Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 16, 2020
Harrison Board Room, Foundation Building

Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:
1. Mandi Lopez (President, VCS)
2. Ken McMillin (Past-President, AG)
3. Joan King (Vice-President, Food Science)
4. Fabio Del Piero (Secretary, PBS)
5. Prosanta Chakrabarty (Member-at-Large, Biology)

Parliamentarian: Louay Mohammed

Senators present (X = Present; A = Alternate; P = Proxy):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Senator Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Proxy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fereydoun Aghazadeh</td>
<td>Cassandro (ENG)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Priscilla “Lilly” Allen</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aly Aly (ENG)</td>
<td>Juan Martinez (PBS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kayanush (Kai) Aryana (AG)</td>
<td>William Monroe (Law)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Michael Banks (BUS)</td>
<td>John Martin (SCI)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chris Barrett (HSS)</td>
<td>William Monroe (BS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inessa Bazayev (MDA)</td>
<td>John Martin (SCI)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dorin Boldor (ENG)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jeffrey Brooks (Law)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Konstantin Busch (ENG)</td>
<td>John Martin (SC)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cassandra Chaney (HSE)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chantel D. Chauvin (HSS)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Senlin Chen (HSE)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Prosanta Chakrabarty (SCI)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jin-Woo Choi (ENG)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brett Collier (AG)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brandi Conrad (HSE)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Robert Cook (SCI)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Theda Daniels-Race (ENG)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jeff Davis (AG)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Michael Desmond (AD)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Levent Dirikolu (CBS)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Peter Doran (SCI)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Edward Gibbons (HSE)</td>
<td>John Martin (HSE)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests:

Andrew Sluyter  Nicole Roth  James Stoner  Matt Lee  Jane Cassidy
Ryan Landry  Stacia Haynie

Public Comments on Agenda Items
None.

Consideration of the Minutes from December 3, 2019
Moved by Ioan Negulescu and Theda Daniels-Race
Approved unanimously with potential corrections.

President’s Report

1. The college policy chairs will be meeting with the Provost for Pie with the Provost on January 22, 2020.
2. The Faculty Standing Committees are active and looking to alleviate circumstances in the university. The Benefits Committee has been especially active. Members have identified payroll discrepancies concerning insurance deductions. Workday does not contain key financial modules with accounting capabilities. It cannot calculate 9-month payroll deductions. Therefore, the calculations are done through Excel that are then manually entered. Errors are identified during monthly reporting. Discrepancies are revised and the new deduction is entered. Despite a new Workday system, deductions are still performed traditionally, the way
they have been for 30 years. Mandi Lopez encouraged all senators to look at their monthly deductions to identify inconsistencies or fluctuations and make sure that the sum is the annual cost of insurance. Share with your findings with the Benefits Committee.

3. Workday student is a potential replacement for the student information systems in the mainframe. Contact the Executive Committee members with thoughts or comments. The initial impression from the Executive Committee is that substantial advances in the system are necessary to meet the needs of the students.

4. Add/drop forms are still driven through paper. The attached carbon sheets continue to baffle students and faculty alike.

5. Physical copies of phone bills are appearing at mysterious intervals to faculty mailboxes. They are charges for long distance calling that are to be deducted from payroll through Workday. The Executive Committee has requested that the university administration please rethink manual and paper actions and move toward efficient processes that are consistent with green practices.

6. Please participate in the Association of Faculty Senates faculty survey.

7. At the request of the Executive Committee and in light of a serious influenza season, Dr. Nelson Perrett, Director of the Student Health Center, will be presenting during the February meeting.

8. Also, in February, VP Sabourin, leader of Strategic Communications, will be sharing happenings and future plans.

9. Classes were suddenly canceled January 13 and 14 for the national championship football game. The core mission of faculty at LSU is to teach and educate the students of this state. While the campus hummed with the quiet activities of faculty scrambling to adjust schedules and syllabi, future leaders and scholars were otherwise occupied with activities that were suddenly endorsed and inexplicably enforced by those in charge of supervising their education. While leisure and fun activities are part of a satisfying life, accountability and responsibility are also inherent components of a successful and equally satisfying existence. Leadership should always consider first and foremost the impact of their decisions. The council of faculty advisors voiced strong opposition to the decision to close the school at the Board of Supervisors meeting. The general tone from student, faculty, and staff was one of dismay. Students were offended at the disregard for their schedules and Saturday makeup classes are socio-economically insensitive. The two makeup days will be January 25 and February 8. Mandi Lopez advised the senators to be kind to those students that work, have children, or other planned activities.

Q&A Summary:
None.

GeauxGrants Update and Strategic Operations Plan, Sam Bentley, Vice President, Office of Research and Economic Development

Sam Bentley began his presentation with the GeauxGrants update. GeauxGrants, a better system than Workday, replaces the SPS program on the mainframe. Four years were spent identifying and customizing the program. There are two main parts. First, the compliance components, PM-11 disclosures on outside employment and travel disclosures, came online early 2019. PM-11 disclosures are up 150% from what they were at the same time last year when using paper forms. The second part of this is turning on the GeauxGrants component. It came online January 1. Since that time, 88 proposals are in the system and dozens submitted for a total of $5.3 million. There have been issues on getting through the interface, but largely, very few complaints. Part of this is due to a vast effort on training. There have been 23 different classes and 230 faculty that have gone through training. ORED has several different goals for the faculty and university. They want to promote and support faculty success, student success through the research enterprise, and they want to achieve and demonstrate publicly an economic and human impact on the entire region. ORED has spent the last year talking and listening—What do you need? What can we do to help? The notes taken from meetings and recommendations were assimilated into a strategic plan that can be implemented and measured. The resources identified are team, staff, and financial resources. The strategies that will be implemented are engaging, engaging group stakeholders, promoting interdisciplinary work, strategic communication, using data to inform any decision making, striving for exemplary support services, and expanding economic development efforts as well as redefining economic development for the state. For example, reducing the hurricane risk to a community is economic development because they can recover sooner and head back to work. Other goals are promoting strategic research priorities, expanding grant activities, increased engagement with ORED, especially with the public and legislators of the important work done at LSU, and increase yearly grant expenditures.

Q&A Summary:
Joan King: Who do you define as the key stakeholder group?

Sam Bentley: Everyone, but it depends on the question. For example, we want to make sure that elected officials understand that we are doing a tremendous amount of work that impacts everyone across the state. Another example would be the fisherman on the impacts of river sediments on shrimp and oysters. It can be anyone—agency directors, elected officials, you name it.

Theda Daniels-Race: I have two questions. One follows up on Dr. King’s question. In terms of key stakeholders and community engagement, are there plans or anyone engaging communities that surround the LSU campus? Since legislators are sensitive to their constituents and their constituents have a stake in what we’re doing and are benefiting from it, from there we can engage the legislators. Is there anything being done or will be done with the local communities to get them engaged.

Sam Bentley: There are many scholarly activities and research being done on campus. Some of them may have benefit in the future in terms of application. For example, research that helps a city that identify urban food deserts, coming up with mechanisms to reduce those are impactful locally. We need to make sure that the community and the state that we are working in this area for their benefit. Another example is the research being done on behavioral interventions to get people to seek treatment on HIV.
Theda Daniels-Race: I have more one quick question. Is funding for graduate student travel under ORED’s supervision? In past processes, the student would apply and one the criteria is a letter of invitation for acceptance. Sometimes the timing, especially local conferences, does not match the deadlines for the application. Is something being done to streamline this for graduate student funding?

Stacia Haynie: I met yesterday with the GSA association and they have been addressing that. That will begin in the new fiscal year. The graduate student governance has been setting the criteria. They are aware of the issue and are taking steps to address that.

ACT Score Analysis, Jose Aviles, Vice President, Enrollment Management

Jose Aviles thanked the senators for allowing him to discuss the changes to ACT score analysis. ACT testing agency announced two significant shifts in what they will be doing. At the national meeting for strategic enrollment managers, ACT in conjunction with the University of Florida did a presentation on what this shift means. Starting next cycle, students will be able to take independent parts of the test at any given date. The core battery must be completed before being allowed to take individual parts. Section retesting will be present in the next recruitment cycle. LSU needs to recognize the implications of this. The more pressing issue for LSU is the super scoring aspect of the ACT. Forty percent of institutions in the United States use super scoring. Currently, it is more present in the usage of SAT. Super scoring is the methodology to take the sub scores of a student portfolio to construct a composite score. ACT’s shift is due to new research from Harvard and the ACT board where 70% of students were retaking the exam and the inconsistencies in methodologies in the use of the exam in admissions. Super scoring also resulted the least amount of prediction error of any methodology. LSU uses the highest score from any exam taken. The average shift is less than half of a point. All SEC schools are implementing super scoring for admission purposes except LSU and the University of Kentucky. ACT boards will still be providing composite scores. Beginning next cycle, students will be submitting individual scoring. The admission process will not be impacted as much as scholarship awards will be. For example, a super score of 26 versus a composite score of 25, will cost the student $13,000 worth of scholarship awards. It potentially places LSU at a disadvantage compared to other SEC schools.

Q&A Summary:

Stephen Shipman: Do you know if there is some kind of theory that can predict or why super scoring should give better correlation to student success?

Jose Aviles: Not necessarily as far as I understand. The composite is an indicator of a single moment in time. Their competency is the highest that they’ve achieved in a single instance. As section retesting moves forward, each subject will be magnified.

Theda Daniels-Race: When does the new cycle begin for the super scoring?

Jose Aviles: October is the testing. For admissions, it’s August 1.

Theda Daniels-Race: I always thought that it was different for different institutions. Some local school counselors are telling students that ACT and every school across the board takes the best score. That’s not true.

Jose Aviles: Yes. That is a broad statement.

Levent Dirikolu: I have two questions. First, there are some schools that are moving away from any kind of scores. How will this affect application process across the nation? Second, for TOPS, it’s state law that a student must have a 27 on the ACT. If they don’t accept a lower score, what is the impact on LSU?

Jose Aviles: We don’t control the state policy and we are at the mercy of that. TOPS is incredibly important for LSU. We are trying to inform and move them forward in this understanding. We are entering an unstable relationship with potential students. States around LSU will make opportunities that we are unable to offer. We should have more students due to the quality of LSU, the faculty, and the research being done. Scoring is commanding about 20% of variables at the time of admission. Changing student demographics is a large contributor to this trend.

Mandi Lopez: What is the status at LSU and how can faculty assist?

Jose Aviles: In terms of super scoring?

Mandi Lopez: Correct.

Jose Aviles: I would love to have more conversations. The more that we can talk to community members and faculty across the campus about the rigor that goes into the evaluation of an application at admission, the more confidence we can have. We need to practice selection of students that is consistent of research and best practices.

Mandi Lopez: We will be starting this for the next class?
Jose Aviles: Super scoring has not been decided for the next cycle. We are still using holistic admissions.

Mandi Lopez: Perhaps we could take a poll: Are the faculty convinced? All those who believe that this is an acceptable and reasonable approach to evaluation of our students for admission, please raise your hand. Super scoring. It looks like the majority has it. The Faculty Senate supports your efforts.

**Update on PM-16 Implementation, Protection of Minors Participating in LSU Programs, Edward Nobles, Director, Office of Risk Management**

Mandi Lopez introduced Edward Nobles and stated that faculty had relatively little warning that this permanent memorandum was coming. While this is not unusual among institutions of higher education, but what this pertains to is minors and their activities on the LSU campus. High school students working in laboratories will be impacted. There are some concerns regarding the policy. The Office of Risk Management is still working through issues and barriers. Risk Management covers risk identification analysis management, risk financing and insurance programs, property and liability insurance, international insurance, claims, and they have now added youth programs. The office was just assigned the youth programs after PM-16 was adopted. There are two main kinds of youth programs. The first is the LSU supervise program. The definition in the policy is broad. It is anytime we assume responsibility of a supervised minor. It also involves all non-university programs that uses our facilities. Risk Management created a campus committee including point people at all of the external campuses. It has been realized that this will not be implemented easily. At the moment, there is a temporary waiver for full compliance. No new requirements will not be added at this time. State and federal laws still need to be in compliance. PM-16 calls for three levels of management—the first is the policy administrator and they are the central point of contact for all campuses. They report to campus leadership. This role has been taken on by the LSU A&M Office of Risk Management, Edward Nobles. In addition, there must be a campus administrator for each individual LSU campus. They oversee and ensure that the campus is in compliance. They report to the policy administrator. There is also a program administrator. They will be involved in the coordinating and supervision of the youth programs. As the Office of Risk Management met with individuals around campus, another level was needed, a program coordinator. They are responsible for their specific program. Partial compliance with the policy includes all youth programs registering online to create an on-campus repository, and stringent background check standards. Items that we are ironing out are required training, outlining waivers, supervision requirements, and contracts for non-LSU programs to ensure that they will be held to the same standards. The policy has been developed since 2011 and the Office of Risk Management is still organizing and ironing out requirements and details. However, state and federal law still apply. For example, anyone working with minors is required by law to report abuse and neglect of minors. Report to the hotline, police, and program administrator.

**Q&A Summary:**

Mandi Lopez: Do background checks need to be done every three years or within three years?

Ashley McGowen: We are still ironing out all the details.

Fabio Del Piero: What kind of standard will the stringent background checks have?

Ashley McGowen: Most departments utilize HRM for background checks. They don’t necessarily check for a sex offender registry, which is important for youth programs. Adding this feature will enhance liability and protections on campus. When most individuals are hired at LSU, they are no necessarily hired to work specifically with minors. We want to check for that. However, we haven’t made the decision on that yet. If there are any questions on this, feel free to email the Risk Management office.

Stephen Shipman: Sometimes in my department, individuals from high schools do work at LSU. How do faculty fall under the guidance for PM-16? If it is not an LSU program, are departments required to follow this?

Ashley McGowen: This policy is applicable to LSU programs and non-LSU programs that operate on campus. If minors are on campus, it applies. The procedures and how far it will apply still need to be developed.

Edward Nobles: We have not outlined that yet. The things we are concentrating on first the group programs. At this point you don’t have to worry about it, but eventually, the way it is written, you will.

Senator: What about minor students enrolled and taking individual classes on campus?

Ashley McGowen: The policy is not applicable to LSU students. Minor students enrolled at LSU do not fall within the scope of this policy. That includes the LSU Lab School.

Priscilla Allen: Does this policy relate to LSU programs that are off campus?

Ashley McGowen: The policy states LSU programs wherever they are operated. We have oversight, no matter the location. We are still looking into this.
Priscilla Allen: Have you discussed this with all the programs that fall in this category?

Ashley McGowen: We have not talked with all programs. If you know of any, please let them know to reach out.

Joan King: How would this impact 6th-grade day?

Edward Nobles: It all has to do with supervision. If LSU is not supervising, then it would be under the 6th grade teacher’s purview. We would have a contract with them regarding liability.

Dorin Boldor: How do you define neglect?

Mandi Lopez: It is well defined on the DCFS website. You can also take the training. You will become very well versed on the subject.

Stephen Shipman: Does this mean that high school students can’t have individual mentors?

Edward Nobles: One on one mentors must go through the training. However, it’s not that simple. We are still working out the details, but the way the policy reads now, it must be two approved adults. When we organize it, we will communicate the details to the campus.

Senator: Can this presentation can be sent to faculty? This is a huge impact.

Edward Nobles: The presentation is missing information and might cause more alarm.

Mandi Lopez: This was intended to make the faculty aware of what was happening in addition to opening lines of communication between Risk Management and faculty. This presentation was to start the conversation. We will send the PM-16 and the link for training. We would be happy to add to the committee already established.

Edward Nobles: We will add the requirements to our website. Until we get things worked out, you can work around them for now. Most of it is common sense.

Old Business

Second Reading, Resolution 19-07, “Tuition Reduction and Fee Remission for LSU Faculty Children and Spouses”

Sponsored by Faculty Senate Benefits Advisory Committee

Read by Andrew Sluyter

Whereas the merit-based TOPS no longer is guaranteed to cover 100% of undergraduate tuition at LSU;
Whereas TOPS is unavailable to faculty spouses and to the children of incoming faculty who have not graduated from a Louisiana high school;
Whereas the cost of an LSU undergraduate education for faculty children has increased because fees are high;
Whereas seven of LSU’s thirteen Flagship Peer institutions offer 50% tuition reduction to faculty children and spouses, and most state universities in the South do the same;
Whereas the merit-based Louisiana Tiger Legacy Scholarships require a minimum ACT composite score of 24, and thus they are unavailable to some faculty children;
Whereas the Tiger Legacy Scholarships offer only $500-1000 (depending on ACT score), which is too little to offset the recent rise in fees;
Whereas the recruitment and retention of faculty is crucial to LSU and faculty flight is a growing problem for the University;
Whereas twenty-seven of thirty-six LSU deans, chairs, and directors said in a 2016 poll that a new tuition benefit and a full remission of fees for faculty children would help “very much” or “some” in the recruitment and/or retention of faculty in their units;
Whereas a tuition benefit and a full remission of fees for faculty spouses would also help in the recruitment and retention of faculty;
Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends a new benefit for faculty regarding their children enrolled in undergraduate courses at LSU: while remaining eligible for Louisiana Tiger Legacy Scholarships, faculty children should receive (1) either TOPS or a 50% reduction of undergraduate tuition; and (2) a full remission of fees, including application fees;
Therefore, be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends a new benefit for faculty regarding their spouses enrolled in undergraduate courses at LSU: (1) a 50% reduction of undergraduate tuition; and (2) a full remission of fees, including application fees.

Discussion unanimously approved.
**Q&A Summary:**

Nan Walker: I would like graduate students to also be considered.

Andrew Sluyter: It would read in both therefore clauses, in undergraduate and graduate courses. Or perhaps courses.

Nan Walker: TOPS does not include graduate students.

Mandi Lopez: There are many variations that include graduate students. The goal that you would like it to apply to graduate students as well.

Nan Walker: I don’t see why they would be excluded from this. Some parents are paying for their graduate student children. The TA assistantships are not high and there is no way for the students to live in society.

Fabio Del Piero: Would you also consider adding post-doctoral associates?

Suzanne Stauffer: We need to define children. At what age are parents no longer paying tuition?


Marwa Hassan: I would say dependents and not focus on age.

Juan Martinez: What do our peer institutions do? Clearly some of them have these benefits. How do they define dependents or children?

Andrew Sluyter: I don’t know the details at peer institutions. This is something we tried to jump start several years ago. We have no idea where it’s going to go. TOPS funding is currently stable. Where it might be in the next few years, we don’t know. The university might even profit from this. Children of faculty members often go to other institutions for their graduate degrees. What about using this an incentive to recruit them? Undergraduate students might get TOPS from the state which would forego the fees. What the details would be, we would have to see.

Mandi Lopez: We are not here to not define the implementation. However, could we just change children to dependents enrolled in courses? This would be a friendly amendment.

Nicole Roth: They might make you clarify whether it is for undergraduate or graduate.

Andrew Sluyter: Nicole is on the committee.

Nicole Roth: Yes. I did the research for the committee. For peer institutions, they make you classify it as be a student 26 years of age or younger. Some make you provide proof for that as well. For spouses, there is identifying documentation required as well. This varies from institution to institution. Most of our peers only cover undergraduate at 50%. Some do sponsor graduate programs. There is one that does a DDM, but that’s very unique. You’re looking at budgetary restraints and what the university can afford. As far as the benefit availability, it is usually 3 years. Some are immediate or just consistent employment at the university. Retirement is another issue.

Andrew Sluyter: Thank you for that information. HR already has this information for our benefits. Would you like to join the committee?

Theda Daniels-Race: Assuming the kinks are worked out, what is the next step? What would the anticipated timeline?

Mandi Lopez: I can’t answer that. However, this would be added to our resolutions and then Faculty Senate Executive Committee is then charged to work with the administration. Usually an ad hoc committee or standing committee to work with the administration as well. Leadership usually makes the final decision.

Theda Daniels-Race: Could this be retroactive?

Mandi Lopez: Highly unlikely.

Senator: Is this considered income? Would it be taxable?

Andrew Sluyter: You would have to pay taxes on that.

Senator: That might be something to consider when negotiating. The benefit is basically money in your pocket.
Nicole Roth: It could be considered part of the education benefit for you as an employee. Some schools classify this as a scholarship which might be something to consider here. It depends on how you define it.

Nan Walker: The last therefore paragraph, you might want to modify that.

Andrew Sluyter: Courses. Yes.

Senator: It also says undergraduate tuition on both.

Andrew Sluyter: Ok, so just tuition.

Vote on Resolution: Passed unanimously.

New Business
None

All moved to adjourn at 4:52pm.