Special Recognition

- Past Senate President George Strain was presented with a plaque of appreciation and the Senate voted to extend its appreciation for his two years of distinguished service as president.

Elections

- Malcolm Richardson (English) was elected Secretary to replace David England.
- Peggy Draughn (Human Ecology) was elected Member-At-Large to replace Wade Dorman.
- Elizabeth Wilson (Marketing) was elected Member-At-Large from among the class of new senators.

President’s Report

- Erwin Poliakoff gave a presentation on the American Association of University Professors.
- Results of faculty raises were presented; deferred maintenance funding was reported and the impact of not receiving a continuation budget was discussed.
- Student enrollment is up by approximately 1,000.
- Solicitation of bids from outside vendors to run University food services, including the Faculty Club, was discussed.
- The Executive Committee met with the Dean of Academic Affairs and Student Services from Baton Rouge Community College and offered support.

Old Business

- Senate Resolution 95-06 on meeting the Board of Regents general education requirement on computer literacy was tabled.

Faculty Senate Minutes
September 6, 1996

The meeting was called to order by President Collier at 3:05 pm. Proxies were announced. Guests present included Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs William Jenkins, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dan Fogel, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Laura Lindsay, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Director of Budget and Planning Bob Kuhn, Lisa Harris (Dean of Undergraduate Admissions), Janice Lovett (Public Relations), Erwin Poliakoff (Chemistry), Robin Etheridge (Staff Senate) and several student observers.

Minutes of the May 6th meeting were moved and approved.

President’s Report

President Collier began the meeting noting that the President’s Report would be interpersed with the results of the various senate elections being conducted. The positions being filled were those of Secretary and two Member-at-Large positions. According to the Senate’s Bylaws, the new Senate Member-at-Large position must be filled from among the senators starting a fresh term of office with the new academic year. Collier explained that the position of Secretary, to which David England was elected in May, had to be filled because Senator England had left the university, and one of the Members-at-Large elected at the May meeting, Wade Dorman, was currently on leave from the University. Collier explained that the only restriction which applied to the membership of the Executive Committee was that no more than two of its members could be from the same college, so no senator from the College of Basic Sciences was eligible for either nomination. Collier announced Malcolm Richardson (English) as the Executive Committee nomination for the position of Secretary. There were no further nominations from the floor, so Richardson was declared elected. The replacement Member-at-Large election was then conducted with Ralph Kinney as the nominee. Senator Maren Hegsted nominated Senator Peggy Draughn (Human Ecology). Draughn was elected. The new incoming senator Member-at-Large position went to Elizabeth Woodside (Marketing) when no further nominations were received from the floor.

Collier resumed his president’s report by presenting past president George Strain with a plaque of appreciation for his distinguished
service. Collier then asked Senator Paxton to make a motion to extend the Faculty Senate’s appreciation to Strain as its former president. The rules were suspended so this motion could be acted upon immediately. The motion was approved unanimously.

Collier recognized Erwin Poliaffoff (Chemistry), current president of the American Association of University Professors. Poliaffoff described the AAUP as an organization with concerns similar to the Faculty Senate, with the two groups cooperating and working together for the benefit of all faculty. Poliaffoff noted that his organization, like the Senate, tries to carry on faculty business, but with different rules. He noted that the AAUP expends a lot of effort raising faculty concerns in general, and sometimes gets involved with grievances to guarantee that procedures are properly followed and faculty interests are represented. One of the group’s main activities is to act as a liaison to groups who affect the future of faculty at LSU. The AAUP has had faculty members testify before state legislative committees. The AAUP holds regular meetings with University administrators to provide an additional line of communication. They also meet with legislators and other people in state government invited to their meetings. Recently, several gubernatorial candidates spoke at a meeting. He concluded by urging the Senators to join AAUP, saying it would be a worthwhile investment and provide an additional way for their voices to be heard.

President Collier then reported on a number of events which had occurred since May: Salary increases were approved by the legislators, the Board of Regents, etc. for faculty. The legislature only approved 5/6's of the annual amount necessary for the raises and as a result they won't start until September (12-month employees) or late October (academic year employees). Collier noted that if calculations are based only on full-time faculty and the money being calculated is based only upon state sources, then the average raise was 12.76%. If calculated on the basis of both full and part-time faculty and on the basis of all sources of income, the average was 12.06% since these additional faculty were not covered by state funds. Emphasis was on those faculty furthest below the regional SREB averages, the instructors and full professors. Collier noted that these full-time faculty, paid from state sources, received average raises of 13.34% (instructors), and 13.0% (full professors). Collier also noted that the entire raise list is available in the Hill Memorial Library and in Middleton Library. Collier noted that the $8.3M which came to LSU for faculty raises was restricted to faculty below the rank of dean, and could not be used for any other purpose. Four percent of the raise was across the board and merit and equity were also a consideration.

The university received another $8M restricted to deferred maintenance. As a result, the university’s budget did go up. Unfortunately, the rest of the budget was reduced because funds for mandated costs such as utilities, civil service increases, and promotion raises were not provided by the state. As a result, the ‘96-’97 budget actually had a $5.3M shortfall. The result, after rebudgeting, was a permanent $2.6M reduction. Collier commented that this reduction has surely been felt in the departments and schools and reiterated that this was a direct result of the fact that the budget for ‘96-’97 was not even a continuation budget. On a more positive note, Collier said that there is a very good probability that next year’s budget from the legislature will at least be a continuation budget, so we don’t have to be slashing the other parts of the budget. Collier went on to explain that for the university to suffer a $5.3M shortfall in the new budget and yet only have $2.6M in permanent cuts, a number of things had to happen. One offset to this shortfall was that the administration had projected an increased enrollment of at least 500 new students this year, and counted on the associated revenue. Thanks to Lisa Harris and her recruiting efforts, the university has more than exceeded that projection, with approximately 1,000 new students now expected. Collier noted that undergraduate enrollment was up, transfer enrollment was up, ACCESS enrollment was up and full-time student enrollment was also up. The increase in full-time enrollment figures are of particular importance since full-time students contribute more money to the general fund. He went on to report that overall Graduate School enrollment was slightly down, with full-time up and part-time down.

Collier reported that strategic and operational planning had been an issue over the summer and noted that this was one of the topics on which the Executive Committee, along with a number of others in administration, was pushing hard to advance. Operational planning is the year to year planning that the institution should do and is one of the things the Executive Committee feels must be implemented to prevent the across-the-board cuts that occur with a shortfall. Fortunately, according to Collier, academic areas were not hit as hard as the rest of the university during the current shortfall. Collier also expressed the sentiment of the Executive Committee that if we are going to do departmental operational planning, it must then be implemented. The Executive Committee is also proposing that incentive-based proposals be solicited as a part of the operational planning process to stimulate the institution to go in positive directions using the creativity of the faculty. Strategic planning is also important, but it has got to be coupled with operational planning, said Collier, adding that the Senate Executive Committee is concerned more about the operational aspect than the strategic planning aspect.

Collier noted that there had been some controversy with regard to the Faculty Club and gave a brief summary. Because of an increased interest by students and others to have food services in the Union reflect franchised outlets, Vice Chancellor Moore has been looking at how to effectively contract out those services, and also at how to do so without use of university capital funds for converting the Union to accommodate these franchise facilities. Collier reported that when a request for proposals went out for bids, it included all campus food services, including the Faculty Club. Stringent requirements were set so that only about six companies in the country were eligible to even bid. The bids will be opened Sept. 12 and those responding will be ranked based on their proposals. LSU will then negotiate first with the company that is ranked first. It does not necessarily mean that LSU will include the Faculty Club, the cafeterias or other components in the final agreement. The possibility of the Faculty Club becoming contracted out under a franchise operation has the Executive Committee concerned, said Collier, and we are involved in looking at it. Vice Chancellor Moore has agreed to have focus groups formed who will be reacting to the bids and advising whether or not they should include the Faculty Club and other facilities in that part of the negotiation before any decisions are made. Collier stated that there would be people from the Faculty Senate and Faculty Club Inc. in those focus groups. He suggested that Senators with opinions about it should let their feelings be known.

Collier also brought the Senate up-to-date on the three administrator searches underway at LSU: director of CCEER, and deans of the Colleges of Engineering and Design.
Collier announced that the Board of Regents has a outside consultant that is working to develop a formula for funding the various universities. LSU is somewhat concerned because the current proposed formula is student contact hour driven, which would not reflect or appropriately fund the role, scope, and mission of LSU. The proposed formula is still very much in progress and the Senate will be watching it closely.

The university will soon be announcing its participation in a capital fund drive in which the faculty will hopefully be active. The Faculty Senate and Executive Committee will also be active in it, not only in raising funds, but also in helping set the priorities. Collier reported that the Senate has been interacting with the administration and giving suggestions on the priorities for the drive. He told the Senators that it should be announced soon.

The Executive Committee met with Dr. Ann Britt, Dean of Academic Affairs and Student Services at the Baton Rouge Community College. They told her that LSU would very much like to become involved in what BRCC is doing. Due to the very tight schedule for getting the college started, Collier said Britt might address the LSU faculty about part-time teaching and other areas of potential support. Collier also added that the Senate would very much like to see our faculty involved.
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Old Business:
President Collier introduced Senate Resolution 95-06 (printed in the May minutes), to be discussed and acted upon. The resolved portion reads:
Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate add the General Education requirement that students be able to demonstrate computer literacy at the school or college level through the designation of one or more approved courses as meeting the requirement of computer literacy in fulfilling his or her General Education Requirements. Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate General Education Committee be responsible for approval and oversight as a part of its authority over the General Education Requirements.

Collier presented background on the resolution. When LSU adopted its General Education Requirements a few years ago, the Board of Regents imposed similar requirements on all the universities in the state, but also added a computer literacy requirement. LSU has not been in technical compliance, although in effect it is probably meeting this requirement. Since we haven't been in compliance with that requirement, we needed to initiate and adopt a resolution for it. The intent of the resolution is that schools and departments will be deciding what in their area constitutes computer literacy. It assumes that almost all campus programs already require computer literacy through existing course work, so it doesn't necessarily mean adding courses to a curriculum. Schools or departments will decide what particular courses meet the requirement, and the General Education Committee will approve their use in fulfilling the requirement.

Laura Lindsay read from the '96 edition of the SACS Reaccreditation Manual which states that the institution's degree programs must provide that students achieve skills in being able to use the computer, pointing out that this is not only a Board of Regents requirement, but a SACS recommendation as well.

Senator Hegsted proposed a motion to substitute the word “department” for “college” in the first part of the Resolved section. Hegsted remarked that she felt the individual departments were better able to determine what would meet the needs of their students.

Senator James Stoner asked that if this was to be a matter set by the department, how would that fit into the university's General Education requirements? He asked whether it was a General Education requirement or more of a departmental requirement? He then asked if there were some Gen. Ed. Requirements that would apply to everyone and then the individual colleges could add on to those requirements depending on their needs? Stoner said his concern was that the Senate was trying to use the rigidity of the course framework to capture something which was still enormously fluid. The whole program is trying to cram the computer literacy requirement into a long-standing formal arrangement. He expressed concern that any sort of attempt to formalize this at the General Education level might have an opposite effect. For example, we would end up still teaching our students programming, when computer programming is not the basic computer literacy for most people at all these days, given the development in technology in recent years.

George Strain remarked that the General Education Requirements on this campus currently do not require computer literacy, but
the Board of Regents requirements do and SACS does, so we need to somehow address this deficiency. He then said that it's not true that
the individual colleges can add to the Gen. Ed. requirements of the university. This is a proposal from the General Education Committee
proposing that each discipline is in the best position to determine how their students should meet computer literacy. Each discipline or
department or college can determine what is best for their students rather than requiring that everybody take Computer Science 1001, for
example. This approach allows each program within the university to identify existing course work that students may have already taken that
gives them an appropriate level of computer knowledge, rather than trying to force a single suit to fit everybody.

Senator Yanitell commented that it is a requirement at most colleges that a department makes a suggestion to change a course,
add a course, or change a curriculum, it is the college that has to sign-off on it before it goes to the Courses & Curricula Committee. So he
argued that leaving the word "college" in the resolution would be more appropriate because it has to go through the college before it goes on
anyway. Nevertheless, the motion to amend the resolution passed.

Stoner made additional comments raising the question of whether or not this was really a General Education matter as opposed to
a matter to be considered in each discipline. He recommended that the appropriate course of action might be to send the motion back to the
committee to consider an alternative approach to a generalized requirement concerning computer literacy. And within each major, students
will demonstrate literacy in the use of computers as appropriate to their field. Senator Richardson stated that he would like to see an
explanation of the mechanisms of the process.

Stoner moved to table the resolution until a representative from the General Education Committee could be present to explain the
proposal; Senator Richardson seconded the motion, which passed.

There being no further old or new business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted
George M. Strain
Acting Secretary
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