

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, January 25, 2021
Zoom



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Mandi Lopez (President, VCS) | 5. Fabio Del Piero (Secretary, PBS) |
| 2. Ken McMillin (Past- President, AG) | 6. Marwa Hassan (Member-at-Large, Engineering) |
| 3. John Miles (Member-at-Large, LSU Libraries) | 7. Julie Wright-Rollins (Member-at-Large, Education) |
| 4. Joan King (Vice-President, Food Science) | |

Parliamentarian: Joan King

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

1		Paula Arai (HSS)	25	X	Jason Harman (HSS)	49	A	Seung-Jong Park (ENG)
2	A	Kayanush (Kai) Aryana (AG)	26	X	Marwa Hassan (ENG)	50	X	Arthur Penn (CBS)
3		Michael Banks (BUS)	27	A	Katherine Henninger (HSS)	51		Rosemary Peters-Hill (HSS)
4	X	Inessa Bazayev (MDA)	28	X	Robert Holton (AD)	52	X	Tracy Quirk (Coast)
5	X	Pamela Blanchard (HSE)	29	X	Tara A. Houston (MDA)	53		Helen Regis (HSS)
6	X	Kellie Brisini (HSS)	30	X	Katharine Jensen (HSS)	54	X	Maria Rethelyi (HSS)
7	X	Elizabeth Carter (Law)	31	X	Kelli Scott Kelley (AD)	55	A	Kevin Ringelman (AG)
8	A	Prosanta Chakrabarty (SCI)	32	X	Heather Kirk-Ballard (AG)	56	X	Julie Wright Rollins (HSE)
9	X	Cassandra Chaney (HSE)	33	X	Joan King (AG)	57	A	Kirk Ryan (VCS)
10	X	Chantel Chauvin (HSS)	34	X	Gerry Knapp (ENG)	58	X	Bhaha Sarker (ENG)
11	X	Senlin Chen (HSE)	35	X	Roger Laine (SCI)	59		Jonathan Shi (ENG)
12	X	Jin-Woo Choi (ENG)	36	A	Lauren Lazaro (AG)	60	X	Stephen Shipman (SCI)
13	X	Brandi Conrad (HSE)	37	X	Julia Ledet (SCI)	61	X	Wei-Ling Song (BUS)
14	X	Robert Cook (SCI)	38	X	Carlos Lee (HSE)	62	X	Shane Stadler (SCI)
15	X	Theda Daniels-Race (ENG)	39	A	J. Michael Martinez (HSE)	63	X	David Stamps (MASS)
16	X	Jeff Davis (AG)	40		James Matthews (SCI)	64	X	Suzanne Stauffer (HSE)
17		Jennifer Davis (HSS)	41	X	John Miles (LIB)	65	X	Daniel Tirone (HSS)
18	X	Fabio Del Piero (PBS)	42	X	Mustajab Mirza (VCS)	66	X	Matthew Vangel (MDA)
19	X	William Doerfler (SCI)	43	X	William Monroe (Law)	67	X	Meredith Veldman (HSS)
20	X	Peter Doran (SCI)	44	X	Carl Motsenbocker (AG)	68	X	Muhammad Wahab (ENG)
21	X	David Dulceany (HSS)	45	A	Ioan I. Negulescu (AG)	69	X	Nan Walker (Coast)
22	X	Jake Esselstyn (SCI)	46	A	Robert Newman (BUS)	70	X	Wei-Hsung Wang (Energy)
23	X	Edward Gibbons (HSE)	47	A	Rafael Orozco (HSS)	71	X	Sonja Wiley (BUS)
24	A	Doug Gilman (SCI)	48	X	Derick Ostrenko (AD)			

Guests:

Robert Dampf	Alexander Chiasson	Robert Hogan	Tim Slack	Sabrina Taylor
Ashley Arceneaux	Dan Davis	T. Williams	Sarah Keller	Melonie Milton
Roxanne Berthelot	Stan Barrera	Leslie Loren	Blaine Grimes	Craig Woolley
Juan Colomine	Stanley Wilder	Stacia Haynie	Tom Galligan	Emily Hatfield
Matt Lee	Madelyn Cutrone	Emily Elliott	R. Darcey	Erin McKinley
Gundela Hachmann	Codee Jones	Devin Scott	Charlie Stevens	Fereydoun Aghazadeh
Louis Gremillion	Dessie Jefferies	Jonathan Snow	Everett Craddock	Lois Kuyper-Rushing
Troy Blanchard	Peter Robinson	Christopher Vidrine	Donna Torres	Betsy Irvine
Arend Van Gemert				

Public Comments on Agenda Items

Resolution 20-05, “Confronting Anti-Blackness by Ensuring Undergraduate Access to Antiracist Curricular Offering”

Tim Slack, Professor, Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – January 25, 2021 2

Well, good afternoon. And let me begin by thanking my colleagues in the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to speak this afternoon. Regarding the proposed AAAS2000 resolution, let me also say I have great sympathy for the motivations of my colleagues who propose the resolution, I strongly support efforts to make diversity, equity, and inclusion principles, a core component of our curriculum. Nonetheless, I'm here today that ask that you not vote for the resolution as proposed, and please consider supporting one a competing resolution that I believe will be coming forward. And allow me to explain why, when the resolution was read initially it was clear to many of us, what was being proposed on our question, of course, was how it would be implemented. The answer was made clear in an article that was published in the Advocate on Christmas Eve in that article. The Provost handy stated, if the faculty approved this requirement, then it would satisfy one of the social sciences. This is a problem. The general education curriculum at LSU requires that all students take six credit hours in the social and behavioral sciences. Along with three credits in the arts and nine credits and each the natural sciences and humanities and other words this resolution is adopted as proposed 50% of the exposure to the social behavioral sciences. For the average LSU student will be mandated to come from AAAS2000 the residual category. Then, from which students would select only one course would be made up of the major disciplines that in fact constitute the core of the social and behavioral sciences, economics, psychology, political science, anthropology, and sociology. Put simply, the curricular structure proposed would fundamentally misrepresent the academic landscape of the social sciences to our students and will also reduce our students exposure to the major disciplines and grapple with critical, analytical data driven thinking about various dimensions of social inequality, including race. I understand that there's going to be a motion resolution that comes forward and I urge you to consider that. The principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion are critical, but we need to think about how we incorporate them in a manner that fits better with our existing curriculum. These are principles I strongly support, but we need an open and honest, deliberative process that brings together all the stakeholder groups and thoroughly vets the pros and cons of alternative approaches. So, we can do our best to get this right. After all, you're, you're not just voting today on whether or not to require a single course. You are voting on whether to restructure the general restructure of the general education curriculum. Again, diversity, equity, and inclusion issues are principles that I valued deeply, but we need to engage a process to really work this through. I thank you for your time.

Resolution 20-05, “Confronting Anti-Blackness by Ensuring Undergraduate Access to Antiracist Curricular Offering”

Stuart Irvine, Associate Professor, Department of Religious Studies

I'm speaking only for myself here, not for my department. Resolution 20-05 concerns anti-black racism. It comes close. I think to setting the record for the number of whereas clauses in a Faculty Senate resolution. I happen to sympathize with all of them. I'm convinced that anti-black racism is the central problem in American culture. And I'm open to the idea that a college education should address this problem in some way. But how, how exactly. The resolution calls for making a single course AAAS2000, a requirement for every undergraduate student. There are 28,000 of them. I figure if the course continues to be offered in sections of 40 students each, African American Studies will have to offer 70 sections of the course, every semester. That would be a huge increase over the two or three sections currently taught. How will triple S be able to meet the student demand? I imagine that many new instructors. Instructors would have to be hired for the course and I fear that the cost would be so high that little money would be leftover to feel faculty vacancies in English or Math or chemistry or any of the other departments. Of course, the high cost could be avoided by offering a small number of large sections of the course with 200 or 300 even 400 students in each. But then, what sort of course would AAAS2000 be? Could it still impart to students an empathetic understanding of the African American experience? Could it instill in them a belief that black lives matter? The Faculty Senate should not approve resolution 20-05 without a better idea of what the course actually will look like and what the cost will be. The practical implementation of the new requirement is a faculty matter. Don't leave it to the administration. Thank you.

Resolution 20-05, “Confronting Anti-Blackness by Ensuring Undergraduate Access to Antiracist Curricular Offering”

Alexandra Chiasson, PhD Candidate, Department of English, LBGTQ+ Representative

To the LSU Faculty Senate -

The LBGTQ+ Faculty and Staff Caucus wish to express our support for the LSU A&M Faculty Senate Resolution 20-05: Confronting Anti-Blackness by Ensuring Undergraduate Access to Antiracist Curricular Offering. We strongly feel that the addition of this curriculum requirement will not only enhance the overall academic experience but will also make way for meaningful conversations and learning opportunities for undergraduate students. In the wake of the 2020 Black Lives Matter protests, LSU publicly pledged its commitment to become a champion of inclusivity, diversity, and equity. This resolution will augment those efforts and will demonstrate a concrete step towards fulfilling that promise. As the flagship university for the state of Louisiana, it is our duty to lead by example. The addition of AAAS 2000 as a required course will signal to our in-state and peer institutions that LSU is actively combating anti-Blackness in the classroom. Similarly, it will demonstrate to the BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and people of color) members of our campus community that our commitment to community is more than a statement, it's an action. It is impossible to become an anti-racist institution if anti-racism work is not part of the core curriculum. Nor is it possible to support LBGTQ+ people without an unwavering commitment to antiracism. Because we are a community that includes BIPOC, anti-Blackness is by definition an LBGTQ issue. The LBGTQ+ Faculty and Staff Caucus implore our colleagues in the LSU Faculty Senate to support this resolution and live up to the values and ideals of our institution. The statement is signed by the executive committee of the LBGTQ+ faculty and staff.

Consideration of the Minutes from November 18, 2020

Moved by Joan King and Marwa Hassan.

Approved unanimously with potential corrections.

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – January 25, 2021 3

President's Report

1. Faculty representation has continually been requested on the Board of Supervisors. The seat requires a change in the state constitution and the FSEC will make this a priority.
2. Compliance with facial coverings and social distancing seems to be improving among faculty, staff, and students. One of the glaring exceptions are that of contract workers. Reasons are unclear as to their reluctance to comply with PPE federal mandates. These violations need to be taken seriously and administration needs to provide a reporting mechanism including consequences.
3. Covid-19 vaccinations continue to be hampered by small quantities (190) and only to select individuals.
4. An LSU survey went out to faculty, staff, and students to provide general information about age and health status for vaccine prioritization. The more vulnerable an individual, the more they should receive priority.
5. Faculty have requested to be included in all decision-making processes regarding plans for a safe return to campus.
6. The FSEC has voiced concerns over any possible conflict of interest with one member of Hush Blackwell, the Title IX investigation firm. Administration has assured the faculty that this post is no conflict of interest.
7. LSU's Title IX office investigator, Mr. Jeffrey Scott, met with the FSEC and agreed that the training would be updated. Other improvements will be communications. Additionally, support services will be made more prominent and accessible, for which we are grateful. I encourage you to share feedback on the timeline reporting and support services for affected individuals. We will look forward to the report regarding changes made.
8. Mandatory end-of-the-year trainings currently include preventing sexual misconduct, Louisiana ethics, and accessibility. Access and printing certificates including whom to send said completions to remain a mystery for some faculty. Direction and completion is controlled by individual departments. Contact HRM with issues on accessing and printing certificates from Moodle.
9. New CIO Woolley is moving improvements at ITS along at a rapid pace. There are changes on the horizon and we will make an effort to keep faculty senators informed.
10. Administration requested feedback from the FSEC, ASH, and C&C Committees on a "W" extension. This will be moved to the middle of the semester to accommodate student circumstances. The faculty do not support any additional changes to grade scales, pass no credit, etc. Thank you for your patience and support of our students and allowing this slight change.
11. Faculty Senate Committee appointments are almost complete, and elections will take place today. Things are a bit out of sync with the Constitution and Bylaws changes being approved late October. We will ask newly appointed members to serve one semester longer in order for appointments and terms to return to the normal cycle.

Q & A Summary:

None.

Welcome, Robert Dampf, Board of Supervisors Chair

Mr. Robert Dampf thanked the Faculty Senate for the invitation to speak. Forty-two years as a lawyer has well prepared Mr. Dampf for the position of Chairperson. There are several challenges this year that the Board of Supervisors are facing. That includes everything from the Presidential search, Title nine issues, structural issues with the University, and the ongoing budget issues. Mr. Dampf thanked Interim President Galligan and Provost Haynie for their dynamic leadership, emphasizing their dedication and work ethic. One of the Board of Supervisors priorities is faculty and pay raises. LSU cannot be a great university unless there is competitive compensation. However, there are certain financial realities that the University must face. Other ongoing issues are scholarships and the growing deferred maintenance. The Board of Supervisors remains very engaged in trying to take care of the University in terms of long-term contract utilities contracts. They are also seeking to improve resources for sexual trauma and response. Awareness, education, and personnel are to keys to accomplishing those goals. The Board is leaning towards keeping the President job descriptions as is, utilizing resources for the students rather than more bureaucracy and administration.

Q & A Summary:

Mandi Lopez: Gender pay disparities continue to be an issue at LSU. It was presented by the Council of Faculty Advisors during one of the Board meetings. Is there any update on this?

Robert Dampf: We have diversity panels that are actively engaged and bringing their recommendations to the table.

Mandi Lopez: There is a question regarding the 19.8 million dollars in December from the emergency Covid-19 funding, how much will be allocated or might be allocated to faculty and staff raises?

Robert Dampf: I do not know but will make every effort to find out.

Tom Galligan: I might be able to address this question. I don't think any of that money will be used for faculty and staff raises. The designated purposes of that relief funding are to cover COVID-19 related expenses. To be able to give our faculty and staff raises, we would need additional federal action and assistance.

Mandi Lopez: Thank you. Another question for Mr. Dampf. At one time, there were many benefits such as transfer student campuses aligned policies and procedures within the universities and savings on contract with it and other services. Is there any intention by the board of supervisors to renew this effort?

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – January 25, 2021 4

Robert Dampf: That was part of the structural conversations we had last year and leading into this year. It's always a work in progress with eight institutions across the state.

Mandi Lopez: Thank you. Will LSU sever the contract with Rouses as the exclusive caterer of Athletics due to Donald Rouses' attendance at the Capitol riots that turned violent?

Robert Dampf: I do not think that will happen. We want to improve community relationships. LSU makes a lot of money from our corporate sponsors.

Joan King: What qualities would you like to see in the next LSU President?

Robert Dampf: We want an academic that the faculty will respect, a fundraiser, someone to work with the students, someone that can work with the legislature, and a dynamic leader. Hopefully by June 1 we will have someone in place.

Proposed Wholesale Revision to PS 104, Dismissal for Cause of Faculty, Dr. Jane Cassidy, Senior Vice Provost, Office of Academic Affairs

Jane Cassidy thanked Professor Lopez and the faculty senators for allowing her to present. Last semester she presented on changes to PS 109, the policy that guides us when faculty members are struggling with components of their job usually teaching a research. It's a policy that gives a formal mechanism to provide required peer support and oversight with the end goal always for faculty members to return to a highly competent performance in all facets of their job. The Faculty Senate provided feedback and the committee met, made some adjustments to the policy, and it's now in the final stages of approval. The policy being discussed is PS 104, dismissal for cause. The committee is made up of faculty, academic administrators, faculty senators, and input from HRM and General Counsel. Two people were from faculty senate Executive Committee, Dr. McMillin and Dr. Hassan. Others on the Committee had served in various roles during other cases, so the committee had many perspectives from which to draw upon. Our charge led us to a nearly wholesale revision of the process outlined in the policy. First, one of four items was long and had an overly convoluted process. It was unnecessarily difficult to wade through and was not in the best interest of the faculty member, or those trying to manage the process. The second field was set up like a legal trial and put various faculty serving in editorial roles. So, the charge was to have a process that mirrored other faculty processes such as promotion and tenure recommendations. Third, we needed to carve out a place in this policy for extremely rare but potential cases that are beyond the purview of faculty. There is a potential where employment law state law or the legal system would suggest in a faculty member be terminated, so, a process was added to the policy for just such instances. The policy identifies three broad areas that would lead to the dismissal for cause process to be initiated. The first is serious deficiencies in performance. The second is an act or acts of commission or omission. The third is when a faculty member has been found to engage in serious specific misconduct, such as a title nine violation or workplace violence, any of those situations would be a reason to initiate the process. Any request to initiate the process would be sent to a confirmation review committee whose only responsibility is to decide whether the case is an academic matter or an administrative matter. If it's an academic matter such as unsatisfactory work the file would be forwarded to a faculty review board. This group made up a Full Professors from a list forwarded to the committee by faculty senate would study the case and make a recommendation to the Provost. If it's an administrative matter such as a significant illegal activity, the file would be provided to an administrative review board that would have a faculty representative on it but would largely be a group of people who would look at the risk to the institution in their recommendation to the Provost. While that while the hearing committee is being named one of those two groups, the case file is forwarded to the faculty member who is provided an opportunity to submit a response with any and all kinds of documentation they want to provide. Once the faculty member has submitted the rebuttal, the entire case file is sent on to the hearing committee. At any time during the process, the faculty member or committee members can add to the file and ask for any documentation, they feel would clarify the issues of the case. The hearing would be scheduled at a mutually convenient time for all those who wanted who need to attend that would be the appropriate review board, the faculty member, and an optional noncontributing advisor to the faculty member. The chair of the review board presents the case and the faculty member presents a rebuttal. And then there were questions and answers asked by anyone until everyone is satisfied that all the information available is on the table. The committee makes a recommendation to the provost, accompanied by the complete file. This can be followed by a rebuttal by the faculty member the problem considers the entire case file and makes a recommendation to the President. The faculty member can make a rebuttal. At this point, however, it can only be based on procedural error. The President considers the complete file, makes the final decision, and he or she would inform the Chair of the Board of Supervisors for information only. The policy ends with a paragraph about restoring the reputation of the faculty member should there be no disciplinary action taken due to the merits of the case.

Q & A Summary:

Joan King: Who decides which faculty are on the faculty review board?

Jane Cassidy: There is a 15-person listing from the Faculty Senate, that will be forwarded to the President, who then selects individuals.

COACHE Survey and the Advance Grant Update, Dr. Emily Elliott, Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology

Dr. Elliott started the presentation by sharing information on the COACHE faculty job satisfaction survey. It is the collaborative on academic careers in higher education. A group of us of faculty and administrators have been working together over the last several years to gain an understanding of faculty successes as well as challenges that faculty face and data is needed to be able to make informed decisions going forward. The core committee is a group that is drawn from multiple areas of campus to support the exploration of campus climate. Dr. Elliot emphasized how important it is for us to understand what's happening with our culture and with faculty experiences. The committee is

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – January 25, 2021 5

also using multiple processes of institutional self-assessment, with the COACHE survey being only one faucet. There are survey questions with regards to several domains such as the nature of work, thinking deeply about the research that you do the teaching that you do, the service that you do, and how do you feel about those components of your work. Questions also include any resources that faculty might have and the support available. Please visit the FAQ page for more information. The survey will start the week of February 8 and it will close April 12. This is linked to IRB approvals by Harvard, the university that is hosting the COACHE survey as well as locally here at LSU we have IRB approval as well. The coach team will organize the data and process it and send it to us in the Fall of 2021.

Q & A Summary:

Mandi Lopez: You said that this was different from previous satisfaction surveys?

Emily Elliott: Yes. It is a broader array of questions across more domains. It is going to be a tool for us to look at our own local response and also compare that to other universities.

Mandi Lopez: You also said that the data would be correlated outside the University as a service for the survey?

Emily Elliott: Yes that is correct. The COACHE team consists of chief academic officers that will put together a report from the data that will then be shared with the core committee.

Old Business

Second Reading Resolution 20-05, “Confronting Anti-Blackness by Ensuring Undergraduate Access to Antiracist Curricular Offering”

Sponsored by Faculty Senators Profs. Sonja Wiley and Cassandra Chaney

Read by Profs. Sonja Wiley and Cassandra Chaney.

Whereas in the wake of the deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Philando Castile, Stephon Clark, Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, Atatiana Jefferson, Alton Sterling, Elijah McClain, and too many other Black people, the nation’s largest protest movement in recent history unfolded across the country to demand an end to the institutionalized racism and the pervasive anti-Blackness that injures and kills;

Whereas this is a moment in which the country is engaging in a long-delayed reckoning with the ways it has been built on anti-Blackness, and in which Louisiana, Baton Rouge, and our university are challenged to confront the potency and destructive power of anti-Blackness in everyday life;

Whereas LSU has committed itself to the truth that Black lives matter and has further dedicated itself to becoming an anti-racist institution;

Whereas students are expressing the desire to be more well prepared for the world in which they will live and work, including the students of the Black Student-Athlete Association who have advocated for expanded curricular discussions related to social and racial injustice;

Whereas LSU strategic plan seeks to inculcate cultural adeptness as a core value, and that its pillars all involve, in some way, grappling with the legacies of systemic and structural racism;

Whereas dismantling and disrupting racism demands conscious and intentional decisions about how we center antiracism in our curriculum;

Whereas research suggests that the overwhelming majority of high school students in the United States are not instructed in the true history of African enslavement, in the role of slavery in American history, and in its continuing effects in American social life, nor are students adequately instructed on the important contributions of African Americans to Louisiana and American history;

Whereas statistics tell a stark story of the way the study of African Americans’ contributions to Louisiana and American history is under-represented in higher education. The percentage of LSU students identifying as Black or African American has grown from 8.8% in Fall 2009 to 13.3% in Fall 2019, with 14.5% of Degree-Seeking First Time Freshmen (N=887) identified as Black or African American in Fall 2019, and that our increasingly diverse freshmen classes will continue to increase the share of students identifying as Black or African American, in line with national demographic trends in the race/ethnic composition of future cohorts of college attendees, coupled with a heightened attentiveness to recruiting more diverse pools of students. At the same time, African Americans are 34% of Louisiana’s population. And yet, there are no public colleges or universities in Louisiana that currently offer an independent BA in African & African American Studies (AAAS). LSU is in the process of seeking to be the first, in making the Program in African and African American Studies a department, and a curricular commitment to the study of Black and African American history and experience would cement LSU as a leader in the state;

Whereas, as the Statement from the Consortium of Chairs and Directors of Black Studies in the Southeastern Conference, which was drafted this summer points out, “Black, Africana, and African Studies continue to be the most viable academic solutions to this crisis and the ongoing national and global crises continuing to undermine our entire educational system,” and that “our systems must invest rather than continue to divest the kind of real support that matters, because as Black Lives Matters, #blackstudiesmatter”;

Whereas the Integrative Learning Core builds students’ proficiency in areas including global learning and in intercultural knowledge and competence, but does not guarantee that students will be challenged to confront the anti-Blackness so central to United States history, and its palpable legacies as they manifest in the present;

Whereas African and African American Studies 2000: Introduction to African and African American Studies is already an option for satisfying the Social Sciences requirement under LSU’s ILC program, and, per the General Catalog, addresses ‘Dimensions of African & African American thought and practice in contemporary and historical perspective,’ and supplies students with opportunities for studying Black experience in the US, and equips students with the tools for identifying and combating anti-Blackness, which has played such a

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – January 25, 2021 6

specific and immense role in the history of the state of Louisiana and our university, and thereby helps students begin the process of identifying and combating the many forms of intersecting oppression that characterize 21st-century United States life;

Whereas the spring 2020 Diversity and Inclusion Roadmap Report, produced by a robust committee of faculty, staff, and students, recommends a diversity and inclusion core requirement for all degrees;

Whereas a subcommittee of the Academics group from the summer 2020 Inclusion, Equity, and Diversity leadership retreat and task force deliberated this recommendation in consultation with faculty experts, including faculty experts on the subjects of race and racism;

Whereas other universities are in the process of deliberating or implementing required courses that center on ending anti-Black racism (e.g. Yale and the University of Pittsburgh);

Whereas the Office of the President and the Office of the Provost have expressed their support for this resolution, and have committed to supplying the necessary resources for its implementation;

Now therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate endorses requiring that AAAS 2000 be one of the courses each undergraduate completes in satisfying their ILC obligations.

Q&A Summary:

Mari Rethelyi: I am speaking on behalf of the Religious Studies department. We have two points, the first being a financial concern. We are afraid that this would require a lot of money and we don't know where the money will come from. Will it come from taking away from other resources?

Mandi Lopez: Thank you. Let's get back to your question once the background noise has faded a bit.

Julia Ledet: As the resolution is something that covers a sensitive topic, we wanted colleagues to be aware that this result of the resolution we wanted them to be able to have their voices heard without fear of repercussion. We assured colleagues at their identities would not be revealed. We also encouraged anonymous responses. We compiled them into a single document which was submitted to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for distribution. And the request for input from our colleagues, we indicated, we wanted a balanced view we received responses, both in favor and opposed to the resolution. And I want to make it clear that saying that I agree or disagree with the responses. I am just the messenger. The document is eight pages long.

Mandi Lopez: Thank you. We did distribute this to the Faculty Senate ahead of time, the day short and the list is long. Is there any way you can summarize the majority and minority responses?

Julia Ledet: I think the majority vote would be in opposition to the resolution.

Mandi Lopez: Can you give us a quick summary about what is the basis for that opposition?

Julia Ledet: One of the big things would be that it actually does add three hours to some degree requirements. Although not on paper, it will add three hours in the sense of students can get their six hours they need in social sciences. Another major component of opposition was in terms of the number of sections needed with the current freshman undergraduate class at 50 students per section that this would require 134 sections of this course in one academic year.

Mari Rethelyi: So, two points. One was a financial concern. The other was diversity. We thought it was a bit too narrow just concentrating on African American history and the syllabus was specifically on history of slavery, which of course is extremely important. But, we thought maybe addressing some Native American history might be just as important.

Daniel Tirone: I'm speaking on behalf of a group of faculty spanning multiple ranks departments and colleges on campus. Our group supports the principal embodied within the proposed resolution and agree that our curriculum would be improved by greater integration of material addressing issues related to diversity, equity and inclusiveness. We do, however, have some questions and potential reservations about the specific mechanism by which this principle is proposed to be put into practice. At its heart, the proposed resolution addresses the question, which is a core responsibility of the faculty, which is what is to be included in a general education curriculum. This question is fair and appropriate and as I said, we support the inclusion of these issues within the liberal arts whose purpose according to the Association of American colleges and universities is in part to develop specific learning outcomes that are essential for work citizenship and life. However, every policy has an intended and unintended consequences and mandating a specific course has consequences they will be felt throughout the entire curriculum. The proposal requirement is one which is instead of rather than in addition to. Given that it would displace other coursework, students may take under the current requirements which has impacts on their familiarity with many subjects which are also when said essential for work citizenship and life. Consequently, we think that it would be best to give these questions the consideration. They deserve by establishing a committee which could explore the benefits and costs of different approaches to revising the curriculum to better familiarize students with these issues within a holistic framework, which is also sensitive to other important areas. The committee would also play a critical role in determining the parameters of these alternatives, including the proposal requiring each student to complete AAAS2000 and allowing for more than a vote by the Senate on their perceived visibility of each. It was difficult for many of our members to conceptualize how the requirements for this specific course would be put into action. The most resource intensive but likely most beneficial format, would be to have students in sections of no more than 35 to 50 students which would require scaling up from three sections, a year to over 100. The least resource intensive, but presumably least effective would be the creation of course through LSE online, which was similar to a massive online course enrolling hundreds if not thousands of students in a single section. There are also a wide variety of options between these two extremes, each with their own benefits and drawbacks. These considerations must be taken into account because policies

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – January 25, 2021 7

which aspire to advance important goals will fail if they cannot be effectively implemented. The information generated by the Committee on the question of implementation will be of tremendous assistance and helping this body, make the best decision we can and in so doing better serve our students by providing them with the framework, they will expose them to the wide body of knowledge and experiences which is necessary for them to be successful. For these reasons, I moved to refer the motion to a special committee to study the likely impact of the proposed resolution on the curriculum and recommend how best to accomplish its central goal of educating LSU students on inequality and the troubled history of race in America. The details of the committee shall be as follows. The committee will be charged with consideration of the following questions and others which may arise during their deliberations. The compatibility of the proposed resolution with existing general education requirements, meeting the impact on other departments and their course offerings. The compatibility of the proposed resolution with proposed ILC program, including impacts on others who might be eligible for inclusion under LSU roadmap to diversity. The preferences of the undergraduate student body and how to incorporate issues of diversity, equity and inclusiveness into the curriculum. perhaps obtained through the commission of a survey and the solicitation of comments from individual students and student organizations. Issues pertaining to the actual implementation of the proposed resolution if passed, including but not limited to how adoption might impact the number of sections required to be offered, staffing, financial and other logistical requirements. Investigation of potential amendments or alternatives to the proposed resolution to improve implementation of the program relative to its stated goals and to improve compatibility with each of the points of consideration listed above. Membership of the committee shall be determined as follows. Following adoption of this motion, the Faculty Senate President shall announce a two-week period in which nominations shall be accepted for each of the following groups: Faculty affiliated with AAAS, with nominations provided by the program director, Faculty from programs and departments which offer courses which a) are included in the Social Science category of the General Education Curriculum; b) are included in the Social & Behavioral Science category for the Integrated Learning Core; or c) include content which covers issues related to diversity, equity and inclusion. Nominations for this category are to be provided by the program director or department chair, and Faculty from the Senior Colleges at the university, with nominations to be provided by the college dean or their designated representative. Once the nomination window has closed, the Faculty Senate President shall provide to the Senate a complete list of all nominees and appoint five nominees from each of the three categories to serve on the committee. With the exception of category one, no unit may have more than one representative on the committee. The chairs of the Faculty Senate Admissions, Standards and Honors and Integrative Learning Core committees are to serve on the committee as ex officio members. The committee shall provide the Senate with preliminary reports on its progress at each senate meeting in February and March, with a final report to be provided to the Senate for its deliberation at the final meeting of the semester in April.

Mandi Lopez: Thank you professor. Is there a motion to move this into discussion?

Motion to move into discussion: Kellie Brisini and Meredith Veldman

Julia Ledet: I like the motion. I think it's a good way to address some of the concerns that a lot of people have voiced in the meeting.

Tara Houston: I just wanted to clarify in our previous discussion of the resolution. We were told to focus only on what was on the paper and not worry about implementation and not worry about cost and things like that. There has been an exceptional amount of conversation about cost and implementation. So, I just want to clarify what our role here is I'm concerned about implementation and a lot of different ways and perhaps that is the reason that this motion makes sense. But I just want to clarify what my role is here in terms of how I should speak to the resolution as it stands.

Mandi Lopez: Well, right now what we are discussing is the motion to refer so depending on the outcome of this, as I understand it, we can go back to discuss the resolution. Again, I think your question is very important.

Lori Martin: If the desire is to create a subcommittee, and that is the way in which the Senate would like to go, then we would like to withdraw the resolution.

Theda Daniels-Race: Good afternoon. I have a question, or point of clarification, if you will. To my understanding with the original resolution, a great deal of research study investigation and likewise reference to experts. So, I am a bit confused or concerned about this subsidiary motion needing additional study. We would be rehashing the work already completed. My primary question would be to the originators of the resolution. Could you address some of the points raised in the motion? I would like some clarification please.

Lori Martin: I'm able to comment because I was on that committee and that committee you mentioned including Matt Lee, Chris Barrett in English, and Dr. Stephen Finley. We have individuals on campus who've been studying issues related to race and racism for their entire careers. The committee looked at what some other institutions are doing and proposing. We also drew from our work and the work of our colleagues and so again we were listening to individuals who have expertise in this area.

Stephen Shipman: I haven't quite heard answers to the questions about the implementation and how it's going to work. We are looking for answers to the questions raised regarding the technical questions about curriculum. I feel that instead of rushing ahead, it would be a good idea to clarify how this will work. Those issues about changes to the curriculum, number of classes, cost, and so on, need to be addressed adequately.

Meredith Veldman: I'm speaking on my own behalf. I have talked to my colleagues in the History Department and there's quite an array is a controversial issue sensitive topic. We could come to no consensus as a department, but I support this resolution, specifically the part of the resolution where it talks about the importance of making sure that we keep the aim in mind of educating our students in history of the African

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – January 25, 2021 8

American experience in both Louisiana and again in the country. This is an important issue and I think most you know I think we agree about educating our students. And so, for me, the big question is, what's the best way to do it. Maybe it is to have the single course at this point, but I'm not convinced. I think three months to consider would be three months well spent, so that we come up with the best solution possible to this very important issue.

Stephen Shipman: It also looks like there is quite a bit of discussion on the under the underlying basis that has not been completely addressed. That might need more discussion. It can also give people a chance to read what other faculty members concerns are. There may be ways to address those concerns so that at least there's a consensus. I just feel that there are many issues that we probably should think about that have been raised. We want to avoid doing something that's going to somehow anger others without actually having that discussion. It's about helping us understand together.

Mandi Lopez: Thank you. Is there a motion to move this forward?

Motion to vote: Chantel Chauvin and Meredith Veldman

Vote: In favor of the motion proposed by Professor Tirone

Lori Martin: Is it possible to withdraw the resolution at this time? What is the process? The committee was not interested in any other options at this time and that the focus should be on anti-blackness and that's doesn't appear to be in the interest is of this body at this time. When we had our meeting and said that we would not proceed forward if this was the outcome. I would ask the professors who sponsored it to do just that. Thank you for your time.

Sonja Wiley: Dr. Cheney and I will withdraw the resolution because the purpose of the resolution was to address what is a glaring and obvious issue in Louisiana, in the nation, and specifically at LSU and even at the university lab school, and that is to confront anti blackness. I'm a diverse individual and I believe in diversity, but that was not the purpose and that was not the intent of this resolution. So, we withdraw this resolution.

Joan King: It is my understanding that the senate needs to vote to allow the resolution to be withdrawn.

Theda Daniels-Race: If the resolution is withdrawn, it will nullify the motion as well. Is that correct?

Mandi Lopez: Correct.

Vote to allow withdrawal of Resolution 20-05: Vote passes, resolution is withdrawn.

New Business

First Reading, Resolution 21-01, "Formation of Ad-Hoc Committee to Develop A Comprehensive Framework for Open Access Publishing at LSU"

Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Library Advisory Committee

Read by Professor Hachmann.

Whereas LSU is, according to its Mission Statement, committed to "using its extensive resources to solve economic, environmental, and social challenges"; and

Whereas according to the Strategic Plan 2025, LSU aspires to be "a catalyst for transformation; a force for good that changes lives and makes a significant, positive impact on the world around us"; and

Whereas the federal memorandum "Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research" stipulates that government-funded research be "made available to and useful for the public, industry, and the scientific community" alike, resulting in the requirement of federal funding agencies to make research findings available through open-access platforms; and

Whereas the cOALition S, a cooperation of leading European research institutions and organizations under the auspices of the European Commission and the European Research Council (ERC), pledges in their Plan S, "With effect from 2021, all scholarly publications on the results from research funded by public or private grants provided by national, regional and international research councils and funding bodies, must be published in Open Access Journals, on Open Access Platforms, or made immediately available through Open Access Repositories without embargo;" and

Whereas the current COVID-19 pandemic demonstrates with unprecedented the urgency for Open Science, showing that it is unethical to bar potentially life-saving research findings and data behind pay-walls and that instead, new findings must be made immediately available not just to the scientific community, but also to the larger public, as people, governments, and health care workers in every part of the world are in dire need of evidence-based, scientifically proven information to protect themselves and others from a formerly unknown and in many cases deadly disease; and

Whereas for-profit publishing corporations such as Elsevier or Springer have in recent years driven up the subscription costs for scientific journals to the point where even well-funded research libraries struggle to pay and individual readers are strongly deterred by annual costs of up to \$20,000 per journal ; and

Whereas journal subscriptions constitute by far the biggest item in the budget of any research library and steep annual inflation adjustments (5% at LSU, up to 6% nationwide) rapidly exacerbate the strains libraries already struggle with as library budgets around the country are “for the most part flat or diminishing” ; and

Whereas many publishers have made open-access publishing available on the condition that authors pay Article Processing Charges (APC), in the case of Elsevier in the range of \$150 to \$5900 per article; and

Whereas APCs are not necessarily and rarely in full covered by research grants; and

Whereas experts warn that APCs create an unwarranted burden for individual researchers, noting that for graduate students trying to publish two articles in one year the costs can easily amount to “more than a quarter of their annual income”; and

Whereas the Chronicle of Higher Education reports that some open-access journals have gone so far as to require copies of personal bank statements from graduate students before even considering an APC fee reduction for them; and

Whereas a comprehensive study by the Max-Planck-Society concludes that “a large-scale transformation of the current corpus of scientific subscription journals to an open access business model” is possible at no additional costs to research institutions if, in a wide-spanning international effort, “the money currently locked in the journal subscription system [were to] be withdrawn and re-purposed for open access publishing services” ; and

Whereas the Max-Planck-Society modeled how research institutions can use transformative agreements in journal subscriptions such that subscription fees to journals grant affiliated researchers not just access to the content, but also coverage of the APCs for publications in these open-access journals; and

Whereas the LSU Library was able to procure in 2020 a transformative agreement with the American Chemistry Society, under which the library’s journal subscription automatically covers 28 APCs for LSU researchers; and

Whereas the ROARMAP that tracks open access policies around the world, lists 79 research institutions in the United States and 834 worldwide that already have implemented open-access policies, among them peer institutions to LSU such as the University of Florida, the University of Kansas, Kansas State University, or the University of Kentucky, and similar large state universities such as Oregon State University or Penn State University; and

Whereas open-access policies encourage members of the respective research institutions to seek out open-access publication forums, define which standards the institution wishes to support with respect to principles and practices of open-access publishing agreements, provide guidelines to authors in identifying and avoiding predatory open-access publishing entities, enable researchers to make informed decisions about their open-access publishing options, and generally serve as institutional roadmaps in a changing publishing landscape; and

Whereas the LSU Libraries’ Open Access Author Fund, which normally supports roughly 20 to 25 faculty members, staff members, or graduate students every year with up to \$1500 to cover APCs of publications in fully open-access, peer-reviewed journals, has already seen a substantial increase in requests this year; and

Whereas LSU faculty already serve in editorial roles on open-access journals for preeminent publishers including PLOS, PeerJ, Frontiers, and Hindawi and can attest that open-access scholarly publishing is as rigorous and comprehensive as traditional publication models; and

Whereas open-access publishing platforms often enable researchers to retain copyright on their publications and may offer to authors new metrics to measure the impact of their scholarship which can serve as supporting evidence in tenure and promotion cases,

Therefore be it resolved that LSU live up to its aspiration of being a catalyst for transformation that positively impacts the world around us by modeling a sustainable and innovative open-access publishing policy and thereby productively contributing to the global transformation of the publishing industry that is already well underway; and

Be it further resolved that an ad-hoc committee be formed and charged with the task of drafting a comprehensive open-access publishing policy that provides a robust regulatory and budgetary framework for open-access publications by LSU faculty, staff, and students; and

Be it further resolved that this ad-hoc committee consist of representatives from the Office of Finance and Administration, the Office of Research and Economic Development, the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Committee, the Faculty Senate Library Advisory Committee, the administration of the LSU Libraries, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee; and

Be it lastly resolved that the ad-hoc committee closely collaborate with the Dean of the Library in identifying both short-term and long-term strategies for repurposing or redirecting existing funds to ensure that individual authors at LSU are never forced into subsidizing open-access publications of their research with personal funds.

Motion to pass into discussion: Robert Cook and Joan King

Q&A Summary:

Robert Cook: The concept of open journals is fantastic. It's just that I think if we do this, we also have to basically have discussions about exactly how tenure promotion is done because certain fields do not have that access journals. So, if we basically put the onus on the fact that they must publish an open access journals that could limit career progression to LSU drastically.

Gundela Hachmann: I'm sorry. I think there's a misunderstanding. We are no way, suggesting that there is an obligation to publish an open access journals. We are merely trying to create options and opportunities for those who wish to do so.

Robert Cook: Okay. Number two, if you get money for some federal funding agencies such as NIH. They have their own database whatever paper, paper you publish, you must put it into their repository that anybody in the world can look at and I know that NSF is looking at this as well. When I have publications, I must put into an NSF repository as well. So, I don't know if you talked to some of the funding agencies on

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – January 25, 2021 10

exactly how they're handling this, but this needs to be much more of a unified than just institute by institute. There are a lot of funding agencies that are requiring this, and they have the power to require the same from the publishers.

Gundela Hachmann: Yes, you're right that some funding agency may or may not require this, but the publishers are not necessarily under any obligation to then allow you to also publish with them, so there are number of conflicts that can arise because of copyright issues.

Robert Cook: If you get NIH funding, they own the copyright, and the publishers cannot argue with them. I don't think they have a legal right to argue. Any paper I publish goes up on their website, regardless of what journal I publish to.

Mandi Lopez: That original publication, right. So, say, the cost of the initial publication is what this resolution addresses.

Gundela Hachmann: Yeah and that that doesn't solve the conundrum that we are have tried to outline here, which is that there are a number of journals that require APCs and that these APCs can be very substantial and as of now, there is no unified institutional approach to how to cover these APCs. So, a lot of people may find themselves in that situation where if they want to publish, they have to pay and what they have to pay maybe very substantial. I'm glad that the that you have a good experience with the NIH, but that does not solve the problem in general.

Robert Cook: For some scientific journals, you do not need to pay so it must be APC. So, okay.

Gundela Hachmann: There's a lot of variation and different fields. The, the article that I quoted from in the Chronicle of Higher Education for example was specifically taking examples from the economics.

Stephen Shipman: The very last sentence where you say "...Altruism never forced into subsidizing open access publications of the research with personal funds..." First of all, are there people who use personal funds for this? And second, do you mean to say personal research funds or personal pocket funds?

Gundela Hachmann: I mean personal funds. Some people do not have personal research funds.

Stephen Shipman: Okay. To follow up on that, should research grants be used for this or should the support somehow come from the university?

Gundela Hachmann: We do not have one idea on how to address this problem. That is precisely the reason why they're suggesting that needs to be committee because we as a library committee, we cannot solve it. It's too complex. There's too many factors playing into it.

Morgan Kelly: I just wanted to sort of summarize that I think the core issue we're trying to address here is the relative allocation of funds and the resources to supporting open access publishing.

Gundela Hachmann: Yes, thank you. Open access publishing is underway, and LSU needs to find its place in that process.

Faculty Senate Committee Elections

Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

Stephen Shipman, Elected

Faculty Adjudication Committee

Kelly Blessinger, Elected

Meredith Gaglio, Alternate

Faculty Appeals Board

Estanislado Barrera, Elected

Jeffrey Brooks, Elected

Christine Corcos, Elected

Michael Desmond, Elected

Levent Dirikolu, Elected

Paul Hrycaj, Elected

Lynn Kennedy, Elected

Juan Martinez, Elected

Chad Seifried, Elected

Carlos Slawson, Elected

Jim Stoner, Elected

Sabrina Taylor, Elected

All moved to adjourn at 5:50pm.