Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
September 3, 2003
Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union


Proxies: Kelli Scott Kelley for Thomas Neff, Jon Cogburn for Ian Crystal, Nick Apostolou for Tom Lynch, Dennis Landin for Laura Hensley, Dominique Homberger for Yvonne Fuentes, Witoon Prinyawiwatkul for Maren Hegsted, David Dismukes for Margaret Reams and Victor Stater for John Pizer

Alternative Representatives: Larry Crumbley for Ji-Chai Lin

I. Call to Order by President Carruth McGehee
   A. Reading of proxies

II. Minutes of the May 2003 Faculty Senate Meetings
   A. Approved

III. Chancellor Mark Emmert’s Comments
   A. Focusing on issues which lie before us at LSU
      1. Noted he would be sponsoring two faculty forums to answer questions and address issues related to PS109.
      2. His office issuing press releases on the key objectives of the Flagship Agenda and results of the “Chancellor’s Task Force on Administrative Procedures Dealing with Research Funding”
      3. The processing of grant contracts is being streamlined
      4. Indirect cost fund return are being increased from 10% to 15% and research travel funds will be raised through the office of the Vice Chancellor for Research, Dr. Kevin Smith
      5. LSU will likely be able to fund 30 new faculty positions, continued graduate student support, and faculty raises.
   B. The state’s budget is likely to be in a large deficit
      1. LSU hospital system hit hard
2. Desire to have a new Governor who is supportive of higher education  
a. Chancellor stated how important it is for all of us to be involved in the upcoming Governor’s race  
b. Chancellor told us to be aggressive in asking for help from the Governor for LSU and how Governor might support LSU  

3. Legislature passed a bill instructing the Board of Regents (BOR) to bring back a more “sensible” state-wide funding formula than what we have now  
a. LSU has asked the BOR to involve faculty when making these plans or changing the funding formula. The Chancellor remarked that Laurie Anderson had written a letter to Commissioner Savoie proposing faculty involvement in the revision of the funding formula, and if he hasn’t replied, we should write again.  

4. Stated a desire for a large scale infusion of capital spending on the LSU campus  
a. Infusion of funds would assist with deferred and other maintenance  

5. Continuing concern by people regarding jobs and our ability to employ students in our own state after they graduate  

6. Bond programs “look good” for the state of Louisiana at this time  

IV. Provost Risa Palm’s Comments  
A. Provost Palm spoke of her ideas for LSU stating she thought the best universities have the best shared governance between faculty and administration  
B. Flagship Agenda is critical  
1. Involving, developing a culture and environment that supports a research intensive institution  
a. The need for a strong library  
b. Well-developed facilities in which research and scholarly work can take place  
c. Faculty of adequate size to advise PhD students as well as deliver a mix of large and small classes to undergraduates  
d. Culture that values education  
e. Environment that supports the arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and the professional schools  
f. Teaching that introduces students to cutting-edge new ideas in the fields we teach  
g. Research to strengthen the economy of Louisiana in both direct and indirect ways
h. Direct job creation/environment of culturally educated
i. A strong K-12 system

b. General environment of a great liberal arts and sciences institution

2. Increased breadth, depth, and quality of both undergraduate and graduate programs at the university

a. Higher admission standards
b. Better advising
c. Better provision of necessary classes
d. Examine entire curriculum ensuring quality
e. Service learning
f. Involve students in research internships
g. Study abroad experiences

3. Provost’s goals emphasize the need to be concerned with the “perceived view” of LSU nationally – the perceived quality of education

a. Identifying a set of interdisciplinary ideas for enhancement (enhanced departments as opposed to interdisciplinary areas of enhancement – a topic which Provost hopes to have with faculty groups

4. Provost’s message today that LSU has a vital role in the state, and can and should provide greater leadership in the nation

5. Provost’s job is to help faculty, chairs, and deans to work together to reach these goals through

a. Budget enhancement
b. Systems that encourage the best possible expenditure of the money we have
c. Active promotion of a variety of ideas that let us make significant progress

C. Senator Jon Cogburn asked the Provost to expand on her comment regarding interdisciplinary ideas

1. Provost Palm stated the need for enhanced departments to work together

D. Senator Judith Schiebout commented on the Flagship Agenda on the LSU website and noted that there wasn’t much dialogue going on. Senator Schiebout
wondered if “chatting online” by faculty about the Flagship Agenda was a good idea.

1. Provost Palm thought this was a good idea but she really prefers to “look someone in the eye” in conversation
E. Senator Pratul Ajmera asked for the Provost’s view on shared governance
1. Provost Palm stated that changes in policy procedures would be examined, knowledge regarding budgeting (how is it done), and how money flows were all topics for further discussion

V. President Carruth McGehee’s Report
A. There will be a website which will give updated reports on our progress in implementing Faculty Senate Resolutions. The website will eventually go back several years, and cover questions that come up at Faculty Senate meetings that call for follow-up. Currently, an essay on PS-109 appears at http://www.mathlsu.edu/~mcgehee/PS-109Essay.html
B. Status of SR03-10: It was clearly the sense of the Senate at the May meeting that the matter of PM-35 and so forth should be the subject of direct communication between the administration and the general faculty. A meeting of the Faculty Council will be called eventually, but for the sake of the needed communication, three events are planned: A panel sponsored by the LSU Chapter of the AAUP, to be announced; and two meetings of the Chancellor and Provost with the general faculty, set for the morning of October 7th and 3:30 p.m. on October 15th, both to be held in Campbell Auditorium. A broadcast email will be sent to all faculty about these meetings. McGehee commented that when the Faculty Council meets to consider SR03-10, there will be several possibilities. The Council might approve or reject the Resolution, so they may do something in between; or, there might fail to be a quorum. So it remains possible that the responsibility will come back to the Senate.
C. PS-109 Advisory Board will be established to oversee all PM35 processes on campus.
1. President McGehee asked Senators to send recommendations of persons for the Advisory Board to him by September 11
D. Senators were asked also to send suggested names for the Committee on Committees. Two one-year positions will be filled by an election at the Senate meeting on October 7
E. Questions asked of President McGehee:
1. Senator Dominique Homberger asked President McGehee what would be the next steps in the matter of PM-35, PS-109, etc. He said he hoped that by the October or November meeting, he would be able
to report on behalf of the PS-36 Committee and have an extensive discussion. The plan is both to provide a preliminary draft of policy affecting the Instructor rank, and at least to raise a number of issues pertinent to the revision of the main subject matter of PS-36. Some of those issues form the context of PS-109, and it may help to begin dealing with them.

2. Another senator asked if PS-109 is open to change at this point. McGehee suggested we let the open discussion between the administration and faculty take place, and see what happens when the Faculty Council meets. Then the Senate might well take up the task of making further recommendations regarding PS-109 and related issues. He felt the Chancellor would be open to our recommendations.

3. Professor Larry Crumbley asked why the Chancellor didn’t use the document from the May meeting. McGehee said he didn’t want to answer for the Chancellor, but guessed the reason might be that some of the changes that had been made in May made our document inconsistent with PM-35. Prof. Crumbley further asked if McGehee believed this [PS-109] to be retroactive for faculty already hired. McGehee said Yes, but that such answer needed some qualifications; for example, there are provisions in PS-109 that address the transition from the PM-35-only period to the PS-109 period.

VI. Elections

A. At-Large Member to the FSEC
   1. Ballot included Pratul Ajmera, Kathy O’Reilly, and Paul Wilson (there were no nominations from the floor).
   Vote Count (First Ballot): Ajmera (23); O’Reilly (19); Wilson (10)
      a. There was a run-off election between Ajmera and O’Reilly;
      Ajmera 21 votes, O’Reilly 23 votes, Abstain 1 vote.
      Kathy O’Reilly elected to be the new At-Large Member to the FSEC

B. Alternate for Grievance Committee
   1. Ballot included Bill Daly and Dan Satterlee (there were no nominations from the floor)
      a. Daly earned 40 votes, Satterlee 17 votes.
      Bill Daly elected as an Alternate for the Grievance Committee
VII. SR03-11 Guidelines and Recommendations for Establishing Criteria for Awarding Merit and Equity Raises (Paul Bell, author)

A. Senator Carl Motsenbocker read resolution aloud
B. Discussion/Comments included the following:
   1. Senator Brian Hales commented that it is hard to make a policy which governs a criteria for all departments; Senator James Catano provided comments relating to equity issues involved in the past, promotion procedures and a formular increase; Senator James Catallo remarked about pay-scale disparities by disciplines; and Senator Joseph Skillen commented he thought the resolution would be a “welcome change”.
   3. An Amendment to the Amendment was offered, to change the second date from May 2004 to April 2004.
      – The amendment to the amendment passed.
      – The amendment passed.
      a. The wording of resolution SR03-11 remains in its original version except for the final paragraph beginning “Therefore, be it resolved....” The amended paragraph reads as follows:

      Therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Personnel Policies Committee prepare a policy statement (PS-IXX) for guidelines and recommendations for departments and units for awarding merit and equity raises for faculty. The following reports are to be delivered at Faculty Senate meetings: progress report in January 2004; draft of the policy in April 2004; and a revision in September 2004. The report and policy statements will be distributed to the Council of Deans and Directors and any others interested.

4. Further discussion of SR03-11
   a. Some senators urged others to vote against the resolution asking what the function of the resolution was.
5. Vote on SR03-11 (as amended) by “show of hands”
   For: 29
   Against: 13

SR03-11 PASSED
VIII. SR03-12 Analyses of LSU Salary Data (Paul Bell, author)
   A. Senator Motsenbocker read aloud the resolution
   B. Discussion/Comments included the following:
      1. Larry Crumbley moved to change dates in the final paragraph beginning “Therefore, be it resolved....” as follows: November 2003 to January 2004, March 2004 to April 2004, and May 2004 to September 2004.
         a. No discussion; Amendment PASSED
      2. Senators commented that it was very difficult to do any kind of salary analysis and some were wondering if the resolution could be amended to include the naming of departments.
      3. Senator James Honeycutt offered a further amendment in the “Therefore” section of the resolution to say “ . . . a study of salary data of faculty and unclassified staff partitioned by discipline be conducted by....”
         a. Further comments included what non-classified meant and would this document include Research Associates. A friendly amendment was offered to correct the title of the committee listed in the “Therefore” paragraph. Instead of “Committee on Long-Range Planning”, it would be “Committee of Review and Long-Range Planning”.
         b. Senator Cogburn suggested an amendment to the amendment by changing the wording in the “Therefore” section of SR03-12 from “...a study...” to “...an on-going study...” as well as no longer list the years 2004 at the end of the paragraph.
            1. Vote on this amendment FAILS
      c. Further discussion of SR03-12 included the following comments: Senator Milton Rush stated this resolution is taking a simplistic approach to a complicated situation; Larry Crumbley stated the resolution would be “a start” in giving faculty information; Senator Rush stated that even if the resolution passed, we’d feel like we had resolved a problem when we really had not.
      d. Wording of resolution SR03-12 remains in its original version except for the change in the final paragraph as follows:
Therefore, be it resolved that a study of salary data of faculty and unclassified staff partitioned by discipline be conducted by the Committee on Review and Long-Range Planning. The Office of Budget and Planning will be asked to provide a liaison to the committee. The topics of study will be determined by the committee, but may include a review of data from the last 15 years. The committee will prepare the following reports for the Faculty Senate: a progress report in January 2004; a draft of their study in April 2004; and the final report in September 2004.

4. Vote on SR03-12 (as amended) by “show of hands”
   For: 21
   Against: 23

SR03-12 FAILED

IX. SR03-13 Posting Faculty Salaries on the Web (Paul Bell, author)
(Note: See Faculty Senate Website, Meeting Minutes from April 2003 for Original Version of SR03-13)

A. Senator Motsenbocker read aloud the resolution
B. Discussion/Comments included the following:
   1. President McGehee obtained unanimous consent to change the wording in the final paragraph from “non-classified” to “faculty and unclassified.” McGehee commented that SR 88-01 had been the Resolution that got the salaries posted publicly in Hill Memorial.

   2. Senator Homberger questioned the terminology “password protected” in the resolution. An amendment was offered to strike the statement “password-protected” in the final two paragraphs of the resolution.
      a. Further discussion included Senator John Chandler being in support of striking the phrase “password-protected”; Senator Sigrid Kelsey stated that persons call the library seeking this type of information and the information is given to the person calling; Senator Skillen pointed out that all salary information about faculty is readily available now.
   3. Vote on amendment to strike the phrase “password-protected” in the final two paragraphs of resolution SR03-13:
      For: 12
      Against: 35

Amendment FAILS
4. Unanimous consent was obtained to accept a suggestion by past President Laurie Anderson to omit the word “and” at the end of the seventh sentence.

5. Senator Cogburn moved to amend the “Therefore” part of SR03-13 to read as follows: Therefore, be it resolved that salary data of LSU A&M and LSU AgCenter faculty and unclassified staff be placed on the password-protected Faculty Resources portion of the PAWS website. The vote:

   For:  28
   Against:  8
   Amendment PASSED

   a. Further discussion included Senator Rush suggesting an amendment to strike the words “unclassified” in the final paragraph of SR03-13. Vote was taken on this amendment. The vote:

   For:  4
   Against:  25
   Amendment FAILED

6. Final version (last two paragraphs) of SR03-13 (as amended):

   Whereas, LSU salary data are public records available at the Hill Memorial Library, Middleton Library, and a bookstore, further public dissemination of the salaries via a password-protected web site would not be substantively different from the distribution already occurring; Therefore, be it resolved that salary data of LSU A&M and LSU AgCenter faculty and unclassified staff be placed on the password-protected Faculty Resources portion of the PAWS website.

   The vote:  
   
   For:  21
   Against:  16
   SR03-13 PASSED

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Senator Lori Bade-Secretary
SR03-11  Guidelines and Recommendations for Establishing Criteria for Awarding Merit and Equity Raises (Paul Bell, author)  
(Note: SR03-11 PASSED at September 3, 2003 FS Meeting)  
See Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting from April 2003 for original version of resolution at  http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/Facsen/apr10_mins.htm

Whereas, unfair awarding of merit and equity raises severely damages faculty morale;

Whereas, annual salary are more common now, it is therefore of more concern to faculty that deficiencies in how salary increases are awarded are addressed;

Whereas, with some exceptions, departments have only rudimentary policies on how to award merit and equity raises;

Whereas, most faculty only know the average merit-raise increase for their department or possibly the range in merit raises, this is inadequate to judge how well one has done;

Whereas, the intent of merit raises is to boost performance, it is often difficult to determine what performance is to be boosted because criteria used for awarding raises are unclear;

Whereas, most department faculty do not discuss how raises should be given whether merit, equity or a combination, whether a small or large range in the percentage-of-salary increases for the department, and whether an across-the-board raise instead of merit raises when the average raise would be less than the inflation rate;

Whereas, it would be useful to learn more about salary policies at other leading universities for their incorporation here;

Whereas, few faculty have been willing to file salary complaints to the Grievance Committee in part because it is unclear what constitutes performance for below-average to above-average merit raises, and

Whereas, policy statements must allow departments substantial power to determine their own criteria for merit raises;

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Personnel Policies Committee prepare a policy statement (PS-1XX) for guidelines and recommendations for departments and units for awarding merit and equity raises for faculty.  The following reports are to be delivered at Faculty Senate meetings:  progress report in January 2004; draft of the policy in April 2004; and a revision in
Whereas, the Faculty Senate has little expertise in the study of salaries even though such study can provide the body with useful information for helping set LSU budget and policy;

Whereas, a study of faculty salaries may help pinpoint faculty rank, discipline, or other groups in particular need for equity raises;

Whereas, LSU and the Board of Regents utilize regional comparisons of faculty salaries to assess LSU salaries, additional study of the comparisons are required to examine the effects of including compensation and the use of other regional or national peer groups;

Whereas, a study of salary data may be helpful for new and old faculty in salary negotiations;

Whereas, the type of efforts by the Office of Budget and Planning in conjunction with deans to present summary statistics of faculty salaries are valuable, these efforts need further development via a joint effort between a liaison from OBP and the Faculty Senate;

Whereas, evidence of a disproportionate increase in salaries of some administrators across the last decade has been found, a rigorous examination of this issue is needed; and

Whereas, faculty’s supposedly greatly improved state of salary compensation in the last few years has been noted, this data must be examined in a more thorough fashion;

Therefore, be it resolved that a study of salary data of faculty and unclassified staff partitioned by discipline be conducted by the Committee on Review and Long-Range Planning. The Office of Budget and Planning will be asked to provide a liaison to the committee. The topics of study will be determined by the committee, but may include a review of data from the last 15 years. The committee will prepare the following reports for the Faculty Senate: a progress report in January 2004; a draft of their study in April 2004; and the final report in September 2004.
Whereas, the easier the access to salary data, the more open must be the awarding of merit and equity raises, and the more public any punitive or unwise actions against faculty regarding salaries. Sometimes the best reform efforts are those that require previously private actions to be placed into public view;

Whereas, efforts to remove obstacles to the access of LSU salary data will help increase the chances of independent, rigorous examination of the data, decrease the novelty of viewing the data, and diminish the taboo against the study of salary data;

Whereas, serious study of salary data requires computer-searchable text, scanned copies of LSU salary data placed on the web would allow easy conversion to searchable text; a step much more difficult if a paper version is used;

Whereas, a web version of LSU salary data is virtually free and does not use paper while a paper version costs $11 and is 92 pages; and

Whereas, LSU salary data are public records available at the Hill Memorial Library, Middleton Library, and a bookstore, further public dissemination of the salaries via a password-protected web site would not be substantively different from the distribution already occurring;

Therefore, be it resolved that salary data of LSU A&M and LSU AgCenter faculty and unclassified staff be placed on the password-protected Faculty Resources portion of the PAWS web site.