LSU Faculty Senate Meeting
3:00 P.M., May 6, 2005, Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union Building

Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:
1. Claire Advokat (Senate President)  3. Charles Delzell (Secretary)
2. Andrew Christie (Member-at-Large)  4. Carruth McGehee (Ex Officio, Immed. Past Pres.)

FSEC members absent:
1. Pratul Ajmera (Member-at-Large)  3. Sarah Pierce (Vice-President)
2. John Chandler (Member-at-Large)

Senators present:

Proxies for absent Senators:
3. John Pizer for Yvonne Fuentes  8. Mary McGehee for Aimee Welch
5. Randall Hall for Irvin Peckham  10. Barbara Wittkopf for Lisl Zach

Alternate Representative: Craig Freeman for Louis Day

Senators absent without proxies + (# of consecutive absences without proxies):
9. Angeletta Gourdine  15. Carl Motsenbocker
10. Maren Hegsted  16. Thomas Neff
12. Laura Hensley  18. Witoon

Parliamentarian: Professor O. Carruth McGehee.

Visitors: Chancellor Sean O’Keefe; Executive Vice-Chancellor and Provost Risa Palm; Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Karen Denby; Vice-Provost Frank Cartledge; University Registrar Robert Doolos; Professor Michael Cherry.
1. Officers thought that a quorum was present, but after the meeting, the attendance record showed only 34 senators present, one short of a quorum. No one challenged the presence of a quorum.

2. Consideration of the minutes of the February 17, 2005 Senate meeting was deferred, due to concerns that Senator Delzell’s February 17 report on the FSEC’s February 15 meeting with LSU System Vice-President for Academic Affairs Carolyn Hargrave about PM-35 (pages 4-5 of the February 17 minutes) had been critical of the LSU System Office.

3. The minutes of the March 15, 2005 Senate meeting were approved.

4. Remarks by Chancellor Sean O’Keefe. He reported that LSU’s higher admission standards had been followed by higher enrollment. He said that, at 31,000 students, LSU is as large as it can get. He said that LSU needs to increase the percentage (now 17%) of graduate students in the student population. He discussed the recent invitation to all departments to apply for Foundation of Excellence status, and the fact that the University Planning Council (with no input from the Chancellor’s Office) had been reviewing the applications submitted by various departments. He said that it is important that the criteria for and process of selection of the Foundations of Excellence be understandable to everyone. He expressed the desire that the Foundation of Excellence competition become more frequent than it has been. He discussed the new office of Vice-Chancellor for Research and Economic Development that he was creating; he said that this new research position will be separate from the administration of graduate education. Kevin Carman (Dean of the College of Basic Sciences) will chair the search committee for this new VC position. He discussed the new Office of Vice-Chancellor for Communications and University Relations that he was creating. He described LSU’s $300 million endowment as “anemic,” and discussed fundraising. He discussed LSU’s 2005-2006 budget, and various unfunded costs of advancing the National Flagship Agenda. He discussed the Board of Regents’ proposal (April/May 2005) to change the requirement of a 2/3 vote of the legislature in order to raise tuition. This tuition proposal, if enacted by the legislature, would enable LSU to pursue the Flagship Agenda. [The proposal was not enacted.] He discussed the problem of providing health insurance for graduate students, and electronic journal subscription support for the library. When asked whether a security system like that in the Vet School could be put in the life sciences building, he indicated that he was opposed.

5. Senator Randall Hall was elected to the second member-at-large position on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

6. Senate President’s report: President Advokat announced that the McGehee Award Fund (see Resolution 05-05, December 8, 2004; http://senate.lsu.edu/Resolutions.html), had been established. She announced that a PM-35 Committee had been established to continue negotiations with the LSU System to replace PM-35 in accordance with Senate Resolution 04-10 (http://senate.lsu.edu/Resolutions.html). She announced that the new academic calendar that the Office of Academic Affairs had recently proposed for the 2006-2007 academic year had been withdrawn; some of the better-received proposals for calendar changes will be considered for later years. She announced that the Administrative Service Committee Report would be posted on the Faculty Senate website (http://senate.lsu.edu; click on “Pertinent Reports”). She reported on the on-
going struggle to create an Ombuds position at LSU, referring to a 1997 report recommending the creation of such a position [http://senate.lsu.edu; click on “Pertinent Reports”].

7. Professor Michael Cherry, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), reported on the activities of the EPC in its first year of existence. He said that the EPC was disappointed that the Committee on Admissions, Standards, and Honors (ASH) had decided not to seek an increase in admission standards this year; ASH wanted to wait a year or so to see the impact of the latest standards; ASH might consider an increase next year. He said that he and the EPC would encourage ASH and the Senate to address admission standards in the next academic year. He reported that the EPC discussed linking courses together in learning communities; required versus optional final exams; and questions involving class attendance and excused absences. The EPC also discussed graduation rates and students’ progress toward degrees. He said that the Provost had set up a Graduation Task Force consisting of deans (with John Hamilton as Chair). Professor Cherry said that LSU’s 6-year graduation rate is low; this year neither the EPC nor the Graduation Task Force offer specific suggestions to improve the retention and graduation rates; but next year they plan to make some suggestions.

8. Senate President-Elect William Daly presented a plaque to Claire Advokat, in appreciation of her distinguished service as President of the Faculty Senate, 2004-2005.
Minutes

1. Call to order; quorum appeared to be present, but wasn’t; no challenge:
By 3:09 P.M., President Advokat and Secretary Delzell had counted what appeared to be 35 senators in the room; they therefore believed that a quorum had been achieved, and Senate President Advokat then called the meeting to order.

Secretary’s note: After the meeting, however, the attendance records showed that no more than 34 authorized members of the Senate were present at any given time during the meeting (see page 1 of these minutes). The Senate Constitution states:

“Fifty percent of the authorized membership of the Senate shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business of the Senate.”

The Senate has 69 authorized members (see page 1 of these minutes), not counting one vacant Senate seat for the College of Music and Dramatic Arts (that vacancy was not noticed until after the 2004-2005 academic year). In the version of the Constitution currently posted at http://senate.lsu.edu/FSCB.pdf, there is a footnote after the word “quorum” above; the footnote reads:

“Interpretation: A ruling made in January 2005 states that elected Senators, including those duly designated as Senators for a semester or more, count toward a quorum; alternate representatives do not, and absent Senators who assign proxies do not.”

Thus, Professor Craig Freeman (alternate representative for Senator Day), does not count toward a quorum; nor do the 10 other absent Senators who assigned proxies (see page 1 above). At the beginning of today’s meeting, when President Advokat and Secretary Delzell were counting senators, they probably counted Professor Freeman as a senator, not realizing that he was actually an alternative representative.

No one challenged the presence of a quorum.

President Advokat read the names of proxies and alternative representatives for absent senators.

2. Deferral of consideration of minutes of February 17, 2005 Senate meeting:
2.a. The LSU System officers know the procedure for changing a Permanent Memorandum: President Advokat asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the February 17, 2005 Senate meeting (http://senate.lsu.edu/Minutes.html). Senator Wittkopf expressed the concern that pages 4-5 of the February 17 minutes do not accurately reflect the procedures of how changes are made to a PM [i.e., a “Permanent Memorandum” from the LSU System]. She recommended postponing ratification of the February 17 minutes so that they could more accurately reflect our knowledge of the process for making policy recommendations to the LSU System office. Both [LSU System Vice-President for Academic Affairs] Carolyn Hargrave and [LSU System President] Bill Jenkins have worked with LSU before moving to the System office, and know the procedures, she said. It is not a matter of them vacillating in informing the Faculty Senate Executive Committee of how to proceed in making recommendations for change, she said. Her point is that they both know the procedure (though she wasn’t sure what wording they had used to convey that), and “we” also know the procedure, and we can find a better way to do some of that wording, to make it look better, and reflect “our” knowledge of the process. So she
moved to delay the ratification of the February minutes until that can be changed [inaudible]. The motion was seconded.

2.b. Pages 4-5 accurately record and attribute Senator Delzell’s remarks of February 17: Secretary Delzell (author of the February 17 minutes) didn’t have a copy of the February minutes at his fingertips, but he recalled that the passage on pages 4-5 to which Senator Wittkopf was referring was a quotation (not quite verbatim) of his own remarks of that day. He recalled having said, on February 17, the things ascribed to him on pages 4-5 [about what LSU System President Jenkins and LSU System Vice President Hargrave had, on different days, told the FSEC]. He said that if, by chance, that passage did not make it clear that it was quoting or reporting Senator Delzell’s remarks of February 17, then that would be a problem. Senator Wittkopf understood that what was written on pages 4-5 was pretty much what was recorded on the audiotape on February 17. She didn’t know if we were supposed to be transcribing the words verbatim, [inaudible] reflecting the work of this body and thus showing that we do not know the procedure for moving something through the System office. She thought that this was not in our best interest.

2.c. Robert’s Rules’ guidelines on minutes; inclusion of certain statements problematical: Parliamentarian McGehee said that this is a bit of a conundrum. He made sure that everyone understood that the motion on the floor is to defer consideration of the February 17 minutes until September. In view of this problem, this is fine, he said. The basic thing here is that Robert’s Rules has certain guidelines for minutes, and they are quite restrictive, he said. They are supposed to record official actions of the body. We have been in the habit this year of approving a rather complete transcript of the meeting, so it becomes one question whether so-and-so said what the minutes say, and another matter whether what was said was correct. We may not be satisfied that the answer to both of those is yes. And yet all these statements, whether or not open to correction or refutation or answer, go into our official minutes. He said that that is problematical. He thought that that kind of problem will have to be addressed, and that deferring approval of these minutes just might be a good idea.

2.d. Senate Constitution mandates “detailed” minutes: Secretary Delzell quoted the Constitution of the Faculty Senate: “The Secretary of the Faculty Senate shall record detailed minutes of the proceedings of all meetings.” He said that he had not read Robert’s Rules lately, and he didn’t remember what it says about minutes—whether minutes should or should not be detailed, or how detailed they should be, but he thought that the Constitution trumps Robert’s Rules in case of conflict. To him, “detailed minutes” include strong statements; if someone makes a strong statement, whether true or false, then there should be a record of it.

2.e. Faculty will be suspicious if we “correct” the minutes so as to misrepresent what was said: Senator Homberger said that she would like to speak up for truth in what is being done. Minutes should reflect what was done. If something is truthfully reported, then this is how it is, she said. This is an open meeting; everybody can be here, the press can be here, everybody can hear what is being said. She thought that if we have minutes, they are based upon what we record. She said that she would be suspicious, as a faculty member, if she knew that the Faculty Senate minutes would be “corrected” afterwards so as not to represent what was really said. If

---

1 Secretary’s note: Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised, 10th edition, October 2000: “In an ordinary society, unless the minutes are to be published, they should contain mainly a record of what was done at the meeting, not what was said by the members” (p. 451; emphasis in original). On the other hand, Robert also says (p. 458): “MINUTES TO BE PUBLISHED. When minutes are to be published, they should contain, in addition to the information described above, a list of the speakers on each side of every question, with an abstract or the text of each address, in which case they may be called ‘proceedings,’ ‘transactions,’ or the like…” (italics added).
we have an audiotape, and the tape said this, then she doesn’t see why we should not stand up for what was said, she concluded.

2.f. Minutes should include official actions of the body; few have read the minutes: Parliamentarian McGehee said that the word “detailed” is defined well enough in the dictionary. But the word “minutes” is defined in Robert’s Rules. It is very specific; it includes official actions of the body. He said that he had been telling the Executive Committee repeatedly that we have been violating Robert’s Rules. If the body wants to approve the transcript and make that our official minutes, that’s fine; but the pertinent question right now, he said, is: “How many of you have read the minutes of February 17?” (Few hands went up.)

2.g. Motion adopted; February minutes deferred: Senate President Advokat put Senator Wittkopf’s motion to a vote; the vote was 23-17; President Advokat declared the motion adopted, and deferred consideration of the minutes of the February 17 meeting until the September meeting.

3. Approval of minutes of the March 15 Senate meeting:

President Advokat asked if there were any comments or corrections to the “report” of the March 15 Senate meeting. She said that she was referring to it as a report, and not as minutes, because on March 15 the Senate did not have a quorum, and so could not conduct official business. Someone asked about this “report.” President Advokat said that it is listed in the “Minutes” page of the Senate website (http://senate.lsu.edu) [and not, for example, in the “Other Reports” page of the Senate website]. She clarified that two reports were presented to the Senate on March 15, with no action taken by the Senate; she said that one report was on the collective bargaining survey of faculty, and the other report was the Provost’s report. She said: “Those were summarized for us, in lieu of official minutes.” Hearing no call for corrections of the March 15 minutes, she asked for a show of hands for approval of the “report.” It appeared to be unanimous, and she declared them to be approved.

4. Remarks by Chancellor Sean O’Keefe (3:19 P.M.):

4.a. Gratitude for Senate’s welcoming Resolution:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: Thank you, Claire, I appreciate the opportunity to spend time with you. First and foremost, this is my first opportunity to spend time with the Faculty Senate since my arrival, and I want to thank you for the really warm endorsement as a colleague that you have extended through the resolutions I saw passed before my arrival, and I am most grateful to you for that. That’s an expression, I think, of support as a colleague, that means an awful lot to me. I consider that to be quite a compliment, and I take it as such.

---

 Secretary’s note: Webster’s defines “detailed” as “marked by abundant detail or by thoroughness in treating small items or parts.” Webster’s also gives a list of synonyms of “circumstantial,” where it says: “DETAILED stresses abundance or completeness of detail.”

 Secretary’s note: The first report given on March 15 was presented by Executive Vice-Chancellor and Provost Risa Palm, and was entitled, “Advancing the Flagship Agenda”; the second report given on March 15 was entitled “LSU Faculty Issues Study Results.” President Advokat did not mention it, but not only do the March 15 minutes record the oral presentations of the above two reports, but the minutes also mention that at that meeting, President Advokat announced the then-current slate of candidates for the FSEC elections to be held on April 11. The minutes also include the lists of present and absent senators and officers on page 1, and the “Highlights” of the meeting on page 2; the official minutes themselves begin on page 3, and are entitled “Minutes.”

 Secretary’s note: Resolution 05-08, “Welcoming Chancellor Sean O’Keefe,” adopted January 24; http://senate.lsu.edu/Resolutions.html.
4.b. Next fall Chancellor plans to seek Senate’s input on a couple of policy questions:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: In my vast experiences, now, of nine weeks on the job, I am offering to you a few thoughts here on where our current activities stand, and walk through a couple of quick points in the presentation here. I am more than happy to engage in a dialog, but I’m going to ask, in the course of this, for your input and thoughts next semester on a couple of vital policy questions, I think, that are necessary, I think, in the spirit of shared governance, that I’d like to get a much better understanding from each of you in working through these challenges. So that’s coming towards the end of this presentation. I’ll make the intro as brief in terms of the run up to this, but it would be most helpful to receive that thought again—not an immediate reaction here, although that’s invited as well, but certainly something a little more structured in the fall would be most helpful.

4.c. Throughout the State, Chancellor has found enthusiasm and high regard for LSU:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: First of all, let me just give you a quick thumbnail of some of the external activities that are not covered in some of the presentation materials we use here in a minute. What I have engaged in in the last couple of months. That includes spending time across the State in every … most of the major cities, if not all, with editorial boards, the legislative folks who represent those respective districts, as well as with friends of the universities, alum, you name it, any number of different constituencies in that regard, as well as peers and colleagues there at each of the respective institutions throughout not only the System, but also throughout the University of Louisiana System and other elements of higher education throughout the State. So it has been a most enlightening range of inputs that I have received from them, that wide range of different interests. I would summarize the key common points of those inputs as overwhelming positive enthusiasm for this University. I have really been just buoyed by the fact it is an exceptionally strong reputation we have throughout the State, even among our peer institutions, that are other institutions of higher education, and those who are peers of ours as colleagues have a very high regard for what we do.

4.d. Higher admission standards have been followed by increased enrollment:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: And there’s no question that the reputation around the State, that the citizens of this State have for what we do here is doing nothing but ratcheting up. I understand … and it comes as a great surprise to most of the editorial boards, I guess maybe not surprisingly to us, but to them it does: that standards have been progressively marching forward, and that has resulted in a really exemplary, I think, improvement in the range of student body representation as well as the requirements we have for admission, which are progressively becoming more and more, I think, rigorous. And yet at the same time what their expectation was, and I think that which was safely predicted across the State in several cases, was that enrollment and demand would go down; it has done exactly the opposite. It is a testimonial, I think, to the notion advanced in the State higher education policy that as you continually demand higher performances and issue that challenge, that folks will perform commensurately. We are seeing nothing but a continuing change to that. This coming fall, the Board of Regents sets a standard that will require at least a 3.0 grade point average for admission, or a 25 ACT, or being in the top 10% of the graduating class in high school. Based on what we see so far, just on the admissions to date, more than half of those admitted meet the first two criteria; not “or”; “both.” More than half of who we have admitted exceed both 3.0 and 25. So as a consequence … just a range of interests as well as the standards of what the State wanted is being recognized here, I think, as coming as not only an enthusiastic reception by members of the legislature, certainly within the Governor’s administration, editorial boards, community leaders, alums, those folks within the business com-
munity—across the State this is overwhelmingly greeted with great enthusiasm—that we’re still
drawing that kind of …, and having the capacity, I think, to keep among the very most extraor-
dinary students in State. So, that’s an external activity.

4.e. Issues about the challenges that other institutions have in working with LSU:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: We were going to tell you that there is a common denominator, there
are lots of other nuances to that, several issues that I think are important that we will certainly
have the opportunity to debate in the time ahead. There are other inputs that we receive from,
again, other institutions across the State, in terms of the challenges of working with us, which is
again: the University is considered very favorably, but there are issues that are raised that we
need to enjoin [sic], but again across the board it is a very, very uplifting kind of set of experi-
ences that get that view.

4.f. Importance of Chancellor’s visiting each college across the campus:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: Internally, I spent also a lot of time with each of the colleges across the
University, spending time really… I think the most, I think, descriptive comment I heard from
the deans, my first week I was here, the Deans’ Advisory Council, was that it is absolutely essen-
tial that I make time to go around to each college, and spend time at each location; because oth-
wise the impression I will form in short order will be that which is offered by [Associate Vice-
Chancellor for Budget and Planning and Comptroller] Bob Kuhn. So as much as we all know
and love Bob Kuhn, I think the expression there was certainly to get a live understanding of
what’s involved plus make a stronger understanding of what the infrastructure condition is as
well as the capacity that we have here at the University. Again, lots of different impressions
from spending time, which are not complete entirely, but going around to most of the colleges in
elements … across the University has been really quite enlightening and very instructive.

4.g. At 31,000 students, LSU is as large as it can get:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: And again a couple of common denominators—there’s lots of individ-
ual, unique nuances of each and every college to be sure—but among the common denominators
are: we are probably at the maximum end of the limit of what we can handle infrastructurewise,
for numbers of students enrolled—and, at 31,000, we are right at the top end; that’s about the ex-
tent of it. So one element that we have worked I think rather extensively in looking at the con-
comitant case of concurrent circumstances of the standards rising and admissions meeting the
kinds of objectives we are looking for, is to maintain where we are, not increase it. And that
comes as great news to a lot of our other institutions around the State who are thrilled to death to
hear that we are not expanding much more. But at the same time I think it’s just a case of,
whether we wanted to or not, this would probably be the upper limit of what we could do any-
way.

4.h. Need to increase percentage (now 17%) of graduate students in the student population:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: And the other thing I think we would have gotten as input from folks
around the University internally in discussing this, is there is a demand, there is a need, to alter,
to try to improve upon, the graduate student mix. At about 17% of the overall population the
student enrollment right now is something that would be higher than that, and there are lots of
different statistics that would support one number or another, but certainly all numbers augur in
favor of a stronger mix of graduates to undergraduates, but not dramatically so, that it still none-
theless is an emphasis that we [did not? inaudible] take to be focused on in the time ahead.

4.i. Each college demands money:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: So those are the common denominators of what’s involved, in addition
to, there isn’t a single college—this is going to come as a huge surprise, I’m sure, to all the mem-
bers here—there’s not a single college that has said, “We have all the money we need, thank you very much. We appreciate your stopping by.” That is among the things I have not heard, among the many things. If anything, it is quite the opposite, there is a resource demand at each and every location around this University, no doubt about it. We have spent a lot of spirited discussion—I’m sure we will here today, too—of different ways we could go about looking at, I think, looking at the support that we receive from across the State.

4.j. How the first 12 Foundations of Excellence departments were selected 6 years ago⁵:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: So many things[?] … I begin that with a couple of issues that I wanted to touch on that were just summarized by those two external and internal kind of observations, and then pose a few points at the end here that we could debate either today or at another point later next fall. The first one is that what we’re about now, and I’m sure has gained some discussion around the University, is a fundamental inquiry that, I think, started here a couple of months ago, of examining in pursuit of the very specifics of the national Flagship Agenda, and our advertised efforts, I think, to try to achieve that here in our second year of trying to work through those goals and objectives, to then take stock, and look specifically, in a very measured, very analytical way, where we are in terms of the Foundations of Excellence, how do we derive at this, and where do we think we are relative to the same factors that may have contributed to their selection in the first place, and given the fact that it has been now the better part of six years since the last time we’ve conducted that self-examination, this is as good a time as any to try to think in terms of how we would do that. And what’s really interesting, I think, looking at the dozen programs that were identified, I think, on the basis of a wide range of criteria, apparently the formulation of the process that was put together at that time in arriving at this was as good as any. I mean, it was basically a case of saying, “What is it that we are really proud of, what do we think we do as an exemplary, identifying, distinctive set of things with this University, and identify as LSU very distinctively?” And in that regard, I think much was arrived at, and the dozen programs were identified based on a very widely ranging set of criteria.

4.k. Recent invitation to all departments to apply for Foundation of Excellence status:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: So instead we looked at it and said, OK, let’s think about how would we, kind of, look at some measure, some metric, some means to examine this analytically, of where we think we wanted to be, relative to where we are, where we think we’d like to go, with not only with these programs, but across the University. And as a result, looking at the question, I think, across the board, of how we’d go about that, rather than simply moving along in the same manner we have, and working on the same set of assumptions that existed that have become dimmed memories of most, as to how we got there six years ago, so therefore revisiting that question is a matter of continuous quality improvement we are after. So what we asked is that, from the Provost’s Office there was an invitation issued that all programs, departments, or colleges, however they want to be constructed, invited to look at how to look at this Foundations of Excellence designation.

4.l. UPC to revisit and find criteria to select Foundations of Excellence departments:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: The University Planning Committee was to find the selection criteria. Again I’m sure most of you are familiar with the membership of the University Planning Com-

---

⁵ Secretary’s note: At this point, Chancellor O’Keefe began referring to a series of seven power-point slides. The first slide was on the Foundations of Excellence, stating that in 1999, 12 programs had been selected, on a variety of criteria, for enhanced support.
mittee, but to the extent that it is not familiar to you, we could certainly identify them in detail, but there is a wide representation of folks that are part of this that represent, I think, a very interesting and diverse cross-section of the University and among [the? inaudible] exemplars of our colleagues who really have put a lot of concentration into this question. So I asked them to define a selection criterion, how would you actually go about doing this, in this continuous quality improvement effort, is part of what they were conducted [sic] to do. And the criteria that they came up with, and that they enunciated back to the departments and colleges, was evidence of recent departmental achievement, which includes any range of different, traditional ways of measuring that, but standard ways of doing so: external evaluations, recognition, placement of docs, various approaches to how we’d go about that, looking at how the faculty composition has changed in the last six years, what are the alterations that occurred in that period? And also the evidence of successful hiring and retention. In some cases, as I gather it, six years ago the idea was, let’s look at providing the kind of resources and capacity to do impact hires, in those kind of cases. Well, OK, did they happen? What’s been the result? What have we seen as a consequence of it? So going back and looking at the evidence of where we are is what this University Planning Council posed as an approach to this. And then in turn evaluate it as those submissions came in. And then looking at the departments’ strategic plans: support for the Agenda, contributions to the mission overall of the University, all the different objectives that were enunciated, again, six years ago, let’s go back and revisit it and see where we are. And then, how does the unit contribute to the University mission and reputation. That were the criteria that the University Planning Committee put together as a way to do this in a more, again, analytically driven approach with some rigor to it that has a very specific metric and measurement process that can be involved, and again that garnered the support overall of the members of said[? inaudible] committee.

4.m. **UPC now evaluating applications from the departments; no input from Chancellor:**

**CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE:** What they are also engaged in right now, what they received, were each of the units that elected to participate submitted—again this was purely voluntary, every department and college had as an elective choice whether or not to participate in the endeavor—we received the better part of 34, I think, submissions or intents to go forward to do so. They submitted 5-page documents that made presentations to each of them, again each of the folks that are on the University Planning Committee are listed therein, and they are now in the process and have been in the mode of evaluating the information and the detail, going through the analysis, of where we were, and where we’ve been, and where we are today with that objective in mind, and we’ll make a determination that they are to render here in short order and we’ll be announcing that certainly within the next couple of weeks, it could be as early as next week if we can get all the material packed up in the time, if the Committee so chooses to proceed in that manner, with no value added from me in that process, strictly by the University Planning Committee to use that approach, so I will be guided by whatever their findings are and however they deem is the appropriate way to do this.

4.n. **Want understandable, more frequent Foundations of Excellence competitions:**

---

6 Secretary’s note: By now the fourth power point slide was on display; it listed the following members of the University Planning Council (not Committee): Claire Advokat, Richard Bengtson, Bary Byerly, James Byo, Frank Cartledge, William Cooper, Guillermo Ferreyra, James Garand, Gerald Kennedy, Thomas Klei, Robert Kuhn, David Kurpuis, Thomas Lynch, F. Neil Mathews, Marcia Newcomer, and Harold Silverman. As of August 2005, all I can find about the UPC on LSU’s website is an obsolete list of members of the UPC, at [http://appl003.lsu.edu/acadaff/upc.nsf/$Content/University+Planning+Council+Members](http://appl003.lsu.edu/acadaff/upc.nsf/$Content/University+Planning+Council+Members). That list appears to date back to 2003-2004.
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: The second thing, one element of value-added, though, in the process, is that we not conduct this effort as episodically as this is now; we ought to be doing this every couple of years, with the purpose of reaffirming to ourselves what we believe to be the exemplary standing, I think, of various efforts that we’re engaged in around this University, that make us distinctive as LSU, and then also add to that what we believe can therefore make us even more so in the time ahead and constantly be looking at that continuous quality improvement effort. It ought to include not only the understanding, and I think this is exactly what the committee has taken on with great diligence, not only an understanding among, between all of us as colleagues what it will take to retain and maintain that kind of standing, but also what it will take for those who want to aspire to be among that group, and so therefore the approach that is being laid out is, incentives and motivation for those departments and colleges that have been selected to stay that way, as well as motivation and incentives for those departments and colleges that seek to be among that number, how do they go about doing so. Because if we just do this as a lottery every six years, based on a differing criteria each time, it will have zero credibility, and one that would be legitimately called into question. So this is a means to devise and construct a process that we can all understand, that can be derived by some measurement, that can withstand the scrutiny based on all that detail, I think, that’s exactly what the committee, I think, in a very impressive way has done to this point, and we’ll see what the results are here in short order and again look at this as an opportunity to enjoin it again within the next couple of years a means to continuously improve.

4.0. New Office of Vice-Chancellor for Research and Economic Development; graduate education will be separate:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: A couple of things that just, off that target, a couple of issues that have come up in terms of impact hires, if you will, that we’ve advertised for in the last couple of months since I’ve been here, is, first of all, to look at, kind of merging some of these external and internal inputs that I’ve talked about, and try to address some of those observations by the kinds of position recruitment efforts for senior positions that we’re looking to. Again as you recall, last fall a vacancy occurred for the vice-chancellor for research and graduate education, and after a lot of input on this question from faculty as well as from business community and lots of community leadership and everybody else, the clear message has come back, the research component of what we do, and that aspect of how we can lend and add value in the administration toward the pursuit of research objectives, would be extremely well served by an individual who concentrates dominantly on that part of the portfolio. In doing so, in my prior experiences at two other universities, I’ve seen varying approaches to how research and graduate education are handled. As a matter of fact, I’ve seen in one case research and graduate education in the same office activity or same administrative structure, then split out and then remerged again in the span of tenure at one of those two institutions. So there really isn’t a model that, across the nation, I think, and in among our peer group or in any other metric you could look to that would be a standard formulation of how this is done. So as a consequence we have really looked at what is kind of standard or accepted practice in some cases, which is to put great emphasis on research activity, does, in fact, if you’re not careful, inadvertently and as an unintended consequence, severely diminish the important role that the graduate school must play. So as a consequence we have now decided, under the terms of this particular approach, to sever and divide those two functions, so that the Vice-Chancellor for Research and Economic Development now as part of the portfolio change, is particularly concentrated for the purpose of that recruitment objective, dean of the graduate school has a separate matter entirely. So for this focus the idea is to look at really as-
serting a leadership role in, I think, national and international activities regarding research policy. I think that’s a critical function, and one again that in my mind, the objectives that I’ve heard from faculty input as well as, again, from business community engaged in research activity is that this is, by benchmark standards, a reasonably good effort that has been put forward in terms of measurable kinds of things that we can do in a research portfolio; that would be patents, licenses, the kinds of things that are proof of research activities that spin off, measures that most universities across the country look to as a way to look at that success rate; we do OK in the overall measurement of that.

4.p. Excessive emphasis on compliance with regulations in research:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: That said, we are by faculty input statement, an extremely difficult place for folks to want to do business with. Because our orientation is heavily towards compliance. The focus we look to is, in the administration, is very much to assure that the federal, state, and other regulatory kinds of things are met, and that the legal parameters are established, and that all the elements of what you do are as conservatively documented as we can. As a consequence, it has the effect of discouraging in the mind of faculty, research, principal investigators and research faculty among us, it has the effect of discouraging a lot of other activity that could otherwise be occurring in technology transfer, in a wide range of different exploratory efforts. And as a result, that leads me to conclude that, gee, if we do reasonably well, even with this rigid set of standards in compliance orientation, imagine how well we could do if we simply changed the focus of how we orient this, and opened it to a much wider range of opportunities for our research faculty, for our principal investigator proposals, I think, in looking at partnering arrangements, to excel. I mean, there’s all kinds of ways, I think, that we could do that that then become part of the responsibility of this office to help facilitate that mindset change—not at the risk of not complying, that is the last thing we need to do, because then we’ll find ourselves awash in lots of auditors and internal investigators and lots of other folks who make a living out of assuring that the way you did it was the wrong way, but instead, you know, focusing instead on the activity, I think, of trying to promote and facilitate, beginning with the proposition that “Yes, we can accomplish this partnering arrangement if the following conditions are met and all the things we need to do are complied with,” as opposed to “No, this can’t be done, because here are all the reasons why, you must overcome all those reasons before you can move forward.” I think it is a simple cultural mindset shift that’s going to be very important to do, easy to talk about, very hard to accomplish, and therefore will require the full-time policy focus and attention, I think, of the individual in this capacity.

4.q. New Office of VC for Research & Economic Development will help faculty compete:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: In addition to that, I think it also calls for someone who will help, again, facilitate, design the structure and process for colleagues around the University as research faculty, as principal investigators, to compete successfully for research grants. There is a wide range of activities we are engaged in. And it’s been a very impressive, I think, performance in the last several years, of an increase in what was about an average annual 40 to 50 million dollars in grants and so forth, to now what hovers around 130 to 140 a year. So that’s an impressive change. And you can target, you can kind of focus and see where the specific increases have occurred, as well as the expanded opportunities that have occurred, but it hasn’t been even. So as a result, much of what, in listening to colleges, the grants administration folks, faculty and others in administration talk about what the challenges are. Typically it turns on an inability to really be able to talk about, with any great authority, the kind of differing nuances of each federal agency or department or each state agency or department or the location for corporate interests or
whatever else that may identify, to help ease that administrative activity, to get that to happen, and be competitive, so that the research faculty and the principal investigators can spend their time on the substance of what the research is about. So that the activity of this particular office ought to be, again, to facilitate that competitive advantage, which already seems to be ressing[? inaudible] here, I mean again, the progress, inasmuch as we still got all these impediments, nonetheless, and not a lot of facilitation of this, still seems to have an impressive return. Imagine how much better it could be, and how much wider those opportunities could be offered to all of our colleagues if we were to open this as a matter of focus of this administrative office to help facilitate the competitiveness of all of us who are engaged and want to be engaged in more competitive research activities.

4.r. New VC will focus on intellectual property, patents:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: And finally I think it also is a case where there’s nuance that ought to occupy the attention and time in many ways of this office, which will be to really look at the thorny challenges of definition of intellectual property, of patent arrangements, of all the contractual terms that go into this. This is typically where all the best intentions, all the best culture, falls apart, because in all deference, there is usually a lawyer behind trying to figure out exactly how those other pieces are put together, and it is, there is a role for lawyers, there’s no doubt about it, but if they take a dominant role, it then requires that only lawyers can negotiate these matters. And it turns into a real process challenge that becomes very difficult. This is not a unique challenge. In the time I spent in a graduate, office of research and graduate education activity at a different university, I recognized this one exactly, it’s like, you know, déjà vu all over again, Yogi, I mean it’s just unbelievable, to see exactly the same issues, exactly the same challenges, and upon all the time that I’ve had relating working with other universities, this is a very common problem, it is not unique here to LSU, not at all. It is very much a challenge that we’ve all dealt with across the country in higher education in working through intellectual property and, I think, patent right kinds of challenges and it really usually turns on, again, the common denominator of: do lawyers run the occasion, or is it something else? So that’s going to be a primary focus of what we’re going to ask this new, you know, re-constituted kind of focus in this office to place emphasis on, which is very much a progressive, forward leaning approach, to advance our research faculty and principal investigator intentions and hope objectives, improved competitiveness and engage in a wider range of partnerships for all of our manage [? inaudible] in that case and for those who seek to participate.

4.s. Carman to chair search committee for VC for Research & Economic Development:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: I’ve asked Kevin Carman to chair this committee. He is in the process of doing so now, meeting with the group for the first time the other day, and now is in the vetting mode of, you know, putting together all the materials, and this is going to take, I think, some time. But it’s one that we really are anxious to find an individual and individuals who will be recruited to this organization that will focus on that kind of mindset that I’ve just outlined.

4.t. New Office of Vice-Chancellor for Communications and University Relations:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: The second area that we’re looking to that is an important one as well is the Vice-Chancellor for Communications and University Relations. This is a … consider this a taking the university relations organization and upgrading it to include not only the media relations focus that has dominated the way that portfolio in our organization has functioned, I’m told, for the last several years, but also to add to it two major components: we put the legislative affairs activity and an institutional development advancement kind of focus to that office. In part
it is driven by, again, all these external stops I’ve made around the State that I’ve talked to you about, from varying, different constituencies.
4.u. Need for a consistent message about LSU for all audiences; anemic, $300 million endowment, despite LSU’s name-recognition:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: There is a primary observation which is: there is a different message depending on who the audience is. So if it’s the press, if it’s the legislature, if it’s the business community, if it’s donor base, if it’s alums, they all get a different message about this institution. Well, it can’t happen. That’s not something that we can do, I think, as a matter of course. And it ought to be a consistent message in its basic themes, and then a lot of nuance issues to fill in the potato[?]. In terms of the consistent message it ought to be the same points across the board that we emphasize about this University. And it is one that, frankly, given the brand name that this University has and its recognition in the general public and in the press and among legislators and among our alums and friends and whatever else, it’s amazing! This is a brand that is, would be desired by almost every other institution in the United States. Most don’t aspire to anywhere near the name recognition that this University has just as a matter of course, and yet we really emphasize it little. So as a consequence there is so much more advancement that can come from this literally in terms of the kind of focus that we can take with donor base, in which we are looking at an endowment right now of about 300 million dollars. That’s where we are. Now by comparison to other public institutions, this is, there’s no other way to describe this, it is anemic. All other public institutions, all other public institutions which have nowhere near the brand recognition of what we have, nowhere near, are usually substantially better off than we are, in terms of the endowment level. That speaks to a wide range of things. It’s about, you know, partly the culture of giving and all these other things that, you know, folks in the institutional advancement business will tell you all about.

4.v. Need organization, coordination; no individual responsible for campus-wide fundraising:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: But it’s also about the fact that we really don’t organize the way we do this very well. And it’s not, again, something malicious or belligerent; it’s more just a case of organization to it. There is no individual on this campus today, right now, who you can ask to say: “Are you, as a matter of your responsibility, responsible for University institutional advancement or development?” The answer is there is no one who fits that description. No one. Now there are lots of folks who are in the colleges, and around departments and in all kinds of places, they’re there to look at fundraising programs and all that and the LSU Foundation and lots of other things that go to this. But there really is no strategy for this. Nothing that matches the LSU Master Plan, there’s nothing that matches anything else we do. So trying to coordinate this activity through an office that has the same consistent message with the press, with the legislature, with the donor base, with everybody, that says here’s …[audiotape turned over; approximately 5 seconds of speech missed] … stays on the same set of themes, rather than an approach that seems to be an element of the way we do business presently, which is, every college, and every departments, you’re on your own. And if it all works out great, well all the better; and if it doesn’t, well then I guess that’s, we have to go worry about that as another matter. And it’s very much a squeaky wheel, closest-dog-to-the-sled kind of problem where we focus on right now, rather than this approach. And yet given the extraordinary recognition, tools, capabilities, venues we have, for doing this, this, all this requires, I believe, is a bit more coordination in the way we do things, and think about things from a strategy standpoint. What do we want in terms of priorities? And where do we go to seek that support in a very structured way? The yield, I believe, will be considerable in very short time, simply by getting organized on that focus. So this is an attempt to try to pull together all the pieces that make up that kind of strategy and development and to assure that all of us have an opportunity to input to it, provide what those priority
sets ought to be, advance what the agenda needs to be in that order, based on what we collectively agree to, and then that we all collectively in this kind of focus, go forward and hit the right kind of venues to ask.

4.w. Anecdotes of two reactions of donors:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: I will just give you one piece of anecdotal evidence on this one. The tip files, I think the nature of the kind of disparate focus we take today, around the State and indeed a little bit around the country but mostly around the State, the donors I’ve had a chance to spend time with have one of two reactions. The first one is, gosh, I get fifteen calls a week from you people, and this week I got four, and the one I donated to was the lowest one, so I could tell the other three, and all the other calls that come in, that I’ve already given at the office, thank you very much. So we did it to ourselves. We managed to find a way, based on random selection, we got the lowest denominator simply by volume and no coordination and no one else helped. And it was, you now, lots of folks, just, with all kinds of good intentions, and good objectives, asking the same people with the same focus for the same kinds of things, and it turned then to a discretion of how high a priority it is to the University was made based on when the call was and how much was actually asked for, rather than: “Is it important, is it something that we need here to advance the Agenda, our priorities, whatever else?” It’s random. We might as well have just played the lottery that day or taken of a couple of bingo cards out. It’s about the same method of strategy that we went to. The other reaction that I get from folks who are friends of the University, who are potential donors, is: “It’s so nice to meet you. I haven’t heard from anybody in thirty years.” So we are awfully adept at plowing the same furrow we know. And we’re not particularly good at figuring out where the other places are to do so.

4.x. Need for coordination and a strategy:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: And so part of this is about a strategy. There are a lot of folks who know how to do this really well, and the expertise at the Foundation and elsewhere across the University, there are ways to do this if we just coordinate our activities. And that’s what this focus is about. It is thinking about how to pull together those messages and compile them so we have a place in which we can really enjoin on what the priorities are, know what venues we are asking, so that all others know where it’s being asked, and do it in a structured, strategic way, rather than as a random formulation, and rather than having the legislative agenda, which apparently it would seem to have to be formulated strictly out of my office, done that way, that it be done as a University-wide activity, and not something that’d be done simply because, you know, the person sitting next to wherever the Chancellor sits knows what the current legislative activity is. There’s a lot of, a lot of expertise around here that we are missing if we, if we do it different ways, so having that structure the … way it works, and also thinking about how to get the public relations activity to focus on what all of us want to see advanced would be a real opportunity, and there’s been lots of differing words of what people, how they’ve worked with the University Relations in the past, and all, all that comes into the same formulation.

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: Finally, let me just … this is the last point, and this is the issue I wanted to touch on briefly here, is the kinds of things I would like to pose for future consideration. The first one is, let me just quickly give you, on the legislative session itself, where, what the hot issues are. I sent around two pages. The first one is entitled, “Unfunded Costs of Advancing the National Flagship Agenda; the 2005-2006 Budget Overview.” And that one should be before you. And it’s basically tells you we’ve got a budget … the budget before the legisla-
ture right now, when you add up all the pieces and parts and all the implications of everything that’s involved, we’re looking at about a $10 million challenge that we are going to have to work through. There are a series of mandated costs that were enacted by the legislature in the past, dealing with health insurance, you know, a range of different retirement costs, you name it, all of which add to the overall expense, that are not, in my judgment, not discretionary, there are things … they are a function of how many of us are there here, so the only way you can affect this total is to have a different number of those among us. You can’t simply deny the benefits in those cases, so it’s a, in my mind, a nonnegotiable, nondiscretionary, mandatory cost that must be covered. It amounts to about 40 million, I think. The second one is that I think the intent and certainly our objective, and it has been for the last several years, to reach the kind of national peer group averages we are looking for, the SREB averages, you name it, any number of different benchmarks we are looking for, in terms of the overall salary compensation position, that ought to continue, and I believe that as a matter of course we have an intent to stay on the march towards that, we’ve made great progress in that regard. I do not see any reason to see slippage in that area or dropping back and punting. So as a result, I’m going to plan into this a [sic] intent at least for an October 1 3% pay raise, so that we’ve got that built into the calculus and move forward, so that’s what I’m advertising to our friends in the legislature, is a necessity to do in order to, again, keep moving forward, and there’s an attempt that was advertised well before, I think, the legislative session began, to think in those terms. And another big piece is the, you know, library and scientific equipment. This is an ongoing debate between the operating budget and the capital outlay budget, of which the nuances are, you know, only folks inside the process have a great love and affection for how those pieces of it work, but it nonetheless is going to be a challenge for us to work out all the details of that in time. So in aggregate, suffice it to say, that where we are, is about a $10 million challenge, even after a tuition increase, which was approved by the legislature and endorsed by the Board of Supervisors back in March. That does little to move us forward; if anything, it fills just a part of a pothole that was created here. So how this sorts out, stay tuned in the next 45 days. We’re going to have all kinds of exciting times with our friends in the legislature. I’ve already had a chance to go to hearings and spend lots of quality time with individual legislators and work through this agenda. And I’m optimistic that we’re going to be able to mount these hurdles, but it nonetheless is something that … the legislative process in the course of my professional public service career, I’m always heartened by progress but never count it until it’s over, because anything can happen until, as Mark Twain suggested, the public is safe when the legislature goes out of session. So there is no way to know what the outcome will be until we get more into this. But so far it’s looking favorable, but still, this is the scope of the problem we are dealing with, and the issues we’re wrestling with.


CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: The second page talks a little about the investment of one-time appropriations. There is a good fortune, I think, of a circumstance, of seeing one-time money, if you will, that will be surfacing in this fiscal year, which ends here in seven weeks time. And so the legislature has the opportunity to kind of structure a few priorities, and there are some things that we, again, have talked about and really worked with the legislature extensively to try to see some portion of, and I think this is way beyond the scope of what we could ever expect, but it nonetheless gives a menu of the kinds of things we are going to do. The first one, I think, we’ve got a really outstanding chance of dealing with, which is the unmatched endowed chairs and professorships. In the course of the last several years what we’ve built up is private contributions to
the University for 60% of the cost of a professorship or chair, of which we now seek the other 40% from a State match. And as it stands, there have been several years now of unfunded liability that has been accruing as a consequence of our success at getting private donations for these chairs and professorships, but not the match. So the unfunded liability right now for LSU alone is verging on $7 million. That’s out of a total statewide of about 11 and half. So of all other institutions of higher education, we account for more than half of that unfunded liability. There’s a nuance that I will come back to you and talk to you about next time around, that’s one of the reasons why I wanted to put it on the schedule here, is, we have now have 124 professorships that are unfunded for the match. They are funded by private donations; we have 60% of the cost of the professorship, but the other 40% is not there. These are, as you may recall, are $100,000 professorships, $60,000 provided by individuals, $40,000 by the State. And we’re going forward, again, as a portion of this, 6.7 million, to cover the unfunded cost of the professorships. They account for most of that number, of 124. The balance of it is again for chairs, which are, we’ve done reasonably well at, too, I think there’s a handful of minor math, I’d have to go back and take a look at it again, but somewhere in the range of 5 to 10, which are million-dollar positions. There are two things that we really are hoping to do. The first one is, that even if we are successful at getting the unfunded liability of the professorships covered, at the end of the day, after breaking lots of, you know, twisting arms, is probably a better way of saying it, in the legislature, what we’ll end up with is an investment that accrues about $4000-5000 per year for each professorship. The universal reaction that I’ve gotten from lots of our colleagues from around the University is that, boy, for that amount, that covers a couple of conferences and a few things, and, you know, it really isn’t much to really talk about. And having a professorship, while very important for, I think, recognition and for external kind of representation, nonetheless doesn’t really do much to advance research agendas or to underwrite the cost of different activities or bringing on graduate students or anything else. So it really, kind of nice to have, thank you very much, but, you know, not really all that significant. A chair is a different matter. I mean that’s an opportunity to underwrite and support faculty lines. I had the great good fortune in the endowed chair that I had to be fully supported in terms of my salary and fringe benefit costs, to cover the cost of staff, graduate assistant, all the research activities I got into, a book publication, a conference twice a year, that I sponsored at the University, that’s how much was in that endowment for that chair; that’s what we ought to have more of. So rather than going around talking to folks about, gee, we really need you to support a $100,000 professorships which have the opportunity of putting, you know, someone’s, you know, favorite uncle’s name on this in order to accrue $4000-5000—I’m being very blunt about this—$4000-5000 in proceeds each year, I think the better bet is we concentrate our efforts to that which really can support faculty lines and graduate fellowships, graduate assistantships, the kinds of things I talked about in the beginning, which is, we want to see an increase in the number of graduate students, but that takes support, that takes resources, and this is one way to refocus our priorities and attention to do so. So rather than breaking picks[?] to go downtown and ask the legislature to fund yet another collection of professorships, which we’ll do this year, I mean we’ve got to cover the difference, because those donations were made in good faith, but as a matter of policy from this point forward, what I’d like to get input to, down the road, is the idea of, how do we structure a proposal to the Regents to see a support of fellowships and assistantships for graduate students, and an emphasis on chairs that matter, OK, as opposed to accruing off what are accounts to the equivalency of Christmas club, you know, proceeds of which you can basically give, you know, almost anywhere, and this kind of thing. I mean, if we are going to do this, let’s do it seriously and do it in a way that really
supports the kind of research activity and supports the graduate students specifically to recruit. So that’s a big one, and it’s one that, again, this year we will go to see this unfunded liability covered. But the intent is in the future to see an opportunity to support something more ambitious and more constructive, I think, towards what we see for faculty as well as graduate student advancement.

4.aa. More from second handout: campus facilities, and library & scientific equipment:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: Campus facilities, I think this is going to be a case where you buy it by the yard, to be very blunt about it. We’ve got $209 million worth of challenges that we’re facing, in terms of deferred maintenance, you know, the ADA compliance requirements, a range of upgrades, and things for safety replacements, all this are, again, continuing dire needs around this campus for infrastructure. And so as much of what we can get from one-time money for these kinds of things is what we intend to really try to put our capital on to try to see if we can find our leverage to accomplish this task. And again, library and scientific equipment, this is an unfunded thing that keeps bumping along, and it’s an issue that, again, I also want to mention is the last part of this which is, has some relationship to it, that’s our electronic journal subscription support for the library. This is in part, you can’t get off to these kind of questions until such time as we get these kinds of things covered, and so this is going to be a big issue. I intend to really put a lot of our chits on with the legislature as a means to try to accomplish this. So those three areas are going to be really important, I think, for the one-time opportunity. And then the three you see on the other side, there’s a duplication in that case, which is the library equipment, I want to try in both places. If we can’t get it in one place, we’ll try to get it in the other, you know, that’s the idea. So we want to keep striking at that one in hopes of accomplishing the task. But also, again, the pay-raise issues, as well as the unfunded mandates. Those, that’s the summary of the kinds of things you’ll hear, are the real focus points, and it’s the ones that I’m handing around to everyone who spends any time expending any shoe leather in the State capital, is, are these two papers. This is what we’re after; these are the things we want to do; everything else is, by comparison, secondary, because this [? Inaudible]. If we can accomplish any of this, we’ll have done, I think, reasonably well this coming year. So in the absence of having someone who is coordinating strategy and the agenda and the message, this is the message that we’re pressing.

4.bb. Regents’ proposal to change requirement of 2/3 vote of legislature to raise tuition:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: The other issue that’s lurking right now, that I’m reticent to suggest that it’s likely to be an issue in the legislative session, but it nonetheless is going to gain attention, it’s already got some coverage in the papers, is the introduction of a tuition bill. There is …, and that’s happened. The Board of Regents has taken a proposal advanced by the Commissioner of Higher Education, E. Joseph Savoie, which, I think, was very carefully debated and discussed among all the systems and the individual universities within the systems around the State, to try to look at what is an appropriate way to get out from underneath a real formula conundrum that we have uniquely in the State of Louisiana, which is the requirement that every time a tuition bill is introduced, or any time an intent to raise tuition occurs, that the legislature must pass it by a two-thirds vote.7 We are distinctive in the United States with this really charming requirement (laughter). And, boy, is it ever inclusive. And it’s a populist notion, and it certainly makes sure that there is, you know, I think, a very strong view expressed by this, that says, you know, we

---

7 Secretary’s note: The Louisiana Constitution (Article 7, Section 2) declares: “The levy of a new tax, an increase in an existing tax, or a repeal of an existing tax exemption shall require the enactment of a law by two-thirds of the elected members of each house of the legislature” (http://www.legis.state.la.us).
really want you to jump through all kinds of hoops to make this to happen, so therefore ask for it very judiciously. And it’s worked. I mean, that’s been the effect, there is no question about it. But as a result of it, what it has created is some real aberrations here, I mean, it’s just, it’s, is odd kind of circumstances of where we are, in terms of not only peer groups, but everybody else, in terms of what covers tuition and fees around this …, not only the State, but also the SREB and, indeed, among our national peers. So this is an attempt to correct some of these questions, and to open up a process to consider tuition changes, tuition and fee changes, in a more structured way, that has the backstop of the management boards, and has all the different elements to it. But it is a very interesting proposal, at least to enjoin this debate about, not only the question of what is an appropriate tuition and fee rate, what is the market dynamic, what is the economic capacity of the citizens of this State to afford, that’s included in it, too, special needs requirements in terms of the overall, you know, requirements, I think, for not just performance-based focus, as TOPS is, but also to look at the individual economic and financial need-based kind of formulas that are necessary. It does an ambitious job of that.

4.cc. LSU the flagship university in the State:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: And notably for our purposes, this is really historic development, I think, looking at all the material, this is the very first time that the State has advanced any piece of legislation or any policy that declares in statement and describes in a separate category that LSU is the national flagship university of this State, distinctively, uniquely, and solely. Let me repeat that. OK? This is the first time in any policy or any piece of legislation that this university is stated as the flagship institution, and there is no other peer in this state.8 We’re it, and that we are held to a national peer average for everything in this document, everything in the policy, everything in the legislation, all of it is focused on the national peers, and it’s a national peer set established by the …, it’s a State-of-Washington based survey that covers a much wider range of national peers, that are very much akin to who we want to be associated with. Extremely impressive thing. And everybody else, all other institutions in the State, are measured relative to SREB averages. We are measured to a national peer set. And a national peer set that is the kind of institutions we want to be associated with, that we are described with, by the nature of what we aspire to, as well as what we are today. First time. And, so as a consequence, this is really something I am very enthusiastic about, trying to work to negotiate something that could move this forward, because it does set that standard in a different way.

4.dd. The Regents’ tuition proposal would enable LSU to pursue the Flagship Agenda:

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: Second advantage is that it creates an interesting process advantages, in that it relieves the legislature from the annual requirement, to the extent there is a tuition increase, to consider it for the rest of this decade. It sets in motion a formula for the balance of the decade, so that they vote one time to let that occur, and it’s governed by a management board set of procedures which are really, it’s going to have to continually be worked, but in the end it’s something that leaves an awful lot to our discretion as governed by the management board procedures, set on standards that meet, match us to the national standards where we want to be, and put us in a peer group in the State in which we are literally peerless, there is no other, we’re it,

---

8 Secretary’s note: Since June 8, 1995, the Louisiana Revised Statutes, Title 17 (Education), Chapter 26 (Colleges and Universities), Part III (University Systems), Section 3215 (Louisiana State University system) has declared: “The Louisiana State University system is composed of the institutions under the supervision and management of the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College as follows: (1) Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, located at Baton Rouge and designated as the premier flagship university for the state…” (http://www.legis.state.la.us).
we’re the single entry on the sheet with that particular standard. So, you know, for all those reasons, there’s a lot of factors in this, too, that are going to continue to play out, but it’s one that is … very optimistic about the potential that could accrue from it. And whether it gets enacted or not is a different question. But it is something I think the debate will be enjoined over this next 45 days. And the fact that the Speaker of the House has introduced it, and the Chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate has sponsored it as well, means that it’s going to be enjoined. This is not something that is just going to get bumped off, and OK, we’ll do this another day. It’s going to have to be enjoined as a matter of course. So, there is a lot that could occur from this in the legislative session that are mechanical, in the case of the two-piece paper I gave earlier that summarize those very succinctly and those are the very specific things, and any other matter that gets in the way of that, I think we make the mistake of losing the focus of what we could obtain in this session on those two pieces of paper. Those are, again, the primary things we are going to focus on. And the second thing is on this tuition bill. I think if … that is a longer shot, but if it happens, this could really be something where we’re, we really are off to the opportunity to apply our own devices, our own self-governance, and through the management boards, discretion, pursuit of the management of the Flagship Agenda in ways that will advance that agenda, rather than, as we are seeing this year, just fill in holes to make do. That’s, this is what really is most problematic, I think, about the current budget before us, that the administration has advanced. It is not that it is particularly detrimental, but it doesn’t really move us forward, it just kind of has us in a holding pattern, and we got to shuffle around in order to make all the pieces work, and it’s going to take a fair amount of arm-twisting to make that happen, and I’m reasonably confident it will work. But in the end of the day if that’s all we’ve got, we’ve just maintained pace, we haven’t danced, we haven’t really made any expansion in this effort, we haven’t pursued the elements of the agenda that we’ve all talked about that are worth pursuing in order to get us to the stage of being a Tier 1 research institution. So, that’s why I see such great optimism and potential in what this tuition bill could do for success in this regard.9

4.ee. Health insurance for graduate students:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: The last two points are the issue, another one I’ve gotten, again, from lots of students, particularly from out-of-State students, but graduate students universally, is the graduate student health insurance is really a problem, this is really becoming a debilitation in terms of recruiting grad students and research assistants and so forth across the University. So I’m looking for some solutions for how we could structure this. And one way that I’ve offered to you, at least as a piece of it, is to begin focusing our attention on asking for State match support for graduate fellowships and assistantships. That’s one I absolutely want to commit to and that’s step 1. But I’m looking for other steps and other ideas and some element, again, of consultation and shared governance with you to think of different ways we could conquer this and how do we set the criteria, what do we do in order to accomplish the task, because it is an issue. We can’t just simply say, well, too bad, you don’t need any insurance. It’s something that is a matter of, as a matter of fact, if you are out of State, and particularly if you are a foreign student, it is federal law that you must have it. So as a consequence, you know, there isn’t, there’s no discretion on this point. And it’s one we really must find a solution to, because it is, like everything else, and we know this from our own personal, you know, household circumstances, cost of health in-

---

9 Secretary’s note: The Board of Regents’ proposal was entitled “Louisiana Post-Secondary Education Tuition and Fee Policy”; the Board adopted it on April 28, 2005, and amended it on May 10. Louisiana Senate Bill No. 277 (2005) would have implemented the Regents’ policy; SB 277 was not enacted by the legislature in 2005.
surance is rising, and it’s going to continue to do so, and anything we can do about that, I think, is limited, other than to figure out how to cover that cost.

4.ff. Electronic journal subscription support for the library:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: And the last one is the electronic journal subscription support for the library. This is, again, part and parcel to the issue I mentioned that’s really among the top issues we have put on the list for legislative must-haves. But this is a nuance of it that’s important. It’s one that I think is certainly critical because it has a cost-variable to it. And so how do we apportion this and how do we work through these kinds of challenges, is something I’m looking for, I think, input on that we work to implement this next fall as a matter of course.

4.gg. Conclusion:
CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: This was a long presentation. I apologize for it, but I did want to try to at least give you a flavor of a lot that’s been going on in the last two+ months that I’ve been here, and the kinds of things that I’ve collected as impressions of what we’re trying to do about it immediately. Some things are issues we have to defer and think about more strategically; others are things we ought to do something about right now, and I’m trying to do that. And all of it is based on, again, lots of input from our colleagues as faculty as well as administration, constituency groups around the State, you name it. And it’s one that, again, I appreciate your indulgence. I thank you for your patience in the time I’ve gone through this.

[Applause; 4:17 P.M.]

President Advokat opened the floor to questions for the Chancellor.

4.hh. Could LSU solve its grad student health insurance problem by sending students to the Louisiana charity hospital system?

Senator Wilson said that LSU runs the State charity hospital system; he asked why LSU could not give graduate students carte blanche to go to any State charity hospital.

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: I don’t know the answer to that; let me go figure that out. As it stands right now, though, there are two free systems, and one of the two is in extremis. So I would imagine that John Rock would be just thrilled with the idea of me suggesting that we have non-payers arrive at his doorstep, when he’s basically, what he’s dealing with right now is an intractable set of problems in New Orleans as it is. Now here in Baton Rouge, again I think the papers have covered the dynamics of this to-ing and fro-ing over, you know, the Earl K. Long Hospital and how to deal with that, I mean, boy, this goes on and on. So my guess is that there would be lots of interesting reaction to that, but it’s one that, let me go find out the answer to that, and what is feasible, but my guess, given the political, you know, sensitivity to the hospital system that LSU has been invited to help manage, and thank God it’s not part of our portfolio here on this campus, I’ll tell you. Because it would be all-consuming, it really would, I mean, it’s just unbelievable to see the kinds of things that are going on, and for good reason, I mean, there’s a lot of important health-care issues with it that affect the State as well as the individual institutions that are involved, but to throw another log on that fire, you know, I’m wondering. But let me check it out, I’ll find out, and we’ll see what we can [inaudible].

4.ii. Could a security system like that in the Vet School be put in the life sciences building?

Senator Homberger said that security for many buildings on campus has been an issue for a long time. She recalled the break-in in the life sciences building with great damage being done to research. She also said that there have been fires put into the building. The life sciences building contains chemicals and animals, she noted. She has been worried about the many students and

---

10 Secretary’s note: John Rock is Chancellor of the LSU Health Sciences Center in New Orleans.
faculty who work at night and on weekends. There is no security, no checking whether persons entering the building are authorized. She is worried that one day, something terrible will happen in that building, and that LSU then will say, “We wish we had taken action earlier and put in an entry system with cards and cameras to see who is entering.” A security system is in place in the Veterinary School, she noted. She asked if a security system for the life sciences building could be put on a higher priority.

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: Fair enough. I, as a matter of fact, just yesterday, I had the opportunity to go through the Life Sciences Building, to visit the College of Basic Sciences, and looked at the very rooms you are talking about, and boy, this was a perpetrated effort by, as best as we can tell, the, you know, there is no other polite way to say it, folks who really were seeking to avoid the use of animals for research purposes. And here’s the irony of this. When they broke in, what they did, and they really had to work at this, I mean, this was really complicated, I mean, looking through every one of the gates they had to go through and every one of the, you know, the different locked positions that were there, they really had to work on this, when I saw, there were three different steps they had to go through, maybe I saw the wrong hall …

SENATOR HOMBERGER: “No, it’s, it’s ….”

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: Maybe I went through the wrong place, maybe I went through the complicated way, I don’t know, maybe they made it going away from the chutes that could have been done, but seeing what I saw, either of three different locations, they wanted to be there, and what they did was, they rearranged, they disrupted the research lab animals for [sic] there for research, and put them in different cages, in some cases they let them loose, in some cases they took a few away, all of them as a consequence of this now nondescript distinction of all of the research animals[?], the principal investigator lost all the research over the last year and a half, and as a result, all the animals had to be euthanized. The very thing that this group was seeking to avoid is what they prompted. It’s just an out-of-mind case. But it’s one that…. Part of my problem with this is, is that…. An example like that one, I don’t know what we could do, ever, and as a matter of fact, I don’t think we want to do what you have to do, in order to prevent things like that from happening. Because the unfortunate case would be the other way, which is to really make this an incredibly difficult place to access. In order to do … and this is really … and it’s an atrocious case, and it’s one that I found to be positively objectionable for all kinds of reasons. But these people wanted to do this badly, and they really went about the business of planning it seriously, and no amount of security efforts short of really having armed guards there would have stopped them, and I don’t know about you, but I’m not sure I want to see buildings with armed guards. This is really scary, all right? The second thing is,

SENATOR HOMBERGER: ….  

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: I’m sorry, let me just conclude, I apologize. Let me just finish up a thought. The other anecdotal example of this was where the security is present, where I do want to see armed guards, OK? Was in a case not any more than six weeks ago on the west side of campus, in which some kid thought it’d be a wonderful idea to fire off a small arm, a weapon. Fired it in the air five times, at about 11:30, 12:00 at night. And as soon as he completed this activity, he threw it in some shrubbery. Now he was booked for possession of a, you know, a firearm, and discharging it in a dangerous manner, lots of people standing around. I think he was also booked for stupidity, because there was a security guard five feet away from him who immediately arrested him on the spot. OK? Now, I mean, this is, there is, this is how frequent they are, within areas that are frequented by lots of people. And the LSU Police is composed of about, I want to say, 70 to 75 officers, and they have a very comprehensive, kind of, patrolling
methodology that they use that really is quite, you know, extensive. And, again, in this particular case they were fortunately right where they needed to be in order to cart off this miscreant, and I’ve talked to the District Attorney who is putting that particular case on the docket promptly in order to assure that there’s an opportunity to prosecute that individual for that kind of activity, as a real clear message that, boy, this is just, we are going to deal with this one really fast. And that kind of cooperation, I think, really does neat things for security. So, I’m, Dominique, I’m a little bit hesitant to want to look at this as a one-size-fits-all approach, because I think our consequence is the, really could cramp down on access but at the same time I want to be sure that we really do things, clamp down on access, whereas at the same time I want to do things that will continue to provide a broader kind of security to assure that cases like that one get dealt with promptly, immediately, and thoroughly by the right law enforcement folks who are there, and in this case they did, and it was pretty impressive.

4.jj. Every new LSU Chancellor announces new administrative positions; will there be corresponding cuts in administrative positions?

Senator Dooley wished Chancellor O’Keefe luck in his dealings with the legislature. He said that every chancellor who comes to this University (and he has seen a few of them here) always announces that there are going to be new administrative positions. That is fine, he said, because he knows that every chancellor has to put some stamp on the University. Senator Dooley wondered if it would not be salutary to also announce that there will be some corresponding cuts in administrative positions, as well, because every chancellor also comes in with a statement similar to Chancellor O’Keefe’s statement above about budget problems, unfunded liabilities, and belt-tightening. Senator Dooley wanted to see evidence of belt-tightening at the upper levels, too.

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: I appreciate that, thank you. First of all, I made the mistake of … I know there is a lot of sameness to what I’m saying, and I appreciate that, and given your longevity and history here, I’m sure there is not a lot of distinctiveness in what I have to offer. I’m doing my best, but it is one that I will labor to do better at that. And given the fact that I’ve been here all of two months, I freely confess that I, what I know about what I need to know is a fraction, OK? So I will admit that right up front. So I defer to your better judgment.

Secondly, both of the positions that I’ve talked about here are filling of existing capacities. Neither one of them are new. The research and graduate education position is vacant right now. It was … Kevin Smith left last November, December time frame. That position has been vacant for that span of time. There is a senior official within the graduate education activity, graduate school, which therefore will, that position will be filled. So there is no new net change whatsoever, zero. We are just simply recruiting for existing openings. In the case of the strategic communications or communications and University relations, it is an upgrade of the UR job. And it is at the same time, abolishing two of the positions in my office that were there as staff positions for legislative affairs, one individual who kind of did part-time institutional development stuff, neither one of those capacities am I filling. So as it turns out, you got one individual, two staff jobs go away, and it’s an upgrade of the University relations job, so there’s no new positions, and if anything, arguably, it might be one staff job down, after all net done. So I take your point, and I will be extremely mindful that we not add anything at a time when we’re arguing that we’re in cases where we’ve really got to be mindful of expense. I take your point. I will be mindful of that. I think it doesn’t exist in this case.

4.kk. More on security: Grad student murdered on campus years ago; killer still at large:

Senator Schiebout mentioned a case about which, she said, we can do nothing, but which the Chancellor, being a newcomer, needs to be made aware of. She said that LSU had a geology
Ph.D. candidate murdered on campus. It’s years ago. The police haven’t forgotten. Despite the fact that two serial killers have been caught in Baton Rouge recently, this case stays open. So when we worry about security, we’ve had worse than mixing up animals and shooting guns; we’ve had a murder of a graduate student. It stays in the minds of a few of our people, she said.

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: Fair enough. Let me take a look at it. I am unaware of the details of it. I will become more familiar with it, thank you.

SENATOR SCHIEBOUT: Please remember. In the case of the most recent serial killers, police thought that they might be tied to the murder of the LSU graduate student, but they weren’t. So whoever did it, he’s still around.

CHANCELLOR O’KEEFE: I’ll get to that promptly. Thank you.

[Applause.]

There being no further questions for Chancellor O’Keefe, he left the meeting at 4:30.

5. Run-off election for second member-at-large position on FSEC:
5.a. Senators Randall Hall, Peckham, Pizer, and Prinyawiwatkul on today’s ballot: At the April 11 Senate meeting, Senators Randall Hall, Steven Hall, Peckham, Pizer, Prinyawiwatkul, and Schiebout ran for the first and second member-at-large positions on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. These candidates received 15, 17, 13, 14, 2, and 23 votes, respectively, out of 42 ballots cast. Thus Senator Schiebout won a majority of the votes cast, and became the first member-at-large of the FSEC. None of the other five candidates got a majority of the votes cast on April 11. The Senate Bylaws declare: “If no one receives a majority vote on the first ballot [for an FSEC position], then there will be a second balloting between the two persons receiving the largest number of votes.” In this case, Senators Steven Hall and Randall Hall had received the largest numbers of votes on April 11 for the second member-at-large position. President Advokat announced, however, that Senator Steven Hall had, in the meantime, withdrawn as a candidate for member-at-large. She said that in order not to disenfranchise those who had voted for him, all the other candidates for member-at-large would be included on today’s ballot for runoff election, namely: Senators Randall Hall, Peckham, Pizer, and Prinyawiwatkul. President Advokat asked if there were any additional nominations from the floor for member-at-large; none were heard.

5.b. PM-35 questions for FSEC candidates: The day before the April 11 Senate meeting, five members of the FSEC had sent to all Senators an “Open Letter and Questions for FSEC Candidates, April 2005.” The open letter asked all FSEC candidates to address the following two questions:

1. What is your position on improving PM-3511?
2. What particular items in PM-35 would you strive to change during your tenure on the Executive Committee?

On April 11, those questions had been addressed by all the FSEC candidates other than Senator Pizer, who had to leave early that day. Today President Advokat asked Senator Pizer to address these questions.

5.c. Senator Pizer’s statement: Senator Pizer said that if he is elected to the FSEC, he will not be able to attend any Monday or Friday meetings of the Senate for the full amount of time, due to his daughter’s gymnastics schedule. He said, however, that his understanding was that the

fact that he would have to leave some Senate meetings early would be less important than the fact that he would be able to attend all FSEC meetings.

Re PM-35, Senator Pizer said that he does not like it. He said that until recently he had been under the impression that the administration was still considering the question of whether to issue PM-35 or not; he had not realized, until recently, that PM-35 is already in place [and has been since 1999]. He strongly objected to the idea that [under PM-35] two negative annual reviews by a chair, who may have personal, negative feelings towards a faculty member, could trigger a process of mandatory remediation and possible expulsion. He is a firm believer in the idea that one doesn't dismiss a tenured faculty member except for clearly demonstrated malfeasance in office or dereliction of duty—failing to show up for class or unavailability, that kind of thing. In addition, he said that PM-35 remediation committees are a further tax on professors’ time, and he would refuse to serve on any such committees, since he objects to them, and they would be just one more thing he would have to do. So he is completely opposed to PM-35.

5.d. Election of Senator Randall Hall to the second member-at-large position on the FSEC: President Advokat had the FSEC member-at-large ballots distributed, collected, and counted. While ballots were being distributed and counted, President Advokat gave her President’s report (section 6 below). Later in the meeting (4:40 P.M.), she announced that the results were as follows: Randall Hall 12, Peckham 12, Pizer 15, and Prinyawiwatkul with some smaller number of votes. Since no one received a majority, she announced that there would be another runoff election with Senators Randall Hall, Peckham, and Pizer on the ballot. While ballots were being distributed and counted, Professor Michael Cherry, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, gave a report on the EPC’s first year of existence (section 7 below). After that report, President Advokat announced that this time, Senators Randall Hall, Pizer, and Peckham had received 14, 18, and 10 votes, respectively. Since no one received a majority of the votes cast, President Advokat announced that yet another runoff election would be necessary, this time between Senators Randall Hall and John Pizer. While the ballots were being distributed and counted, Senate President-Elect William Daly presented President Advokat with a plaque, after which President Advokat made some concluding remarks and declared the meeting adjourned (section 8 below). After adjournment, the results of the vote were ready: Senators Randall Hall and Pizer had received 21 and 20 votes, respectively. Thus Senator Randall Hall had been elected to the second member-at-large position on the FSEC.

6. Senate President’s report: While the first FSEC ballots today were being counted, President Advokat gave her President’s report.

6.a. McGehee Award: President Advokat announced that the McGehee Award Fund (see Resolution 05-05, December 8, 2004; http://senate.lsu.edu/Resolutions.html) had been established. She said that the charter had been completed, and she promised to include the URL for that fund in subsequent letters that she will be preparing and sending out to possible donors. She invited suggestions on possible donors.

6.b. PM-35 Committee: She announced that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had formed an ad hoc committee to continue the initiative to replace PM-35 [in accordance with Senate Resolution 04-10, March 18, 2004; http://senate.lsu.edu/Resolutions.html]. Currently, the committee consists of Pratul Ajmera, William Daly, Charles Delzell, Sarah Pierce, and Judith Schiebout.

6.c. Academic calendar: President Advokat announced that the new academic calendar that the Office of Academic Affairs had recently proposed for the 2006-2007 academic year had
been withdrawn; some of the better-received elements of that proposal for calendar changes will be considered for later years.

6.d. Administrative Service Committee: President Advokat announced that the Administrative Service Committee Report was almost ready, and would be posted on the Faculty Senate website.12

6.e. Discussion of ombuds position: She announced that there has been longstanding support from faculty and staff for the creation of an Ombuds position at LSU. She said that in 1997 the Faculty Senate was presented with a report recommending the creation of such a position [http://senate.lsu.edu; click on “Pertinent Reports”]. She said that she has been discussing the issue with Executive Vice-Chancellor and Vice-Provost Katrice Albert, and in some cases with Executive Vice-Chancellor and Provost Risa Palm. She said that they have not reached a mutually agreeable proposal, but this may yet come to pass.

6.f. Certificates of Appreciation: President Advokat passed out the traditional Certificates of Appreciation for the “graduating” senators who were present: Senators Anselmo, Cogburn, Crystal, Griffin, Homberger, Lynch, Mary McGehee, Pizer, Schiebout, Stater, and Valsaraj. President Advokat said that she would send certificates to the graduating senators who were absent on May 6: Catallo, Cowan, Fuentes, Gagliano, Goudine, Hegsted, Henderson, Hensley, McCarley, Motsenbocker, Peckham, Rush, Smith, and Terrell.

7. Report from the Educational Policy Committee: Professor Michael Cherry, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), said that the EPC had been formed last year with the help of then-Senate President McGehee. Professor Cherry distributed a report on the EPC’s activities for its first year (see http://senate.lsu.edu, and click on “Pertinent Reports”). The charge and membership of the EPC can also be found on the Senate website: see http://senate.lsu.edu, and click on “Committees.” Professor Cherry reported that the EPC had learned from the Committee on Admissions, Standards, and Honors (ASH) that they had decided not to seek an increase in admission standards this year; ASH wanted to wait a year or so to see the impact of the latest standards; they might consider an increase next year. Professor Cherry reported that the EPC was disappointed, but it felt that it should not intrude on another committee’s jurisdiction, and admission standards are, he said, clearly a matter for the ASH committee. He said that he and the EPC would encourage ASH and the Senate to address admission standards in the next academic year. He reported that the EPC discussed linking courses together in learning communities; required versus optional final exams; and questions involving class attendance and excused absences. The EPC also discussed graduation rates and students’ progress toward degrees. He said that the Provost had set up a Graduation Task Force consisting of deans (John Hamilton, Chair). Professor Cherry said that Vice-Provost Frank Cartledge, Assistant Vice-Chancellor Karen Denby, and he sat in on the meetings of the Graduation Task Force; and Cartledge and Denby also sat in on the meetings of the EPC. Professor Cherry said that LSU’s 6-year graduation rate is low; this year neither the EPC nor the Graduation Task Force offer specific suggestions to improve the retention and graduation rates; but next year they plan to make some suggestions.

8. Plaque for President Advokat; adjournment: While the ballots for the third runoff election today were being distributed and counted, Senate President-Elect William Daly said that during the past academic year, President Advokat had tried to guide this ship through some stor-

12 Secretary’s note: A few weeks after the May 6 Senate meeting, the Administrative Service Committee Report was, indeed, posted on the Senate website, http://senate.lsu.edu; click on “Pertinent Reports.”
my weather, and had done a remarkable job, considering all the strain that had been placed on this Senate. He presented a plaque to her, which reads: “Presented in appreciation to Claire Advokat, Ph.D., for distinguished service as President of the Faculty Senate, Louisiana State University Agricultural and Mechanical College, 2004-2005.” [Applause.] She expressed her thanks, and said that if anyone had told her what a difficult year this was going to be, she might not have gone through with it. She thanked senators for sending her messages of encouragement throughout the year. She said that the Senate had been able to make some significant progress on several initiatives, and she was confident that the Senate’s new President-Elect William Daly would accelerate that process. She wished everyone a good summer, and, barring any objection, she declared the meeting adjourned (at 4:57 P.M.). The tellers continued to count the ballots on the third runoff election (subsection 5.d above), and senators left the room.

Minutes prepared by Charles Delzell, Secretary;
approved by the Senate on October 11, 2005.