

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 20, 2011
Student Senate Room, LSU Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

1. Kevin L. Cope (President, English)
3. George G. Stanley (Acting Secretary, Chemistry)
5. Priscilla D. Allen (Member-at-Large, Social Work)
2. Pratul Ajmera (Vice-President, Electrical Eng)
4. Ken McMillin (Member-at-Large, Animal Sci)
6. Bill Daly (Past-President, Chemistry Emeritus)

Parliamentarian: Charles N Delzell (present)

Senators present:

1	✓	Josh Detre (Ag Econ/Ag)
2	✓	Joan King (Food Sci/Ag)
3	✓	Cristina Sabliov (Bio & Ag Eng/Ag)
4	✓	Ken McMillin (Animal Sci/Ag)
5		Jeff Kuehny (Horticulture/Ag)
6	✓	John Nyman (Renew Nat Res/Ag)
7	A	Wes Harrison (Ag Econ/Ag)
8		Mary Aime (Plant Path/Ag)
9	✓	Yi-jun Xu (Renew Nat Res/Ag)
10	✓	Kevin McCarter (Exp Stat/Ag)
11		Kristi Dykema (Landscape Arch/A&D)
12	✓	Phillip Tebbutt (Interior Design/A&D)
13	✓	Justin Walsh (Art/A&D)
14	✓	Neila Donovan (Comm Sci Disord/HSS)
15	✓	Michael Bowman (Comm Studies/HSS)
16	A	Benjamin Kahan (English/HSS)
17	✓	Melissa Beck (Psychology/HSS)
18		John Protevi (French Studies/HSS)
19	P	Gail Sutherland (Phil & Relig/HSS)
20		Reem Meshal (Phil & Relig/HSS)
21	✓	Michael Leitner (Geog & Anthro/HSS)
22	✓	David Lindenfeld (History/HSS)
23	✓	Paolo Chirumbolo (Foreign Lang/HSS)

24		Patrick McGee (English/HSS)
25	✓	Kristopher Fletcher (Foreign Lang/HSS)
26	✓	Susan Dumais (Sociology/HSS)
27	A	Kathleen Bratton (Political Sci/HSS)
28	✓	Dominique Homberger (Bio/Sci)
29	✓	Frederick Sheldon (Bio/Sci)
30	✓	Carol Taylor (Chem/Sci)
31	✓	Kresimir Rupnik (Chem/Sci)
32		Guillermo Ferreya (Math/Sci)
33		Jeffrey Taylor (Geology/Sci)
34	✓	Padmanabhan Sundar (Math/Sci)
35	A	Juhan Frank (Physics/Sci)
36		
37	✓	David Young (Physics/Sci)
38		Rajgopal Kannan (Comp Sci/Sci)
39	✓	Larry Crumbley (Accounting/BA)
40	✓	Joseph Legoria (Accounting/BA)
41		Edward Watson (Info Sys & D Sci/BA)
42		Andrea Houston (Info Sys & D Sci/BA)
43		Michael Wascom (Environ Studies/C&E)
44	P	Lawrence Rouse (Coastal Studies/C&E)
45	✓	Rebecca Owens (Curricul & Instruct/Ed)
46	✓	Dana Bickmore (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)

47		Renee Casbergue (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)
48	A	Jennifer Curry (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)
49	✓	Jennifer Jolly (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)
50	✓	Aaron Clopton (Kinesiology/Ed)
51	✓	Dianne Taylor (ELRC/Ed)
52	A	Kerry Dooley (ChemE/Eng)
53	✓	Louay Mohammed (C & Environ/Eng)
54		Suresh Rai (Elect & Comp/Eng)
55	P	Bhaba Sarker (Const Manage & Ind/Eng)
56	A	Wanjun Wang (Mech Eng/Eng)
57	✓	Hsiao-Chun Wu (Elect & Comp/Eng)
58	✓	Suzanne Stauffer (Lib & Info Sci/Lib)
59	✓	Michael Russo (LSU Libraries/Lib)
60	✓	Stephanie Braunstein (LSU Libraries/Lib)
61	✓	Craig Freeman (Mass Comm/MassCom)
62	✓	Gabriel Beavers (Music/MDA)
63	P	Alison McFarland (Music/MDA)
64	✓	John Fletcher (Theatre/MDA)
65	✓	Michelle Livermore (Social Work/SW)
66		Joseph Francis (Compar BioMed/Vet)
67	✓	Stephen Gaunt (Pathobiological Sci/Vet)
68	✓	Bruce Eilts (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet)
69	✓	Mandi Lopez (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet)

✓ = present; P = proxy; A = alternative representative

Proxies (can't vote)

Kevin Cope for Bhaba Sarker
 Kevin Cope for Lawrence Rouse
 Gabriel Beavers for Allison McFarland
 Dominique Homberger for Gale Sutherland

Alternative Representatives (can vote)

Dana Bickmore for Jennifer Curry
 Hsiao-Chun Wu for Wanjun Wang
 Pratul Ajmera for Kerry Dooley
 Michelle Livermore for Benjy Kahan
 David Young for Juhan Frank
 Josh Detre for Weg Harrison
 Leonard Ray for Kathleen Bratton

Guests Present that Signed in:

Robert Doolos	Mary Parker	Ryan Landry	Kirsten Schwehm	Jack Hamilton
Samnel Stokes	Gil Reeve	Hugh Buckingham		

Consideration of Minutes for the Dec 8, 2010 Meeting

Minutes approved (provisionally, later revision possible).

President's Report

- There is a new Retention Committee to keep us in compliance with the LA-GRAD act. Saundra McGuire will head up this committee. A seminar on creating a better learning atmosphere in the classroom will be presented by Saundra on Feb 8.
- Increased dialog between Faculty Senates across the state is occurring and there will be another meeting on Saturday, Jan 22 at 10 AM at LSU-Alexandria. This is an open meeting and a wide range of faculty and staff governance issues will be discussed.

- There is a new syndicate of alumni reporters working for the Reveille.
- Campus Federal Credit Union was honored recently for their donations and assistance on the Forever LSU Campaign.
- The Athletic Department has helped with undergraduate recruitment in the Dallas, TX area, due in large part to LSU's performance in the Cotton Bowl.
- If you have any suggestions for commencement speaker please get them to me ASAP.
- The FSEC is studying the Graduate School reorganization and election of members of the Graduate Council (per the Faculty Senate resolution passed last year) and will be discussing it with the Provost at our next meeting.
- We have also been keeping a close eye on the Flagship Coalition and cooperating with them as much as possible. We may get them involved in an upcoming Chancellor Forum.
- We are working on arranging the next Chancellor Forum once the budget situation has firmed up, probably in March.
- There were two short-lived programs (xxxx and xxxx) advanced from the Board of Regents that are back to the drawing board. The FSEC reviewed these and sent our comments back that prompted re-review. There is another BOR program for cutting low-completer MS and Ph.D. programs. This does appear to be moving forward and I will present more information on this in the future as it progresses.
- The SEC is pumping some money into its academic organization and I have already submitted a proposal to spend some of that money here in LA.

Update by President John Lombardi

We have been through so many budget crises that it is often hard to tell where we stand. The first good news is that the 2011-12 budget for higher education will not be as drastic as it appeared earlier. We do not know what the eventual cut will be, but suspect that it will be less than 10%. There will be a great deal of work, however, to get a cut under 10%.

One of the unknowns is whether the legislature will accept some of the proposals to increase funding for higher education. There are one-time fund proposals floating around, for example. There are also a variety of fee increases that the LSU System Office has put forward with support from the entire higher education system. Details are posted on the system website. GRAD-act 2.0 will also be proposed to give us more autonomy and to operate more like most other state universities outside of LA. If implemented it would result in small initial savings or revenue increases, but those could grow over time. The details on this are still be developed.

All of the proposals together will increase revenues enough to minimize any cuts to under 10% if implemented. Everyone should be encouraged that intense efforts are being made to solve the budget problem for next year.

Q&A Summary:

Hugh Buckingham: What about TOPS?

John: TOPS is the third rail of LA politics and I've learned to behave carefully around this program. It will continue. The Governor has just announced a plan for a more stable funding source for TOPS.

Bill Daly: Any comments on the Governor's proposal to merge SUNO and UNO?

John: That has been floating around for quite a while. They are very close to one another, but also very different. How that merger would work is up in the air. We are taking no position on this proposal at this time. Any transfer of institutions is within the purview of the BOR and not the systems. This is being studied by the BOR right now. LSU has a strong interest in supporting and wanting a strong SU system.

Dominique Homberger: You mentioned the 15 credit hour fee/tuition cap. If removed, wouldn't this adversely affect the graduation rate?

John: When credit hours above 15 hrs are free to TOPS students it causes a number of problems. Most universities charge per credit hour. So I don't think it will have a negative effect.

Justin Walsh: Some degrees require more credit hours, so won't that hurt students?

John: We are hoping that 15 credit hours will allow most students to graduate in 4 years if they take their studies and courses seriously. We will be strongly pushing for 120 hr majors across the system. So 15 hrs per semester times four years should work for most students.

Kevin: Can you give us a medium term BOR forecast?

John: The BOR, as with most governing boards, is far removed from universities. The faculty are the closest and at the front lines. Part of our job is to educate the BOR on their policies and try to make them better. The BOR, however, gets a

lot of pressure from the legislature that occasionally forces them into making decisions that are not always the best for schools. The legislature will probably push for a single board once again. The governor is in favor of a single board. We are against it.

Pratul Ajmera: Where does the Flagship Coalition fit in all this?

John: The Flagship Coalition could work well or not. They have put out a number of proposals for higher education that could work, but are also complicated. Overall I think they are a positive force to get us talking about ideas and the importance of higher education. Some of the elements in GRAD-act 2.0 are in the Flagship Coalition proposals. So there is some overlap with respect to cutting red tape and such.

Hugh: Could you comment on “Tigers for Jindal”?

John: That is from his campaign when he looked like a supporter of higher education. We’ll see how many of these bumper stickers you see this year.

Dominique: Can faculty stand against the pressure to dumb down our courses and pass students to get them out in four years? Shouldn’t we be increasing credit hours? Shouldn’t we be increasing the rigor of our courses?

John: It is clear that a bachelor’s degree is becoming just an introductory degree. Additional studies will be needed to increase a student’s knowledge in a field and make them skilled for higher level occupations. There need to be appropriate measures of how students are learning and the effectiveness of teaching techniques. We as faculty need to do a better job on defining “quality”.

Justin Walsh: I heard that we had to repay part of the stimulus money?

John: No payback. We did meet the federal standards to avoid having to pay back any of the stimulus money.

Joe Legoria: When are we going to price LSU to raise more money and be more self-sufficient?

John: That is exactly what our proposals are trying to do. Our tuition is too low. Getting the legislature to give us freedom to charge what we want will be difficult.

Michael Russo: Are you suggesting that LSU should shift from state-supported to tuition supported?

John: We need more tuition money to cover the loss of state funding. We don’t want to lose all our state-support, but we need to bring in more funding to compensate for the drop-off in state funding. We are not anywhere near being self-supporting.

Senator: What is the sustainability of the faculty retirement program?

John: For those of you in the defined benefit program you will be fine. For those of you in the defined contribution program, you are less fine. Defined benefit programs are very expensive and the state wants to shift people to defined contribution programs. New faculty may someday lose the option for defined benefits or a scaled back plan.

Yi-Jun Xu: How do you see the future 5 years down the road? There was a lot of damage from the budget crises over the last several years.

John: These are worse in the short term than in the long term. Universities are built to be robust and stable. Despite all the problems, LSU is better now than it was 10 years ago, even with budget cuts. Faculty need to focus on their jobs, research, grants, teaching, and service. That is what will keep the university progressing and advancing.

Neila Donovan: What about Governor Jindal’s talk about teaching more and the loss of instructors? That is very discouraging.

John: You shouldn’t believe everything politicians say. You shouldn’t listen to all the negative talk about budgets until we see the final budget. You should think positive and do your job as best as you can.

Interruption for Old Business

Second and Final Reading, Resolution 10-19, “New College Preparatory Core for Admission to LSU”, sponsored by the Admissions, Standards, and Honors Committee. Presented by Maud Walsh.

We need to get these in place and submitted to the BOR as soon as possible. Please look at the chart with the proposed changes that have been reviewed and recommended by ASH.

Faculty Senate Resolution 10-29 New College Preparatory Core for Admission to LSU *Sponsored by the ASH Committee*

Whereas LSU, by adopting the proposed admission requirements, has the opportunity to help simplify the process of determining freshmen admission to the university while providing for admission requirements that are stringent and academically challenging, in keeping with the nature and mission of LSU as Louisiana’s flagship university, and

Whereas, the new, proposed LSU version of the BOR Core 2012 will meet the BOR’s minimum criteria while retaining some of the flexibility built into the BOR Core in the way of additional course offerings,

Therefore, the ASH Committee supports adoption of the proposed College Preparatory Core for Admission to LSU, effective 2012, as described in the chart below.

Present LSU CORE		Proposed College Preparatory Core for Admission to LSU effective 2012	
Units	ENGLISH	Units	ENGLISH
4	ENGL I, II, III, IV	4	ENGL I, II, III, IV
	MATH		MATH
1	ALG I/Applied ALG 1A & 1B	1	ALG I/Algebra 1-Pt 2
1	ALG II	1	ALG II
1	GEOM, TRIG, ADV MATH I or II, PRECALC, CALC, ALG III, P&S, DIS MATH, APP MATH III, INTGR MATH III	1	GEOM
		1	<i>ADV MATH-Functions & Stats/Advanced: TRIG, ADV MATH I or II, PRECALC, CALC, ALG III, Prob.&Stats, DIS MATH, APP MATH III, or INTGR MATH III</i>
	NATURAL SCIENCES		NATURAL SCIENCES
1	BIOL	1	BIOL
1	CHEMISTRY	1	CHEM
1	PHYSICS	2	PHYSICS (recommended), <i>INTEG SCI, AEROSPACE, Anat & PHYSIO, EARTH SCI, ENVIRONMENTAL SCI, PHY SCI, PHYS II, PHYS of TECH I, BIOLII, CHEMII, PHYS of Tech II, LSU will accept 2 units of AGRI for 1 unit of natural sci.</i>
	SOCIAL SCIENCES		SOCIAL SCIENCES
1	American History	1	American History
1	W HIST, W GEOG, or WST. CIV	1	WHIST/WGEOG/WstCiv/AP Eur HIST
1	Civics, Free ENT, ECON, or AM GOV or Civics/Free Ent (1 unit combined)	1	<i>Civics/AP AmGov + Free Ent (½ unit each)</i>
		1	WHIST/WGEOG/Wst Civ/AP Eur HIST/Civics (2nd sem, ½ unit), <i>LawStudies/PSYC/SOCL/African American Studies or Religious Studies</i>
	FOREIGN LANGUAGE		FOREIGN LANGUAGE
2	Two units in a single language	2	Two units in a single language
	Additional MATH/SCIENCE		
1	GEOM, CALC, Pre-CALC, ALG III, PROB & STATS, DIS MATH, APP MATH III, ADV MATH I or II, INT MATH III, or EARTH SCI, ENVIRON SCI, PHY SCI, BIOL II, CHEM II, PHYS II, or PHYS for Technology. LSU will accept 2 units of AGRI for 1 unit of natural science.		
	COMPUTER STUDIES		
.5	½ unit of CSC or substitute one ½ unit from any of the above		
	ADDITIONAL COURSES		ADDITIONAL COURSES
1.5	1 and ½ units from the categories above &/or certain courses in the visual & performing arts. These units may be from advanced coursework in the arts, i.e.: Fine Arts Survey, ART III, ARTIV, ADV Band, APP Music, ADV Choir, DANCE III, JAZZ Ensemble, Music Theory II, ADV ORCH, Wind Ensemble, or Studio Piano III. LSU will accept, as one unit of this requirement, 2 units of basic performance courses in music, dance, theatre, or studio Art.	1	Fine Arts Survey or 1 unit from certain courses in the visual & performing arts. These units may be from advanced coursework in the arts, i.e.: Fine Arts Survey, ART III, ARTIV, ADV Band, APP Music, ADV Choir, DANCE III, JAZZ Ensemble, Music Theory II, ADV ORCH, Wind Ensemble, or Studio Piano III. LSU will accept, as one unit of this requirement, 2 units of basic performance courses in music, dance, theatre, or studio Art.
TOTAL Units	18		19

Italicized courses indicate new courses that LSU does not currently have as options to meet our core.

Passed without objection

Announcement by Kathryn Saichuk Concerning Safely and Security Training for Faculty

On Weds, Jan 26 there will be training by LSU Police on how to respond to the presence of an active shooter on campus. This will take place at the Energy, Coast & Environment Building Rotunda.

Comments by Kirsten Schwehm, University Ombudsperson

First off, I'm still here. Some people thought that my office was closed. The function of the ombudsperson is to be available to any employee of the university that is having any work-related conflict. This is completely confidential unless there is imminent danger of harm. I work half time and you can contact me by e-mail or phone. I also work with small groups to work out conflicts. I report to the Chancellor and to you via an annual report to the campus. I've had pretty steady business the first 3 years, but I've had less business this last year and that could be due to people thinking that my office didn't exist anymore. I get about 25% faculty visitors, the rest are staff or more recently graduate students. Most of the issues are supervisory issues, perceptions of fairness. I'd like to do an evaluation of the ombuds-office this year and welcome input from you on this.

Resignation of Faculty Senate Secretary Renee Casberge

Renee unfortunately needs to step down due to increased administrative duties. We need, therefore, to hold an election to replace Renee. We have one volunteer, George Stanley, who has done this in the past. Are there any other nominations from the floor? None being heard can we have a vote to affirm George as Secretary for the remainder of Renee's term.

No objections being heard, George Stanley is elected.

Election of New Senator Representative for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Due to George Stanley stepping down as the new faculty senator representative on the FSEC we need to elect a new senator representative.

Two nominees from the floor: Joan King (Food Sci) & Suzanne Stauffer (Library & Info Sci)

Both give brief statements.

Joan King is elected.

Discussion and Vote on the Schedule Interruption Guidelines Developed by University Registrar Robert Doolos

We prepared this in case of various length interruptions due to unexpected events (e.g., hurricanes) on the semester schedule. We have circulated this plan to the faculty and the revisions from this have been incorporated. These are guidelines and not written in stone.

Q&A Summary:

Joan King: What did we do before for major hurricanes?

Robert: We have extended the semester and held Saturday classes.

No opposition, guidelines are adopted.

Continued Discussion on Proposed Revision of PS-44 – Pratul Ajmera

We had a fairly detailed discussion on this at the last meeting. Chip Delzell presented an alternative version and I've incorporated a number of his points, including heading to clarify the various sections. Chip sent us another document last week concerning a re-write of PS-104, Dismissal for Cause that includes suspensions of faculty or instructors from teaching duties and removes section 4.C in my version of PS-44. I do not think including suspension from teaching belongs in PS-104 and that section 4.C is appropriate for PS-44.

Q&A Summary:

Dominique Homberger: Suspension from teaching can be a very serious event.

Pratul: I didn't say it was a minor event. I agree suspension from teaching can be pretty serious that that is why I think section 4.C is important as it lays out some guidelines on this.

Dominique: The question is how much power the administration should have.

Pratul: That isn't what I have outlined in section 4.C. I have defined an advisory committee, along with a short procedure for meeting with the appropriate administrators.

Michael Russo: I think that section 4.C should end after the first sentence. The rest of it is procedure that should go somewhere else, perhaps PS-104.

Pratul: We don't believe that this suspension procedure fits into PS-104, which is Dismissal for Cause. I think it is important to include some procedure in PS-44 for teaching suspensions. I also feel that this section provides protections for faculty and limits administrative fiat.

Kevin Cope: I want to point out that these policy statements are not immutable. In fact, SACS is pushing schools for a regular review of all policy statements. Some of our policy statements are extremely old and haven't been reviewed in ages. We also have somewhat limited authority on approving

Larry Crumbly: I'd like to suggest a friendly amendment to change "The instructor can select one tenured professor" to "two tenured professors" in paragraph three. Pratul accepts.

Question is called.

The PS passes with two abstentions and no objections.

Proposed PS 44
(Approved by Faculty Senate, Jan 20, 2011)
PS-44: Grade Assignment

I. GENERAL POLICY

Grading policies, as aspects of the total educational policy of the University, are determined by the faculty subject to the authority of the Board of Supervisors.

The responsibility of an instructor as the head of the college or university class is to provide an environment conducive to students' learning and success in the course, and to conduct a fair evaluation of students' performance in his/her course. This policy reaffirms the role of an instructor to assign grades in his/her course while also providing options for the very few special cases in which alternative measures must be taken to ensure that students receive the fair evaluation to which they are entitled.

II. ASPECTS OF GRADE POLICY NOT COVERED IN THIS POLICY STATEMENT

The following aspects of grade policy are described in the current issue of the General Catalog: definitions of the letter grades A, B, C, D, F, P, NC, W and I; computation of grade point average (gpa); pass-fail and pass-audit options; grade reports; transcripts; grade-appeal procedure; and privacy of grades.

In addition, the Code of Student Conduct mandates altering grades in certain cases of academic misconduct by a student.

III. BASIS OF GRADES AND GUIDELINES ON ASSIGNING GRADES

Individual instructors are expected to assign all grades equitably and consistently in accordance with the standards established by faculties of the various colleges, schools or departments. There is no "University curve" or other table of numerical equivalents of letter grades to which a faculty member must adhere.

Grading must be based on work that is assigned and evaluated equitably and fairly, with no special consideration given to individual students unless justified by disability (see PS-26) or excused absence (see PS-22). Individual students should not, for example, be allowed to take on "extra credit" projects, spend extra hours in laboratories, or present themselves for re-examination or special examination unless the same options are available to the entire class on the same terms.

While it is appropriate (and indeed inevitable) that the instructor should exercise subjective judgment in determining grades, particularly in "borderline" cases, the judgment should be based solely on academic considerations. Grades must not be utilized as coercive or punitive measures reflective of a student's behavior, attitude, personal philosophy, or other personal characteristics except as those qualities relate directly to the student's level of mastery of the course material.

Assignment of grades should result from the application of academic standards and the objective measurements of students' course and classroom performance. In no case should the assignment of grades be influenced by extraneous situations, whether institutional goals, retention and graduation objectives or any other measure unrelated to the subject material and assessment within a course.

At the beginning of each semester, faculty members must promulgate (through paper copies, web site postings or other means) written course syllabi in all courses, both graduate and undergraduate, which must clearly state the relative weight of the component factors of the final grade. Additionally, in 4000-level courses in which instruction of undergraduates for undergraduate credit and graduate students for graduate credit is combined, syllabi should clearly set forth any different expectations of performance by students in the two groups (beyond the general expectation of a C grade for undergraduates and a B grade for graduate students for satisfactory performance).

If, in a course including the ones having multiple sections, there is a need for consistency in grading standards and practices, then the faculty of the relevant unit must, by vote, either establish such standards and practices or delegate the responsibility for the same to a smaller subset of the faculty. The established standards and practices will then be promulgated in writing to all faculty members in the unit before the beginning of the semester. An instructor will retain his or her pedagogical freedom in a classroom within these broad established standards. In the absence of such published standards, complete authority for grading abides with the instructor of record for the course.

IV. AUTHORITY TO ASSIGN GRADES

IV.A. INSTRUCTOR'S RIGHT TO ASSIGN FINAL AND INTERIM GRADES

It is the right and responsibility of the instructor of record in a course to determine, assign and submit to the Office of the University Registrar, the final letter grade for each student in the course beyond the final date for withdrawing with a W subject to the basis and guidelines in section III above. At any time during the semester, it is the right and responsibility of the instructor in a course to determine and assign all interim grades for each student in the course subject to the basis and guidelines in section III above.

IV.B. INSTRUCTOR UNABLE TO ASSIGN GRADES

In extraordinary circumstances such as medical leave, departure from the university and other unforeseen reasons during the semester, that make it impossible for an instructor to fulfill the teaching responsibility, the administrative officer having immediate jurisdiction (usually the department chair) will determine if a substitute instructor is needed for the remainder of the semester and whether the original instructor is willing or able to assign grades for the course. In the event the original instructor is unable to assign grades for the course, the administrative officer will consult with an appropriate committee of faculty to determine if it is necessary or feasible to appoint a new instructor of record for the remainder of the course duration.

- (a) In the event when it is not possible to assign a new instructor of record, the line officer shall assign the grade of P (Pass) to undergraduates for work of at least C quality and to graduate students for work of B quality or better and a grade of F (Fail) for work not meeting these standards.
- (b) If a new instructor of record is appointed, then from that day onwards, the grades in the course will be assigned by the new instructor of record. Interim grades (such as grades on tests and quizzes) already assigned by the previous instructor in accordance with the guidelines in section III above will not be changed (other than for computation or oversight errors or if dictated by a grade appeal procedure). Final grades must equitably consider the student performance on record prior to the new instructor's assigned date to teach the course. As far as practical, the new instructor shall retain the basis for grades and their relative weights as distributed in the course syllabus at the beginning of the semester in determining the final grades. Any deviation for the basis of grades from the original syllabus must be clearly stated, promulgated and explained at the time of the change to the students and to the line officer by the new instructor of record.

IV.C. SUSPENSION OF AN INSTRUCTOR

The procedure outlined in section IV.B. above for grade assignment shall also be followed in case of a rare situation in which an instructor is suspended from his or her teaching duties during a semester by administrative intervention. The reason for administrative intervention may arise due to serious causes resulting in suspension of academic duties under other university policies or due to non-performance or serious under-performance of teaching duties.

Under-performance of teaching duties include a situation where an instructor proves to be hopelessly ineffective in teaching the subject matter to the students to a degree that his or her removal is the only option left for the benefit of the students' learning of the course material. The process to be followed in such a case is as follows:

The line officer (usually the chair of the department) must address any concern with the instructor first and must always respect his or her academic and pedagogical freedom in the class room. If the perceived problem persists, the line officer shall consult with a committee comprising of at least six tenured professors of rank equal to or higher than the instructor under consideration from the department to counsel the instructor. Unit rules shall specify a process for establishing this committee. The instructor can select up to two tenured professors to the committee, if he or she so desires. In the event, there are fewer than six tenured professors in the department of rank equal to or higher than the instructor under consideration, qualified individuals can be added from outside the department. If the committee of tenured professors agrees that the situation cannot be resolved and warrants further action, the line officer will contact the dean of the college or school. The dean will meet with the instructor and the chair. If they are unable to resolve the situation, the dean will approach the Provost. The dean shall present the reasons for such intervention in

writing to the provost and the instructor concerned. The provost will make the decision on whether administrative intervention is appropriate or not after consulting with the instructor concerned.

V. STUDENTS' RIGHTS TO AN EXPLANATION OF GRADES RECEIVED

At any point in a semester, the instructor of record should be able to explain, on request, a student's standing in the course, grades assigned to that point, the basis for the grades, and the weight of these 1 Currently there is no single comprehensive policy statement to address all situations that may result in suspension of teaching duties due to administrative intervention. A process is listed under section IV.C to address a situation resulting from serious under-performance of teaching duties. grades in the final grade. Following completion of the course, the student is to be provided, on request, a review of his/her final examination, an explanation of the final grade, and the method by which it was determined; this review is to include an accounting for all other unreturned work. The latter includes submitted work that students were not given an opportunity in class or on-line to access after its assessment.

V. SIX-MONTH RETENTION OF GRADE RECORDS

Faculty members are expected to keep all unreturned student work and grade books for at least six months following termination of a course. If a faculty member leaves the University, permanently or temporarily during this period, either hard copies or computer or web access to his or her final examinations, all unreturned work, and grade books are to be made available to the department chair to be kept for at least six months following termination of a course.

VI. CHANGING GRADES

Once submitted to the Office of the University Registrar, a grade may not be changed except as follows:

1. Completion of an I grade
2. Correction of an error in computation
3. Through the academic appeal procedure (see Grade Appeals - *LSU General Catalog*) If the academic appeal mechanism is followed, appropriate correspondence must accompany the change-of-grade form.

Old Business

Second and Final Reading of Resolution 10-09, "A Faculty Members Right to Assign Grades"

[Postponed until February Meeting]

Second and Final Reading, Resolution 10-13, "Withdrawal Date Policy Revisions"

Introduced at the Request of the Student Government Association

Whereas, Louisiana State University has expressed an ongoing commitment to be recognized nationally as a Tier I research university and state flagship public institution of higher learning; and

Whereas, the current withdrawal policy does not accurately reflect the withdrawal policies in place at universities deemed our regional and national peer universities; and

Whereas, the current withdrawal policy allows for students to drop a class without a withdraw "W" grade on the sixth class day and allows a student to add a class until the eighth class day; and

Whereas, the current withdrawal policy does not allow for students to accurately form an opinion on some classes within the allowed time period (for example, a class that meets Tuesdays and Thursdays will only meet twice before a student must decide whether or not to drop a course); and

Whereas, the proposed revised Withdrawal Policy will allow students to withdraw from a class up to, but not exceeding the eighth day following the beginning of classes for the semester. Furthermore the date for adding classes would remain on the eighth day, as well; and

Whereas, The proposed revised withdrawal policy will allow students to have greater flexibility in scheduling and will place Louisiana State University's Withdrawal Date Policy in agreement with Withdrawal Policies of our peer institutions; and

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate affirms its support for the proposed revisions to the Withdrawal Date Policy and asks that the Provost implement the revised policy.

Jay Hudson, SGA President thanks the audience, introduces his colleagues (Thomas Rogers, Amy Borel, and Jeffery Wale) and presents a brief overview.

The average drop date period for our peer institutions is 17.2 days, while LSU drop period is only 6 days. A majority of professors just go over the syllabus the first day of class. This doesn't give students enough time to fairly evaluate the course prior to the drop date. All we are asking is for another 24 hrs so students will have another class day in order to evaluate the class.

Maud Walsh (representing the ASH committee) adds some commentary about this: The students met with ASH and discussed their points. But we had issues with making it easier to drop a course. The committee discussed this quite a bit and was somewhat split on the issue.

Q&A Summary:

George Stanley: I usually agree with ASH on these issues, but this time I think the students are making a very reasonable request. I don't see how giving them another 24 hrs will increase drops or make students act in an irresponsible way.

Pratul Ajmera: I agree.

Motion is called.

One vote opposed, no abstentions, resolution passes.

Second and Final Reading, Resolution 10-16, “Stoppage of Budget Scenarios that Degrade Morale and Appeal for Increased Leadership by Boards of Higher Education” – Sponsored by Ken McMillin and the FSEC

Motion by George Stanley to skip second reading. Seconded. Passed without opposition.

Q&A Summary:

Justin Walsh: Shouldn't the \$42 M figure in the third Whereas really be \$47M?

Ken: Yes, I'll change that.

Passes without objection.

Second and Final Reading, Resolution 10-17, “Appeal for Increased Leadership by the Governor”, sponsored by Ken McMillin

Second reading is skipped by mutual agreement.

Q&A Summary:

[See video – some suggested changes]

Passes without objection.

Second and Final Reading, Resolution 10-18, “Increased Spending on Higher Education and the Timely Pursuit of Excellence”, Sponsored by Justin Walsh

[Postponed until February Meeting]

New Business

First Reading of Resolution 11-01, “State Subsidies for Athletic Programs and the Higher Education Budget Crisis” – sponsored and read by Hugh Buckingham

**Faculty Senate Resolution 11–01
“State Subsidies for Athletic Programs and the Higher Education Budget Crisis”**

Introduced at the request of Professor Hugh W. Buckingham

Whereas Louisiana is presently undergoing the most severe cuts in the utilization of taxpayer support for higher education in its history; and

Whereas many of our universities are accordingly forced to eliminate faculty, departmental academic programs and majors, and even whole departments or interdepartmental programs; and

Whereas an alarming number of universities in our state continue to spend goodly proportions of taxpayer money for sustaining athletic programs; and

Whereas many of these “goodly proportions” come up to several million dollars of taxpayer money (See Jordan Blum article in the Morning Advocate, July 2010); and

Whereas in these situations, all universities are eliminating faculty members, while coaches remain on taxpayer salary;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate calls on all Louisiana state representatives to make this information clearly apparent to the taxpayers of the state, whose tax money it is that is being siphoned off to sport athletics, while at the very same time faculty are being dismissed and academic programs eliminated.

Q&A Summary:

Joe Legoria: Make sure that it is clear that LSU-BR doesn't use any state funding for athletics.

Hugh: Yes.

Joan King: It might be better to have other faculty senates to push this since it affects them more than us. Presenting this at the State-Wide Faculty Senate meeting in LSU-Alexandria might be a good idea.

Hugh: I'll be there and will discuss it with them.

Resolution 11-02, "Reissue of PS-29 as Control in the Course and Classroom" – sponsored and read by Ken McMillin.

Faculty Senate Resolution 11-02
"Reissue of PS-29 as Control in the Course and Classroom"
Sponsored by Ken McMillin

Whereas the faculty of the University have been designated to be in charge of educational policy, subject to the authority of the Board of Supervisors; and

Whereas all courses and the course contents are approved by the Faculty Senate Courses and Curriculum Committee; and

Whereas it is important to maintain environments and instruction that are conducive to study and learning in all classes and teaching facilities; and

Whereas the Board of Supervisors Bylaws acknowledge the right of a teacher to explore fully within the field of assignment and to give in the classroom and elsewhere such exposition of the subject as the teacher believes to represent the truth; and

Whereas there are no university or system policies that specify how these teacher rights may be expressed, and

Whereas more than 100 approved courses at LSU may directly use animals or food in lectures, laboratories, seminars, and other classes; and

Whereas PS-29 Environmental Control in the Classroom was deleted after consolidation with PS-19 Environmental Health and Safety, which outlines the major roles and authority of the Office of Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) at Louisiana State University (LSU); provides a framework that facilitates the protection of life, property, and the environment; and sets forth

safety and environmental responsibilities, provides support for safety rules and procedures, and

establishes activities/programs which are necessary for the successful implementation of the University's Environmental Health and Safety Program, but does not address faculty rights and responsibilities for course and class behavior other than safety and environment concerns;

Therefore be it resolved that PS-29 be reissued to define instructor control of courses and classes with the following wording:

~~Environmental~~ Control in ~~the Courses and Classroom~~ Classes PS-29

Purpose

To define policy with respect to ~~care~~ rights and responsibilities of instructors in teaching ~~at for the condition of the environment in teaching facilities of~~ the University.

Definitions

Instructors are faculty members as defined in the Board of Supervisor Regulations and Bylaws or guest lecturers invited into classes to provide specialized instruction and teaching to students.

Teaching facilities are classrooms, studios, laboratories, seminar rooms, practice rooms, library study areas and carrels, ~~and~~ museums, and other areas of the university campus that are appropriately determined by the course instructor to give the proper learning environment for the planned class teaching lesson, lecture, or activity.

General Policy

It is the University's intent to provide in all teaching facilities an environment conducive to study and learning. ~~The instructor of record is responsible and has the right to determine the instructional activities for each course and to provide fair and appropriate teaching environments.~~ Any situation or deportment which disrupts the learning process is prohibited. ~~Smoking is not allowed in any teaching facility or area at any time. Eating and drinking in teaching facilities or areas are allowed only in areas designated for those activities in individual buildings and in classes where the course syllabus provides for use of these in course activities.~~ All animals, except seeing-eye dogs, and those that are

used in course instruction are prohibited in teaching facilities. ~~Eating, drinking, and smoking are prohibited at all times in teaching areas. All animals, except seeing-eye dogs, are prohibited in teaching facilities.~~

The course syllabus will specify information to the student about the course, including course objectives, grading policies, topics, textbooks and reference materials, and any other policies necessary for maintaining the instructional environment, including, but not limited to, use of electronic devices in or out of class and guests in the class.

Only registered students and individuals approved or invited by the course instructor are allowed to participate in class instructional activities. The policy of the instructor on official auditing of courses by students and other faculty members and guests in the classroom should be in the course syllabus.

Faculty members are responsible for the enforcement of this policy in their classrooms and should report to the Building Coordinator or Department or School chair, head, or director any deviations needed in this policy and any apparent violations ~~any apparent abuses~~ for which their classes are not responsible. A list of Building Coordinators is available from the Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Business Affairs.

Moved to be accepted into debate. Approved.

George Stanley moves to adjourn. Passed!