FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Wednesday, November 4, 1987
3:00 p.m.
Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union

REVISED AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of October 5, 1987
2. President's Report
3. Interim report from the Committee on the Status of Women by Martha Collins and Dan Fogel, Co-Chairman
4. Report from the Faculty Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Computing by Neil Kestner, Chairman
5. Report on the Library Budget by Sharon Hogan, Director of LSU Libraries
6. Old Business
   a. Final action on Faculty Senate Resolution 87-3 (concerning the support for Library budget)
   b. Final action on Faculty Senate Resolution 87-4 (changes wording in Faculty Handbook regarding grievance procedure)
7. New Business
   a. Faculty Senate Resolution 87-5 to establish a Faculty Senate Standing Committee on Computing (to be distributed at the meeting)
   b. Other New Business

If you are unable to attend this meeting of the Faculty Senate, please refer to Article VI, Appendix b, page 36 of the Faculty Handbook (1986 edition) for alternate representation.
MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 4, 1987

President Purtle called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and welcomed Al-Baghdadi, Martha Collins, Dan Fogel, Sharon Hogan, Neil Kestner, Carruth McGehee, Harold Silverman, and press representatives Dianne Nodier, Carl Redman, and Delia Taylor.

Parliamentarian for the meeting was Gary Moore

1. Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of October 5, 1987 There being no additions or corrections, the Minutes were approved as distributed.

2. President's Report The President's Report focused on an analysis of the LSU Benefits Package. Problems with the Benefits Package, legal issues, and possible means of improving the benefits were presented. President Purtle is the faculty representative to an LSU System Committee on Benefits. Individuals who would like a copy of the President's Report should contact her (Dept. of Sociology--88-5357).

3. Interim report from the Committee on the Status of Women by Martha Collins and Dan Fogel, Co-Chairman The Committee expects to complete a preliminary study of salary equities by the end of this semester. The Committee hopes to make initial recommendations to the Senate during the spring semester. Preliminary calculations suggest that the University's commitment to affirmative action in hiring women must be intensified in the coming decade. Data were presented on the percentage of women in professional ranks department by department compared to the percentage of women holding terminal degrees appropriate to each discipline. These data show large differences (15% or more) between female faculty representation at professorial ranks and Ph.D. production between 1978-82 in fifteen departments throughout the University. In addition, the percentage of women in professional ranks in another fourteen academic units is between 10% and 15% under the percentage of female Ph.D.s granted between 1978-82. Five departments have a percentage of women faculty that exceeds the 1978-82 comparison figure. In order to bring female professorial faculty to the same proportion as that of females awarded terminal degrees (1978-82) in the disciplines represented in each college, the University as a whole would have to add 172 women in professorial ranks. Women are underrepresented in leadership positions throughout the administrative divisions of the University. Copies of this report may be obtained from the Committee and any questions, suggestions, and offers of assistance are welcomed from members of the Faculty Senate and the faculty.

4. Report from the Faculty Senate Ad-Hoc Committee on Computing by Neil Kestner, Chairman Dr. Kestner gave a brief history, beginning in 1983 with the Chancellor's appointment of a task force on computing and data processing, of faculty and administrative involvement in committees on computing. After 18 months, the task force completed a report in 1984 which consisted of 17 recommendations. Dr. Draayer reported in 1985 to the Faculty Senate and Dr. Collins, Senate President, set-up a Senate task force to get an administrative response to the 17 recommendations. In the spring of 1986, Dr. Guilede (Chairman of the ad-hoc Committee on Computing) and the committee again addressed general policy issues. Presently the committee recommends that the faculty become involved in policy decisions regarding computer usage, funding and support activities. Some mechanism needs to be devised to establish consultation and cooperation between the administration and the faculty. A motion to accept the report was made, seconded, and passed. The report from the Committee on Computing is attached.

5. Report on the Library Budget by Sharon Hogan, Director of LSU Libraries The budget of LSU Libraries was cut $250,000 in 1985-86, remained unchanged in 1986-87, and in 1987-88 was cut about $400,000 from a total budget of $6 million. The Director has shifted funds for book purchases to serials in order to maintain the journal collection. In the past year, the price of journals has almost doubled, and the Library will be forced to cancel some subscriptions. LSU Libraries belong to the Research Library Group (a consortium of top research libraries) which are working together to insure that all journals will be maintained within the group. In the near future the Library staff will again ask departments to review their journal subscriptions and prioritize them according to need.

6. Old Business

Final action on Faculty Senate Resolution 87-3 (concerning the support for Library budget) There was a discussion concerning such things as to whom is the Resolution addressed, what is its purpose, what will it accomplish. A motion to send Resolution 87-3 back to the Faculty Senate Library Committee to possibly reword the Resolution was made by Senator Johnson, seconded by Senator Broughton, and passed.
Final action on Faculty Senate Resolution 87-4 (changes wording in Faculty Handbook regarding grievance procedure)

There was a discussion. A motion to amend line 6 under THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, to read "Faculty Senate Grievance Committee before requesting a review by the appropriate Vice-Chancellor." was made by Senator Foster, seconded, and passed. A motion to amend line 5 under THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, to read "and dean before petitioning the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee; however, it is advised that he or she petition the" was made by Senator Grimes, seconded and passed.

7. New Business

Faculty Senate Resolution 87-5 to establish a Faculty Senate Standing Committee on Computing

Senator Kinney offered Faculty Senate Resolution 87-5.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 87-5

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Established the ad-hoc Committee on Computing to review the status of the 1984 Task Force recommendations on computing; and

WHEREAS, this committee is in agreement that a faculty advisory committee on academic (instructional and research) computing is very necessary, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate is the appropriate organization to form such a committee,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate establish a permanent committee on academic computing at LSU.

Charges:

1. to conduct continuous review of and make recommendations regarding policies and procedures governing all activities related to academic computing (instructional and research) on the LSU campus;

2. to semiannually present a recommended faculty position on the status of academic computing;

3. to facilitate communication and cooperation between the faculty and the administration in matters relating to academic computing.

(The committee will have no administrative function; its role will be one of evaluation and advice. The committee should also serve as the focus for faculty expression. The committee will consist of ten (10) faculty members; one from each of the colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Basic Sciences, Business Administration, Design, Education, and Engineering and one from the School of Veterinary Medicine; one faculty member from among the Schools of Library and Information Science, Music, and Social Work; and one faculty member from among the following: the Audubon Sugar Institute, the Museum Complex, the Center for Energy Studies, and The Center for Wetland Resources. The member from the research units should be a person whose major computing activities are more closely associated with the research unit that with an academic unit. The Director and the Assistant Director for User Services of the System Network Computer Center (SNCC) and a representative appointed by the Director of the LSU Libraries will serve as ex-officio members of the committee.)

There was a discussion. A motion to accept Faculty Senate Resolution 87-5 for a final vote at the December meeting was made by Senator Kinney, seconded by Senator Strain, and passed.

There being no further business, President Purkle adjourned the meeting at 4:55 p.m. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 8, 1987.
ranks;
   Music would have to add 9 women in professorial ranks;
   Veterinary Medicine would have to add 7 women in
   professorial ranks;
   And the University as a whole would have to add 172
   women in professorial ranks.

While such an immediate remedy is clearly out of the question,
translation of the percentage differences into raw numbers does
give a clearer idea of the magnitude of the differences we have
noted between recent production of female Ph.D.s and their
representation on our faculty.

The payroll files for 1986 have allowed us to make two other
calculations that are also illuminating. First, since strong
affirmative action plans at other universities have stressed the
importance of having women in leadership positions, we have
counted the number of full-time women faculty with University-
designated administrative titles. Of 144 persons so designated
on the 1986 payroll files, 128 were male and 16 (11.1\%) were
female. Of 12 deans, 11 were male and 1 female. Of 52
department heads or chairs, 51 were male and 1 was female. Of 5
persons designated "director of a school within a college," 4
were male and 1 was female. The other thirteen women with
administrative designations were lower in the academic hierarchy,
serving as assistant or associate deans or as directors or
coordinators of academic areas. Second, of 21 persons with
professorial chairs (Boyd professorships, Alumni professorships,
and other designated professorships), 19 were male and two were
female.

Our salary equity study will allow us to calculate the
proportion of any difference between average salaries for men and
for women that can be explained by such factors as rank, time in
rank, and highest degree. Assuming that the predominant
proportion of any differential will be explicable by such
factors, we will then go on to investigate whether women have
equal access to salary-enhancing positions (e.g., tenured ranks,
administrative assignments, and chaired professorships). We
welcome any questions, suggestions, and offers of assistance that
may be forthcoming from members of the Faculty Senate and from
the faculty at large.
Our calculations show large differences (15% or more) between female faculty representation at professorial ranks and Ph.D. production 1978-82 in fifteen departments throughout the University. In decreasing order of percentage difference, these are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Pct. Female</th>
<th>1978-82 Ph.D.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>41.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &amp; Italian</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant pathology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>27.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Information Science</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>55.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology &amp; physiology</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the percentage of women in professorial ranks in another fourteen academic units is between 10% and 15% under the percentage of female Ph.D.s 1978-82 in the fields represented: Animal Science, Experimental Statistics, Food Science, Vocational Education, Dairy Science, Poultry Science, Mathematics, Philosophy, Sociology, Speech, Curriculum and Instruction, Industrial Engineering, Criminal Justice, and Music. Almost every other department in the University, in fact, has a percentage of women in professorial ranks lower than female Ph.D. production 1978-82. Only five departments (Entomology, Home Economics, Finance, Marketing, and Biochemistry) have a percentage of women faculty that exceeds the 1978-82 comparison figure.

In order to bring female professorial faculty to the same same proportion as that of females awarded terminal degrees 1978-82 in the disciplines represented in each college:

- Arts & Sciences would have to add 90 women in professorial ranks (assistant, associate, and full professors);
- Agriculture would have to add 23 women in professorial ranks;
- Basic Sciences would have to add 17 women in professorial ranks;
- Design would have to add 14 women in professorial ranks;
- Business would have to add 13 women in professorial ranks;
- Education would have to add 10 women in professorial ranks.
From: Martha Collins and Dan Fogel  
Co-chairs, Commission on the Status of Women  

To: Faculty Senate  

The Commission expects to complete a preliminary study of salary equity by the end of the current semester. In addition, the Commission plans to distribute to faculty early in the spring semester a questionnaire designed to record faculty perceptions of gender bias and inequity. Although the Commission still hopes to make a preliminary report and initial recommendations during the spring semester, it is becoming clear that a final report and a full package of recommendations will take considerably more time to complete.

The Commission has done some preliminary calculations based on the 1986 payroll files. These calculations suggest that the University's commitment to affirmative action in hiring women must not be slackened and indeed must be intensified in the coming decades. For your information, we have calculated the percentage of women in professorial ranks department by department and compared that figure to the percentage of women holding terminal degrees appropriate to each discipline. Our sources for the availability of female Ph.D.s are Availability Data (Affirmative Action Office, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1983) and Professional Women and Minorities: A Manpower Data Resource Service (Washington, DC: Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology, 1986). The percentage of female Ph.D.s we report here represents degrees awarded in the five-year period 1978-82. Although this figure is higher than the overall production of female Ph.D.s from 1920 through 1984, it is considerably lower in virtually all fields than the percentage of Ph.D.s awarded to women in the mid-1980s. The 1978-82 figure might seem at first glance like a reasonable target for the University to aim for over the next fifteen years, so that twenty-five years after the 1978 baseline, in 2003, the percentage of female professorial faculty might approximate degree production at the baseline. In fact, however, the task of setting reasonable affirmative action targets for hiring women is far more complicated. Your Commission expects to make what we believe may be a major original contribution to labor economics and to affirmative action programs nationwide by developing mathematical models for calculating targets based on the changes in stock (the current number of Ph.D.s in a discipline) brought about by flow (the production of new Ph.D.s, with changing gender compositions year by year) and by attrition rates within the discipline over time. This method of projecting the gender composition of the work force in each discipline over time, which has not been used elsewhere so far as we know, will provide more reliable, achievable, and fully defensible targets than would otherwise be possible.
1. A "Computer Advisory Committee" should be formed as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate.

LSU's academic computing activities affect all faculty members—either directly or indirectly. As such, it is recommended that the Faculty Senate immediately appoint a standing Computer Advisory Committee.

The Committee's purpose should be to consider activities related to academic computing on the LSU campus and to report on these matters on a semiannual basis to the Faculty Senate. The Committee should meet regularly with representatives from the System Network Computer Center (SNCC) and appropriate administrators to discuss computer-related plans, problems and policies.

The advisory committee should be comprised of appropriate faculty members and staff members of the System Network Computer Center—in particular, the Center's Director and Assistant Director for User Services. The committee's chairman should be a faculty member.

2. The Faculty Senate should recommend a study of the administrative structure that includes academic computing.

The administrative structure that oversees computing activities necessarily impacts a wide variety of academic affairs on this campus. Currently, the organizational structure is not well understood by the faculty in general. Since this committee has neither received the charge nor the information required to properly study the organizational structure, it recommends that the Faculty Senate present this as a primary charge to the Faculty Senate Computer Advisory Committee. Cooperative interaction with the administration in this study is strongly recommended.

3. The Faculty Senate should strongly recommend that the LSU Administration support a range of academic computer activities.

The LSU Administration has consistently demonstrated its willingness to support academic computing in terms of acquiring mainframe and high-computational computer resources. However, several other areas related to academic computing also warrant commitment and financial support by the University Administration. Most of the items listed below are not currently supported (or are supported only by specific colleges), while others are supported on a campus-wide basis only at minimal levels.

The single most obvious shortcoming regarding computing campus-wide is the need for a general-access microcomputer facility. The facility should be placed in a central location, should be open daily for extended periods of time, should be accessible to faculty, staff, and students of all academic areas, and should be supported primarily by a line-item budgetary allocation. The facility's microcomputers should be connected to the Computer Center's computers for uploading and downloading files and for communication with other computers both inside and outside the LSU system.

A second critical computer-related shortcoming is apparent in the small number of personnel available at the System Network Computer Center for consulting-type services regarding mainframe computing, microcomputing, and communication matters. The complexity and desired interconnectedness of today's computer systems for functions such as file transfers, dial-up service, and access to other computer networks has intensified this problem.

A number of other computer-related, potentially valuable services are also widely desired by the faculty, not currently provided, but deserving of consideration and possible financial support by the Administration. Properly administered, these services could well result in a net savings to the University. These include:

a. centralized computer equipment maintenance coordination,
b. centralized computer hardware purchasing coordination, and
c. centralized organization authorized to negotiate software licenses.
4. The Faculty Senate should strongly recommend that the procedures used to set college and departmental computer budgetary allocations be reevaluated.

The impact of computing on the academic process has been dramatic. It is also recognized that budgetary difficulties which LSU has faced have been tremendous. In the face of these difficulties, and partially because of them, we strongly recommend that the current procedures used to set computer budgetary allocations for colleges and academic departments be reevaluated—and possibly simplified. Two key points discussed briefly below emphasize the need for this process to take place immediately.

a. Allocations to individual academic budgetary units have been virtually unchanged for several years. (The procedure of having the individual departmental units negotiate with academic deans for increased computing funds from the college is ineffective.)

b. Under the current budgetary scheme, instructional computing is placed in direct competition with research computing for funds, with the competition taking place initially at the departmental level. Consideration should be given to billing instructional and research computing to separate budgetary units.

Committee members:

- Neil Kestner, Spokesperson
- Peter Chen
- Carter Hill
- Jeff Humphries
- Carl Knopf
- Richard Lomax
- John Nye
- Neal Stolzfus
- Joel Tohline