report to the Senate,” on page 3, paragraph 2, noting that these recommendations appeared in the final ASH report, not the interim report. A motion was made by John Collier, seconded by Ralph Kinney, and approved to accept the minutes as corrected.

President's Report:
President Strain reported that he was asked to serve on the Higher Education Transition Team appointed by Governor Foster as the statewide faculty representative. Executive Vice Chancellor Jim Coleman serves as the Chair of the 21 member committee. Foster gave the team seven broad issues to address, but also gave them carte blanche authorization to suggest changes they feel will improve higher education. The seven recommendations deal with (1) providing constitutional protection for all of higher education funding; (2) streamlining and rethinking the governance of higher education; (3) repair and maintenance of university and college buildings and infrastructure; (4) the development of a comprehensive community college system; (5) placing additional emphasis on basic sciences, applied research, and technology transfer programs which have a direct impact on economic development; (6) enhancing our capabilities of attracting nationally renowned faculty and students and developing a plan for increasing faculty salaries; and (7) reduction of bureaucracy and redefining spending priorities in order to place the greatest emphasis on direct research and classroom instruction activities. The Higher Education Transition Team is meeting weekly on Fridays for 4-5 hours at least until mid-February. Strain reported that he has a very positive feeling about Foster’s approach to higher education.
Strain then reported that at the most recent meeting, the Team proposed a hybrid single board for higher education that would mean redistributing schools in the different systems (LSU Board of Supervisors, the Southern Board of Supervisors, and the University Louisiana System Board) which currently report to the Board of Regents. The Governor is proposing three new groups: the LSU system (incorporating LSU-Baton Rouge, the Law Center, the Agriculture Center, the Medical Center, and Pennington); Southern University (Southern-Baton Rouge), and a third group consisting of the schools in the Trustee System or University of Louisiana System (including LSU-Alexandria, LSU-Eunice, LSU-Shreveport, USL, Southern-New Orleans, and Southern-Shreveport). The Governor also suggested the Board of Regents as we know it will not exist although there will have be some sort of oversight governing body. Strain said this proposed change will have a very positive impact on LSU because it recognizes the preeminence of LSU.

Other changes cited include splitting the Department of Labor two ways with parts of the department shifting to the Department of Economic Development and the rest of the department becoming the new Department of Work Force Development. It is still uncertain where the vo-tech schools and the community college system are going to be placed. The Governor’s goal is to decrease the administrative levels of bureaucracy and their associated costs. According to Strain, the Governor wants to depoliticize higher education. The Governor asked the Higher Education Transition Team to provide advice on the new governing boards for the LSU, Southern, and University of Louisiana Systems as well as advice in terms of the makeup of the governing boards and the qualifications for the people appointed to them.

Another major issue discussed at the Team meeting was how to constitutionally protect higher education funding. An integral part of the special session or constitutional convention convening in March will be a proposed revision to the Constitution to afford Higher Education the same protection that other state agencies have, such as K-12. A goal is that if LSU does not get increased funding it will at least have funding consistent with the previous year. The Team’s agenda is also to ensure that there are no unfunded mandates that have to be absorbed from the existing budget, such as: Civil Service step increases, faculty promotions, risk management, utility increases, tuition exemption for National Guard members, etc.

Some of the Governor’s transition teams are meeting jointly which should improve communication. For example, the Higher Education Transition Team has a subcommittee that is meeting with the Economic Development Transition Team and a different subcommittee that is planning to meet with the K-12 Transition Team, on which President Strain is a representative.

President Strain then reported on the Gender Equity Sports Lawsuit stating that the Judge had released a decision in terms of women’s soccer and football. According to Strain, LSU was found in fault to a limited extent so the State of Louisiana will be obligated to pick up some of the associated legal costs. This money will come from the Risk Management Budget, not the LSU Budget. Regarding the soccer portion of the lawsuit the Judge determined that there was no intentional violation of the law so there were no punitive damages. President Strain stated that LSU has twenty days in which to report to the judge on the specifics of a plan on how LSU is going to deal with the gender equity issue for sports.

Strain reported that a group of faculty and administrators are working on the one-year report to SACS that is due in May. There were five “suggestions” to respond to on the university’s progress, the biggest of which was the recommendation to institute cyclical programmatic reviews of all undergraduate and graduate programs. According to Strain, the proposed guidelines for this review process have been under development for several months by a committee chaired by Laura Lindsay and will be brought before the Senate at the February meeting.

President Strain also mentioned that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee received an anonymous note from a department chair complaining about the raises that went to some LSU administrators when faculty received their 3% raise January 1st. The Executive Committee will be discussing this issue with the Provost and Chancellor at their next meetings.

The first meeting of the Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) to the Board of Regents was held and President Strain was elected chair. FAC consists of four faculty members, one from each of the following systems; the LSU System, the Southern System, the Trustees System and the President of the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates (ALFS), which is George Strain. The Council met with Dr. Jerry Pinsel, the Regents’ staff person hired to work on accountability issues. The Board of Regents has asked for FAC’s participation, input and guidance in helping to develop both campus and faculty accountability measures. President Strain stated that he viewed this as very positive since FAC would have the opportunity to prevent “inappropriate and overly intrusive measures” from becoming written into policy or law.

Vice Chancellor Eaton has requested that a faculty representative serve on committee to examine how to best utilize patent royalty dollars that are distributed to the Office of Research and Economic Development. Senate Vice President John Collier will be the representative.

The annual Council of Louisiana Colleges and Universities Conference will be held in Lafayette, February 29-March 1. The topic will be “The Responsive University” and the keynote speaker will talk on “Responding to the Public Call for Accountability.” Governor Foster will also speak. The two representatives elected to attend this conference are Jim Catanese of English and Betsy Garrison of Human Ecology. President Strain will be attending as well. President Strain announced that if anyone else was interested in attending, they should see him after the meeting for additional information.
Invited Guest:

President Strain noted that because of the impact of Governor Foster’s directions that morning to the Higher Education Transition Team Provost Jenkins said that he would not be making the presentation he had previously planned to deliver.

Vice-Chancellor Jenkins’ Presentation

The Provost acknowledged that as a result of his discussions with President Strain and John Collier earlier, it would seem “out of phase” to discuss the question of restructuring or potential downsizing the university at this time. He then thanked the Senate for their input on his first discussion paper in November and said that, although he has heard a few negative comments, in general, responses have been very favorable. The Provost urged everyone to continue to share their thoughts with him.

The Provost said that “in the world of strategic planning, one looks for ‘shifting paradigms’ . . .” Reflecting back, he said that there was some inkling that the new governor-elect wanted to restructure higher education and there was a strong feeling that LSU would unquestionably have to become the flagship, the premier, the lead university. But, he did not know until late yesterday afternoon (1/11/96) exactly how that was to be accomplished. Provost Jenkins, like President Strain, said that he has a sense of optimism from the new administrative group and, if not everything, much of what President Strain reported will come to pass. Therefore, the university’s strategy, heretofore driven by fiscal constraints, would have to change. That is why he decided to delay his planned presentation.

The Provost indicated that he had planned to look at potential re-organization models, having picked a modest model as a template for developing a scheme and then, through discourse, discussion and perhaps argument, put a new organizational scheme in place. However, with the latest directions from the Governor, the Provost said the new driving force in every case will be a cohesion of our intellectual efforts from a research sense, in a teaching sense, and in a service sense. Any decision to be made now will need to have some rationale behind it; and, in fact, be of benefit to the faculty and students. According to the Provost’s remarks, there is still going to be the issue of “how LSU should reorganize and arrange our academic units and how we should reorganize for the future of the university,” recognizing that there is every likelihood that LSU will no doubt become the premier research university in the state. The total research dollars should make LSU one of the top 25 universities in the United States.

The Provost indicated that the university’s thinking was going to have to change and that LSU’s collaborative academic outreach efforts were going to be different in the future. Therefore, he asked if the Senate could wait and see what the transition teams does and then revisit this issue. He summarized by restating that he believes there has been a ‘major paradigm shift’ in this state. He too believes that “The Louisiana State University” is going to be a university with a far more enhanced, diverse and inclusive mission than perhaps it has had in the past with significant and appropriate financial support. Jenkins then entertained questions.

In response to a question regarding the time-table for some of these paradigm shifts to occur, Jenkins indicated that the issue will be on the agenda for the March special legislative session. Therefore, changes are expected to occur very quickly. Some, especially the constitutional changes, will have to go to the people.

Provost Jenkins responding to a question concerning funding opportunities through private industry, indicated that the Governor expects universities to work with and support industry. However Jenkins indicated that the trend of becoming more state assisted and not state supported or financed is a national trend and is not going to change. He concluded by wishing everyone a good year in what might be a landmark year for higher education.

Old Business:

Senator John Collier moved the adoption of changes proposed in the curriculum of the Manship School of Mass Communication. The motion was seconded by Senator Kinney. Collier indicated that Louis Day wrote a memo responding to the concerns raised last month regarding electives. A copy of this response was distributed to Senators with the agenda.

President Strain reiterated that the motion was to approve the change in the Mass Communication curriculum to reduce the number of required hours in foreign language and to reduce the number of required hours in English literature which still keeps the department’s curriculum within the General Education requirements for the University. The motion passed.

The second item of old business was Resolution 95-01 (copy attached). Resolution 95-01 proposed a change in withdrawal policy as it affects the last date for withdrawing from a course, the last date to add a course, and a maximum number of “W” grades permitted. President Strain commented that he has received from the Provost a number of responses, including one from the Council of Deans and Directors Committee on Curricular Matters, as well as several college administrators who would have to administer these policies- all pointing to a number of perceived problems with both resolutions. These memos were duplicated and available on the table for the senators to read. In addition, President Strain noted that, according to memos from Robert Doolos, Registrar, it would be very difficult to permit changes from pass/fail to grades by the last day of class since grade sheets are printed one week before final exams begin each semester. Also difficult to enforce would be blocking registration for anyone with D’s or F’s until they see an advisor, since advanced billing now has students registering and paying bills well before the final grades are even available. Resolution 95-01 on withdrawal and drop was opened for discussion.
Senator Moore asked if the Reggie program could be modified to prevent two withdrawals in one semester. President Strain commented that presumably that is possible.

Senator John Collier then remarked that there were some comments in opposition to this resolution stating that "it was an unworkable policy." He asked Robert Doolos to comment on the difficulties he saw in implementing this policy from his standpoint. Doolos responded that Reggie could handle its part of it, but he saw a manpower problem. If students have to see someone to have an exception made, who is that someone going to be that will have time to administer those exceptions to this policy. Doolos said that it is his understanding from working with the Deans offices that their workloads are already at a peak, with counselors and advisors maxed out in most departments.

Collier asked Doolos if he had an estimate of the number of exceptions per semester and the time involved with these. Doolos responded "No," but added that he did have data on total withdrawals made by department and that the information on withdrawals per semester by the Deans offices that their workloads are already at a peak, with counselors and advisors maxed out in most departments.

Reggie could handle its part of it, but he saw a manpower problem. If students have to see someone to have an exception made, who is that policy." He asked Robert Doolos to comment on the difficulties he saw in implementing this policy from his standpoint. Doolos responded that there are already existing policies and procedures in place for such things and that it would be possible under certain circumstances for the make those decisions and work that process. She also mentioned that, in the past, the faculty had to approve a student's withdrawal from their class and that it might have to revert back to that system.

Senator Cherry commented that the ASH Committee was asked to discuss the drop/withdraw policy and all the repeat/delete policy. He said that the committee tried very hard to separate out the issues of grades and what looked best on a transcript and concentrated on what was best for the students. The committee focused on how they could help students. He acknowledged that some of the ASH proposals have technical problems, but reiterated that the committee proposals were written for the benefit of the student. He read again the four recommendations from Resolution 95-01 justifying to the Senate the reasoning behind each proposal.

Associate Vice-Chancellor Lindsay asked Senator Cherry if recommendation #4 applied to undergraduate or graduate students or both, because it was not clearly expressed in the recommendation. She then inquired about the exceptions for those students who have to drop all their courses in a given semester, asking if that would count as their quota of 5 W's given those special extenuating circumstances. Cherry said that there are already existing policies and procedures in place for such things and that it would be possible under certain circumstances for the students to have a override or appeal of their limit.

Senator Cherry commented that the ASH Committee was asked to discuss the drop/withdraw policy and all the repeat/delete policy. He said that the committee tried very hard to separate out the issues of grades and what looked best on a transcript and concentrated on what was best for the students. The committee focused on how they could help students. He acknowledged that some of the ASH proposals have technical problems, but reiterated that the committee proposals were written for the benefit of the student. He read again the four recommendations from Resolution 95-01 justifying to the Senate the reasoning behind each proposal.

Senator John Collier offered a substitute motion for the original Resolution 95-01 and moved that the Faculty Senate approve this resolution in principle only, referring it back to the committee to work out some of the technical details that seem to be apparent in working with the Provost’s office and the Office of the Registrar, spelling out those exceptions brought up by Laura Lindsay and report back to the Senate with their final recommendations.

Discussion of the proposed amendment focused on potential problems created by the original proposal and a suggestion by Senator Moore to postpone implementation of the second part of the proposal. Senator Cherry said that the only specific technical issue that he heard mentioned concerned the problem of a student who withdraws from more than one class per semester and then needs to receive prior approval of an academic advisor. He added that if the guidance resources are not adequate for this, then that issue should be addressed. Cherry again reiterated that there already were procedures to allow for catastrophic problems causing students to withdraw from the entire semester.

Senator Draughn recommended raising the number of drops to 8-10 to allow for circumstances beyond the students control as well as for some judgmental discrimination by the student. Senator Dan Yannitel commented that limiting the number of drops was a very positive thing for the education of students. According to Yannitel, the university is doing students a serious disservice by having the drop date as late as it is and also by engendering them with policies that impact their behavior negatively. By these institutional policies, we are teaching students the preconceived notion that it is alright to drop a course 3/4's of the way through it if the grade is not what they need.

Senator Ralph Kinney called for the question and President Strain asked Senators if they were ready to vote on substituting John Collier's resolution for the original one. The amendment passed by a vote of 32 for and 18 against. Next, a vote was taken on the substitute motion to adopt the ASH committee’s proposal in principle only with the direction that they go back and consider the points raised and submit a proposal to properly address those questions. The motion passed.

The next item of old business was Resolution 95-02 (copy attached). President Strain explained that one purpose of this resolution was to encourage students to experiment with courses. There was no discussion of the resolution. The Resolution passed.

The final item of old business was Resolution 95-03 which proposed a repeat policy, based on a model developed by SGA President Erik Monday. President Strain noted that he Deans and Directors several years ago recommended a similar policy and they repeated that
resolve the first grade made in that course, and have only the second grade used in calculating the GPA from Resolution 95-03. President Strain then pointed out that the ASH Committee advised against adopting a repeat policy, based on many points, but perhaps most central was the issue of a perceived loss of integrity in the transcript, even though no grades are proposed to be deleted from the transcript by this resolution. President Strain noted that a specific recommendation on the table such as this one had never gone before the Senate to see what was being considered, so he compiled this one for the Senate’s consideration.

Senator Dan Yannitelli spoke in opposition to Resolution 95-03. He said that all of the various restrictions mentioned could easily be argued either way. Senator Kinney spoke in favor of the Resolution stating that it doesn’t harm anyone and that it could conceivably help some students. He said that 3 courses or 9 hours would not lower standards. Senator Cherry spoke against the resolution, stating that it addressed symptoms and not the problem.

President Strain asked Student Body President, Erik Monday, to respond to a question from Senator Barkley asking for an explanation of repeat/delete. Monday reemphasized once again that both grades would appear on the transcript. He said that this policy was for the good student citing the example of the engineering student taking 12 hours of Engineering courses and 3 hours of Philosophy for a General Ed. requirement. The student concentrates so much on the courses in his major that he makes a “D” in the Philosophy course. This repeat policy would give him the incentive to retake that Philosophy course and earn a better grade and have the second grade calculated into his new modified GPA. This policy is popular with students because they believe it gives them another way to retake a class, learn the material again, and also get a benefit on their GPA. One disadvantage of not having a repeat policy, according to Monday, is that LSU students are at a competitive disadvantage when they compete for jobs or for graduate school. He reported that the repeat policy ranked among the top five concerns of the student body in the SGA survey conducted last fall.

There was more discussion concerning which schools in the same area have such a policy. Twenty-two schools were listed and only 12 of those have a repeat policy of some type. However, all of those schools leave the original course on the transcripts and do not refer to their policy as repeat/delete but rather as a repeat or forgiveness policy. Of those 12 schools, only 2 calculate and adjust the GPA to reflect the 2nd grade received in the course.

At the conclusion of discussion on Resolution 95-03 a vote was taken with 10 votes in favor of the resolution. The resolution failed.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Wittkopf, Member-at-Large
Recorder

Resolution 95-01

Whereas the Admissions, Standards, and Honors Committee of the Louisiana State University Faculty Senate has fulfilled the charge assigned to it by the Senate, and given a fresh look to the University’s current Drop/Withdraw policy and the concept of a Repeat/Delete policy, and

Whereas the Committee has attempted to consider the best academic interests of LSU students and the overall benefits of these ideas to both the students and the University,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate accept without change the four specific proposals submitted by the ASH Committee and that the University implement these policies by the start of the Fall 1996 semester:

1. Beginning with the seventh day of classes, a student who drops a course receives a W on his or her record.

2. The final date for adding a course will be the ninth day of class.

3. The final date for dropping a class and receiving a W will be the 24th day of class.

4. No student will be permitted to receive a total of more than five W grades during his or her academic career at LSU-BP. A student who wishes to withdraw from more than one class per semester must receive the prior approval of an academic advisor.