MINUTES
LSU Faculty Senate Meeting
7 May, 1993

President Culbertson opened the meeting at 3:08 P.M.

Proxies announced were:
- Victor Stater for Tom Owen
- Bob Justis for Larry Farh
- Pat Culbertson for Dan Rinks
- Nick Apostolou for Tom Beard
- Bill Metcalf for Richard Imlay
- Danny Wallace for Connie Van Fleet
- Van Cox for Sadik Artunc
- Pat McGee for Malcolm Richardson
- Peggy Chaleron for Patricia Cruse

The minutes for the Faculty Senate Meetings of 17 March and 5 April were approved and a draft of the 20 April minutes were made available to be picked up.

A motion to suspend the rules to permit voting on a resolution thanking Norma Koenig for her years of service to the Senate was approved.

President Culbertson then presented the resolution (92-13) to the Senate:

WHEREAS Norma Koenig has been a devoted, hard-working, and patient servant of LSU A&M University, and
WHEREAS Norma Koenig has been most especially diligent and persevering in her service to the faculty of the University, and
WHEREAS Norma Koenig is now retiring from her University service,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recognizes and expresses its most sincere appreciation for the service of Norma Koenig and wishes her happiness and fulfillment in her retirement.

Senator Parker moved this resolution be approved, the motion received a second, and was approved by the Senate. A copy of the resolution was distributed for Senators to sign to be presented to Norma Koenig.

Senate Elections:
On the agenda for the May meeting were elections for several Faculty Senate committees. These committees were: Grievance Committee, Committee on Committees, Review and Long Range Planning, Budget Committee, and delegates for the 1994 meeting of the Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities. A slate of nominees prepared by the Committee on Committees was distributed to the Senate with the meeting agenda mailed to Senators prior to the meeting. Ballots listing these committees and nominees were distributed to the Senate, and President Culbertson then asked for nominees from the floor for each committee.

No nominations from the floor were received for the Grievance Committee and the Committee on Committees.

Senator Kinney withdrew his name from the list of nominees for Review and Long Range Planning, and Senator Daly nominated Pat Culbertson for this committee.

Senator Daly nominated Jim Wharton for the Budget Committee.

Nominees from the floor for delegates to the 1994 meeting of the Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities were Bob Grodner, Robert Perls, and Elsie Nebert.

Following the voting, Carruth McGehee and Ralph Kinney counted the ballots. The election results, shown below, were announced later in the meeting.

Election Results:
- Faculty Grievance: Abner Hammond, Lelia Schroeder, and Emily Toth.
- Committee on Committees: Frank Cartledge, Jeff Roy, David Longstreth, and Paul Wilson.
- Budget Committee: Bill Metcalf.
- Conference of Louisiana Colleges and Universities: Bob Grodner and Elsie Nebert.

President's Report:
President Culbertson distributed a letter from Louisiana Senator Randy Ewing who wrote he strongly supports higher education and that he deplores the present plight of higher education in the state. President Culbertson reported he is attempting to contact Senator Ewing to express appreciation for his letter and efforts on behalf of higher education.

President Culbertson referred to a letter (copies were made available) from Chancellor Davis to a faculty committee that he (Culbertson) had formed at the Chancellor's request to study the issue of faculty workloads at LSU. The committee submitted a draft report to Chancellor Davis a week to 10 days prior to this Senate meeting. President Culbertson said there has been considerable discussion and concern by faculty over this matter. Culbertson said though he has seen the draft report, it is still a draft between the Chancellor and the committee. He pointed out the letter indicates what the Chancellor was specifically
President Culbertson reported there had been faculty concerns that Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development Eaton is taking the lead in some part of the effort regarding faculty workload. Culbertson said he had met with Chancellor Davis and Vice Chancellor Eaton earlier today and reported the Chancellor intended for the Provost, the chief academic officer, to address the issue of faculty workload. The Provost was out of town, and knowing one affect students, President Culbertson asked Vice Chancellor Eaton to address parts of this issue, and that is how Vice Chancellor Eaton got involved. President Culbertson asked the Chancellor if he could share the Chancellor's letter with the Senate today because he wanted the Senate to be aware of developments, and he pointed out that making the Senate aware of this issue is the work of the committee the President appointed to make a report to the Senate. President Culbertson asked the Chancellor if he could share the Chancellor's letter with the Senate today because he wanted the Senate to be aware of developments, and he pointed out that making the Senate aware of this issue is the work of the committee the President appointed to make a report to the Senate.
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Senator McGehee provided additional information on this topic. In the 1970s, the exam period was 6 days. By the early 1980s, the exam period had been extended to 8 days to reduce crowding in the exam schedule. The 6-day period did not work out because graduation is usually scheduled for 2 days after the exam period ends, and it puts great pressure on some faculty for getting grades submitted. It was mentioned the proposal goes back to a 6-day exam period, Monday-Saturday. Dead Week in the past has been the full 3-day class week before exams. A few years ago, the university began to try to stop varsity athletic events during this period. The proposed policy calls for a comprehensive Dead Week running from Wednesday through Sunday before exams begin. During this period, as with the previous policy, there would be no student extracurricular activities, such as social and athletic events, on or off campus, and there would be no major tests in academic courses other than lab course. This brings up the new point. This rules out a professor giving a last hour exam during the last 3 days of classes. The rest of the policy is similar to previous policy. It is required that a final exam be given with some proviso.

Senator McGehee asked for additional questions and comments which included:

--- Why make exceptions for lab classes?
--- How does it affect a studio course?
--- Athletic events would not be held during this period starting next year.

A visitor to the Senate meeting, Steve Weintraub, spoke to the Senate against the part of the Dead Week policy that prohibits a major test or last hour exam during Dead Week. He emphasized he was not advocating every professor give major tests during the last few days of class. He pointed out one problem. It happens to fail in the syllabus. Tests and exams should be learning experiences and our students don't learn from final exams because most never see them. For this reason, faculty could be allowed to give tests the last week of class. Also, the speaker said he understands the new policy is proposed in part to stop some faculty from giving their comprehensive final exams during the last week of classes instead of during exam week. He suggested this may be done by a small number of faculty, but this problem should be addressed in a more direct way. He went on to say he thought it important to have an exam that allowed all (in particular, the material near the end of the course) material in a course to be covered in tests in the last days of a semester, then on the last day of classes the last test can be reviewed before the final exam. Also, he believes this policy would be a violation of academic freedom. He suggested the Senate vote to delete the Dead Week part of the policy and approve the rest of the reports recommendations.

Senator Daly stated he generally supports the recommendations, and he stated he gives an optional makeup exam to replace any other test score given during the semester, and that all students were there today to take the makeup test (the last week of class).

In the discussion, it was mentioned this resolution (92-14) would come up for consideration in the next Senate meeting of the fall.

The results of the Senate election were announced at this time (the results are reported on first page of these minutes).

Senator Kinney proposed an amendment to a resolution introduced last time pertaining to a Council of Policy Committees (Resolution 92-12). The amendment concerns membership.

The proposal now reads:

PROPOSAL FOR COUNCIL OF POLICY COMMITTEES

Charges:

1. to represent the policy committees of the various academic units in communication with the Executive Committee; and,
2. to develop and continuously maintain universally applicable criteria for evaluation of academic and research programs for planning and/or restructuring; and
3. to advise the Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding planning and/or restructuring.

Membership:

One representative of the elected policy committee from each of the following academic units: Agriculture, Arts, and Sciences; Basic Sciences, Business Administration, Design, Education, Engineering, Center for Coastal Energy and Environmental Resources, and Veterinary Medicine; one member representing the policy committees from Social Work, Music, and Library and Information Sciences; one member from academic and research units not otherwise represented; and one ex-officio representative from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. In the event that a committee of appointed members functions as a policy committee within a unit, representation from such a committee would be accepted if formally approved by a vote of the faculty in the unit.

President Culbertson asked if there were discussion on this before the vote and noted this would formalize the Council of Policy Committees which will serve as a liaison for the various college policy committees. It was mentioned the Academic Computing Committee was used as a model for this committee. In response to a question, it was stated General College would fall in with the group "other units." This proposal was approved.

Senator Collier was asked to lead additional discussion concerning the teaching or faculty workload memo. She reported the Executive Committee had sent a memo to Vice Chancellor Heden expressing concern about this. The Executive Committee thought the Senate should support the statement in the Faculty Handbook until the Faculty has a chance to have input on developing and evaluating guidelines. She said the Executive Committee feels this is an academic matter and faculty should be involved in all aspects of this. A resolution was read to the Senate:
Resolution 92-15:

The Faculty Senate supports the current statement on faculty workload in the Faculty Handbook unless amended and developed by the University community as a whole.

Senator Kinney moved to suspend the rules to allow a vote concerning this today. The motion to suspend the rules carried by the required two thirds vote.

Senator Collier was asked to read the resolution again, and she pointed out the current statement on workload was reproduced on the copies of the Chancellor's memo as available to the Senate.

Senator Metcalf commented that though he does not question the Chancellor's right to form a committee to give advice on this topic, he does object that something of major significance to faculty such as this should be handled by a committee whose existence was unknown to the faculty until today, and, he said he does not understand the statement about the urgency of this matter. President Culbertson responded that while one may argue about the amount of faculty involvement in setting up this committee, there was no intention or effort to keep secret the existence and work of this committee.

In response to a question from Senator Homburger, President Culbertson stated the report of the committee is a draft at this time and that they may want to do additional work on before it is released. This is why it is not yet available for distribution.

Senator Metcalf again expressed the concern that the way this is being handled could result in the policy being set without the faculty Senate having input.

One of the committee members present reported that their task was to explain and defend the current policy on workload and that they made no recommendations. The guidelines indicated in the letter came from the Chancellor's office, not the committee.

Senator Collier stated that is an important point: The guidelines on the back of the sheet are from the Chancellor's office, not from the committee.

Senator Richardson of the committee emphasized the committee defined the task as making clear or explaining the existing faculty workload statement as if they were preparing a document that would be appropriate to be distributed to the public. The guidelines came from the Chancellor.

President Culbertson indicated the Chancellor's letter seems to be now asking the Committee to consider the guidelines given. The committee's response might be to agree with or reject them in their entirety, advising that some may have merit with or without modifications, or any other response.

Someone commented the guidelines shown would not be appropriate for the type of work many of their faculty do in large writing classes compared to lecture classes, and other differences between the type of work different faculty do was mentioned that may not be recognized with such guidelines.

Professor Rao asked if the Executive Committee was aware that this committee was formed. Senator Perlis suggested that doing something like this internally may be an attempt to persuade politicians they have no need to pass a bill. If it were kept internally and subject to continued review and necessary modification, there might be some benefits in doing this, but there are too many questions and problems with what has been presented. This approach does not take into consideration special duties and special needs of particular courses. And, there is no incentive to serve on committees or do extra duties when your job effort is quantified.

Senator Daly offered that guidelines such as these would be unfair to graduate education.

Senator Pollakoff said he disagrees strongly with guidelines shown. He said he understands some politicians say know of faculty that do no teaching and that there are likely a few problems that should be addressed. But, he should state what our broad guidelines are. We need to consider faculty workload in a case by case basis because of the diversity of what we do. In trying to quantify and make workload defensible, guidelines such as these make the effort ridiculous.

Senator Catano referred to Senate Bill 402 by Louisiana Senator Picard. Senator Feldman pointed out two issues are involved: 1) academic freedom, and, 2) whether or not we can agree with the specifics we see. For both, he supports the proposed resolution.

Senator Catano referred to Senate Bill 402 by Louisiana Senator Picard. Senator Feldman pointed out two issues are involved: 1) academic freedom, and, 2) whether or not we can agree with the specifics we see. For both, he supports the proposed resolution.

Senator Koehnke asked if there was a chance if we pass this resolution the state legislature will say this is not what they want and proceed to make up their own workload guidelines for faculty? Senator Homburger again expressed concern over the timing and urgency associated with all of this and the implication for little faculty involvement.

A member of the committee stated the things that came back in the Chancellor's letter are things the committee said would take a lot of time to develop, and then only after evaluating the mission of University and many other complex issues. She reported the feelings of the committee and feelings she hears in this Senate meeting are very similar. She can't see the committee getting involved with a rush job on these guidelines, and she feels that the fears of some that this committee wields great power are unfounded.

She affirmed that the committee felt any effort to develop such workload guidelines was a serious and massive undertaking.

Senator McGehee supported comments of recent speakers and spoke in favor of the short resolution.
Senator Metcalf said he wanted to rephrase previous comments concerning the committee being a secret, that he has no qualms with the committee's work and no concerns with what the committee will do. But, he is bothered that the Chancellor thinks this is an adequate way to deal with this issue.

President Culbertson read the Resolution 92-15 again, a second was received, and the motion to approve was unanimous.

A visitor, Steve Weintraub, was concerned because it sounds like the Chancellor is proposing to greatly increase teaching loads. He proposed another resolution that he hoped a Senator would introduce to the Senate. His proposed resolution read:

Resolution 92-16

Whereas teaching loads at LSU are already at the high end of those at major research universities, and
Whereas any increase in teaching loads would put LSU way out of line with peer institutions, and
Whereas an increase in teaching loads would have an extremely deleterious effect on research at LSU, and would threaten LSU's Research I status, and
Whereas such an increase would both drive present faculty away and make it next to impossible to attract qualified new faculty, and
Whereas, as a result, such an increase would do long-standing and irreparable harm to LSU, and
Whereas it is simply unfair to LSU faculty to increase their teaching workloads by factors of 50-100 percent and more, Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty strongly, vigorously, resolutely, and uncompromisingly opposes any increase in teaching loads, and
Be it further resolved that the Faculty rejects the "Draft Guideline for determining the normal teaching load of academic faculty at LSU" as totally unacceptable.

This resolution was moved and seconded.

Senator Poliakoff spoke against the resolution. While he agreed with some of its points, he indicated the wording may be too harsh, it is unnecessarily confrontational, and also he thought some of the wording needs taking. He suggested a careful look at the wording and making changes so the resolution would have the same spirit, but sound less confrontational. He suggested the implications workload guidelines pit research against education should be considered more and the wording changed appropriately.

A Senator requested additional discussion be allowed before the Senate votes to suspend the rules. Senator Collier agreed with Senator Poliakoff and stated we have made a statement with the original resolution, and said we need to decide how we feel about the committee, and do we want this committee to represent us. The committee can respond strongly to the Chancellor. There are going to be more negotiations on this and the committee could very well express their strong feelings.

A Senator asked if this was an ad hoc committee of the Senate, and President Culbertson said again it is the Chancellor's Committee appointed by me. It was never a secret committee.

Senator Koehnke asked about the number of people on the committee, and the response was the committee had nine members.

A Senator, also a member of this committee, reported that never once has the administration suggested to them they were considering changing the teaching load. We were simply asked to explain current policy.

President Culbertson stated we may object to quantifying workloads, but we should not object to being able to give a good explanation of what we do, and that is primarily what this committee is about.

A visitor suggested we should not feel defensive about what we do because we can strongly defend what we do by comparing this University's performance with others, especially considering the poorer financial support LSU receives compared to similar universities.

Senator Catano, speaking to the motion on the floor, would prefer to keep the brief motion put forward by the Executive Committee. He stated it was written to let the administration know that this approach is not satisfactory to the faculty and it puts some faculty members in an unpleasant position.

A Senator was concerned by the dates on the memo and documents. The request with the guidelines that came out of Vice Chancellor Eaton's office was dated 5 May and referred to a meeting held the previous day. The memo from Chancellor Davis's office was dated 7 May.

Another Senator supported Senator Catano's position stating we should be very careful about a resolution mentioning increased teaching loads because if you read the official policy and these proposed guidelines, there is no mention of increased teaching loads.

Steve Weintraub voiced disagreement, thinking this is an effort to increase our teaching loads, and he thinks we need a strong statement to come out of this meeting.

At this point, a motion to suspend the rules to permit a vote on the resolution Weintraub was supporting was held. The motion to suspend the rules did not receive a two thirds vote.

Senator Collier asked the Senate to consider how they feel about the committee and should the committee be responsive to the feelings of the Senate on this issue.

Senator Kinney mentioned increased elected members of the Executive Committee have full voting privileges during the summer and the Executive Committee has the power to act for the Senate during periods when the Senate cannot meet. He asked Senators to express their concerns to the Executive Committee during the summer.

Following a motion from Senator Kinney, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 P.M.