

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
3:00 P.M., Thursday, October 4, 2010
Student Senate Room, LSU Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (Senate President, English) | 2. William Daly (Past-President, Chemistry) |
| 3. Pratul Ajmera (Vice President, Engineering) | 4. Renée Casbergue (Secretary, Education) |
| 5. Ken McMillin (Member-at-Large, Animal Science) | |

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

Senators present:

1. Mary Catherine Aime	2. Gabriel Beavers	3. Melissa Beck	4. Dana Bickmore
5. Michael Bowman	6. Stephanie Braunstein	7. Paolo Chirumbolo	8. Jennifer Curry
9. Josh Detre	10. Neila Donovan	11. Kerry Dooley	12. Susan Dumais
13. Kristi Dykema	14. John Fletcher	15. Kristopher Fletcher	16. Forrest Guy
17. Craig Freeman	18. Wes Harrison	19. Dominique Homberger	20. Joan King
21. Michael Leitner	22. David Lindenfeld	23. Mandi Lopez	24. Reem Meshal
25. Kevin McCarter	26. Alison McFarland	27. Patrick McGee	28. Louay Mohammad
29. John Nyman	30. Suresh Rai	31. Larry Rouse	32. Kresimir Rupnik
33. Frederick Sheldon	34. Joseph Siebenaller	35. George Stanley	36. Stauffer, Suzanne
37. William Stickle	38. Padma Sundar	39. Justin Walsh	40. Wanjun Wang
41. Hsiao-Chun Wu	42. Yi-jun Xu		

Replacements for absent Senators (voting):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Margaret Reams for Ed Laws | David Baker for Steve Gaunt |
| Kevin Robbins for Michael Leitner | Michelle Livermore for Priscilla Allen |
| Rick Holden for John Fletcher | Gina Costello for Michael Russo |
| Richard Bengston for Cristina Sabilov | Charles Delzell for Larry Crumbley |

Represented by Proxy - Not Voting:

1. Renée Casbergue for Rebecca Owens	2. Kevin Cope for Ed Watson
3. Dominique Homberger for Gail Sutherland	4. Jennifer Curry for Jennifer Jolly
5. Jennifer Curry for Dianne Taylor	6. Craig Freeman for Kathleen Bratton
7. Suresh Rai for Bhaba Sarker	

Senators absent without proxies + (# of absences without proxies):

- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Philip Adams | 2. John Battista | 3. Aaron Clopton | 4. Bruce Eilts |
| 5. Joseph Francis | 6. John Hamilton | 7. Andrea Houston | 8. Benjamin Kahan |
| 9. Jeff Kuehny | 10. Joseph Legoria | 11. John Protevi | 12. Phillip Tebbutt |
| 13. Sue Weinstein | | | |

Guests Attending Meeting:

Michael Martin	Jack Hamilton	Dan Claitor
Frederick Holl	Robert Doolos	Thomas Rogers
Zac Lemoine	Bruce Eilts	Charles Delzell
Dydia Delyser	Patty Exner	Richard Bengston
Dudley Fricke	J. Hudson	Justin Terracciano
Ann Ostrom	Johanna Sandover	____Ludwig

Consideration of the Minutes from September 2010

Motion to accept minutes (Rouse; Freeman second) - Passed unanimously on contingent basis with minor corrections.

Chancellor Martin's Address

Chancellor Martin noted that Senator Claitor has been a long time LSU supporter. We live in interesting times given a soft economy and only modest hope for some economic improvement. We'll see some cuts, not as severe as we've been asked to plan for, but still painful on top of previous cuts. This will lead to elimination of some programs and narrowing of others. The administration is seeking every way to increase revenues (beyond tuition and fees and state appropriations) to maintain the academic core necessary to a great flagship institution. I encourage all in the LSU community to stay in tune and engaged. I have met with foreign language professors whose contracts will not be continued; I hope that damage to the academic core will be minimized and that we can grow it back.

The chancellor thanked the senate for organizing forums and helping set the criteria used to facilitate budget cuts. This is not an easy task. He understands the challenges from the perspective of faculty members and administrators. We must ask if what we are doing is in the best interests of students and the people of Louisiana. A small group will meet the next day with the "Committee of 100" to offer solutions that might prevent us as a state and a collection of higher education institutions from facing such a situation in the future.

Senator Claitor's Address

The senator began his address by recapping his long experience with LSU - dating from his days at the HUEC preschool. This is not a fight to see who bleeds the deepest shade of purple. Many things I care about are being cut. I don't have a say in that. I just have to trust administrators to do what is best for LSU.

Reported that he filed Senate Bill 213 in his first session to steer unused insurance money into the LSU endowment. (The money went to north Louisiana chickens instead.) He is now on the senate finance committee as an interim member, which means that he can only vote when the legislature is out of session. The Commissioner of Higher Education asked what the Jindal administration plan is to preserve LSU's flagship and Tier 1 status. The answer is that there is no plan. The senate is now working on its own plan. There is a lack of support among some in the legislature, however, with the House finance chairman stating, "There is no LSU where I'm from." The point is that not everyone in the legislature views LSU in the same way. There are likely to be people in their constituencies who do feel strongly about LSU. They - through the alumni association - need to contact legislators (as often as TAF does, for example). Those outside of Baton Rouge need to be made to understand the importance of LSU to those areas.

Senator Claitor reports that he doesn't have easy answers. With nothing coming forward from the Jindal administration, the legislature needs to move forward without his leadership.

Discussion Summary:

Cope: There seems to be no mass mobilization of businesses etc. that depend on LSU for business or expertise. How can we mobilize them?

Claitor: I do believe people understand LSU as the biggest economic driver in the state. How to mobilize? You can send e-mail, letters to the editor, etc. But most important, get constituents in other areas to let their legislators know how much they support LSU. The squeaky wheel gets the grease. There are 143 others in the legislature who need to know why and how the flagship matters.

Daly: What are the chances of changing the constitution so that higher education and health care don't bear the burden of budget cuts?

Claitor: Not likely. There is some call for a constitutional convention, but many are nervous about that.

Delzell: It seems that statutes, not the constitution itself, are in the way (of spreading cuts across more parts of the state budget). Is that true?

Claitor: That is true to some extent, but there are so many dedicated funds (like for Wildlife and Fisheries, for example) that are difficult to tap for other uses. My preference is no dedicated funds. The legislature responds to people's voices

McGee: If LSU made more noise we might get a better response.

Claitor: It can't just be faculty. Tap alumni. 600,000 alumni vs. 1,500 faculty members will get legislators' attention.

Adams: Why do legislators from other areas care about what LSU costs in fees and so on (outside of TOPS)?

Claitor: Accessibility is an issue. Standards have been raised. TOPS is a political football. Just because it makes sense doesn't mean we're doing to do it.

Beavers: Unfunded mandates are increasing. Is there a movement to stop that?

Claitor: Yes, there is sentiment supporting that, but again, not enough political will. The situation is not encouraging.

Harrison: Is there any plan within the Board of Regents for reorganizing the higher education systems?

Claitor: That was tried last year, but the effort fizzled. A performance-based system has LSU at the top of every measure, but there is no political will to enforce it. If the governor won't take the lead, perhaps the senate or house should. I would love to see the BOR come out with a plan. I supported higher pay for a stronger commissioner in charge, but that was defeated.

Curry: Absent a plan from the governor, what are elements of a plan you are formulating?

Claitor: I'm working with others who know more about higher education, but I can't give specifics. Please share your thoughts and engage with me. The plan is not ready for public airing yet.

Ajmera: Like football teams, it takes many years to rebuild (the academic core). The legislature needs to understand the impact of the loss of expertise that has been the result of three years of uncertainty. People who are making decisions need to know this.

Claitor: Clock management is not understood by lots of folks. I try to get others to understand the damage we are doing right now. The perception of LSU as a Tier I institution needs to be understood by all.

_____: How much discussion has there been regarding how much we cost as compared to other institutions or private institutions? The true costs of an LSU education have been hidden from the public relative to its value.

Claitor: The Chancellor does a good job showing us value - a very good product at a very good price. I personally would pay more out of pocket to ensure that. We had a small victory last session.

Stanley: Why not more flexibility with fees which don't affect TOPS?

Claitor: It's an issue of accessibility for kids with no means. That's the battle cry. Most folks understand that LSU is underpriced. I'm only one of 39.

Doolos: We need to look at where LSU is relative to other states regarding fees. Every Arkansas institution has higher fees. I'm disturbed with state leadership and its priorities, such as \$2.5 million for Mr. Benson and Benson Towers. That sends a clear message regarding where priorities are. I hope you go back and help reshape priorities. We can't pick up and threaten to go elsewhere.

Claitor: I've done that through proposals to place money in LSU's endowment. The Saints' license plate money goes to United Way. I tried to steer that to LSU. I appreciate what you're saying. Please keep saying it.

Chancellor Martin: Perhaps we can work with health care to get our common agenda addressed. Thanks to Senator Claitor and others for at least getting us heard. Students and parents need to speak up - they are more influential than just us.

Claitor: The Chancellor works hard at the legislature every day on behalf of LSU.

Provost's Remarks

This is not the time for levity. I should get down to what is grim business. When I took this job, I didn't realize how grim or chaotic it would be. As dean for 18 years, I was appalled at the amount of bureaucracy, and hope to do something about that.

The flagship agenda is underway and it is necessary if we are to show effects of budget cuts. Requests for plans in response to hypothetical cuts are coming in regularly - 23% in June, then 36 or 38%, now 32%. All are hypothetical. It's been a grim and depressing experience. I'm very sorry that you have to wonder what's going to happen. It bothers me that if we were to be specific now, we would ruin units that may not be cut. We might also give away things that don't need to be cut.

Write letters to whomever you want and as often as you want. I have changed my mind regarding how important it is to speak out. As faculty, we're not just talking about saving ourselves. It's about students. We can argue on their behalf. We don't need to be reticent at all.

What's at stake: a 23% cut (the amount equal to stimulus funds that we will no longer receive) would take us to 2001 funding levels nominally, but to 1974 in real terms - not even counting losses and cuts already sustained. We should be talking about how to restore what has been lost. Some believe the notion that we have lots of pots of money, but those funds are not there outside of state appropriations. We have money because we're good (as in indirect costs and salary savings from external funding), and weakening us decreases that money.

I'm disturbed by the message from the Nicholls State president that large institutions can make it, and that smaller institutions should be given preferences. With a cut of 23% we become a regional institution with a football team. Any time we have institutions pitted against each other, we suffer. We must all stand together. It's disgraceful for one institution to ask that we subsidize their shortcomings. To work against each other makes it easier for the legislature to take money from all of us.

I agreed to do this (serve as provost) for two years. I don't aspire to stay in this position, or use it to move on to administration elsewhere. July 2010, I will be out of Boyd and back where you are - as faculty. As dean, I fought for faculty, students and staff. In this job, I will do that. I know unhappiness comes with budget cuts. Two things need to happen. First, we need to maintain the high quality we have had. That is more important now than ever. We have to show that we're worth saving. That will help us make the case for our university. Second, people who care about LSU need to stand up for it. Many legislators have not gotten even one letter or e-mail from anyone saying that they care about LSU. That has to change or the legislature has license to do whatever it pleases.

Discussion Summary:

Adams: I have a daughter at LSU. Another parent said he spent \$100,000 plus for New Orleans private schools, but he's now happy with public higher education. If we can't charge what we're worth....

Hamilton: I get annoyed when people say "it's a business; the economy is tough." We're not a business. We don't suggest getting rid of the Navy because of a tough economy. If they want us to be a business, then they need to let us control our own prices. If we are to survive, we need to be able to change. That is difficult in a populist state. Our best strategy is to compete based on quality - a long-term solution.

Dezell: The University of California declared "extreme fiscal emergency" and didn't fire anyone. Instead they used furlough. Why can't we follow the California model?

Hamilton: Furloughs are okay with a temporary shortfall in money that will be made up, but it doesn't work with permanent problems. It is not a long-term solution. It might be feasible with a mid year cut, although I opposed it last year because it would have been on staff, not faculty.

Harrison: Your point about showing cards is a good one, but a perspective out there is, "They don't believe us that a 23% cut would be devastating." How can we get them to understand without specificity?

Hamilton: We have tried to get some of that impact out there with estimates of what would be cut.

Harrison: It doesn't resonate. In this general economy, everyone is losing people. Without some details....

Hamilton: Describing what we do is difficult. Legislators don't understand what it takes to make this a great institution. It is hard to describe or get people to care unless it is their college. If a big cut happens, the state will pay a huge price and be very sorry.

_____: It will be helpful to have some very specific points to make (in correspondence with legislators).

Hamilton: Kevin has some ideas about that.

Dezell: Can we use some of the dramatic examples from your report?

Hamilton: Yes.

Donovan: I'm interested in your ideas about decreasing bureaucracy. We're trying to react quickly, but our hands are tied by bureaucracy.

Hamilton: That takes place at many levels. We need to empower people in particular jobs to make decisions. We can streamline graduate processes, for example. I don't want to single out particular people. In general, the move has been to move decision-making away from deans to elsewhere on campuses. We need to move more functions back to colleges where appropriate.

Stanley: If a mandated percentage cut comes to the academic campus, can we threaten to cut athletics at the same level? That will get their attention.

Hamilton: Athletics gives us money, and the plans we are formulating have that amount increasing.

Adams: Do you close a department of languages but keep a gold coach? If you don't help some boutique sports, could more come to academics?

Hamilton: Athletics exists because we're here, not vice versa. As we diminish, so will athletics. I recognize discrepancies in pay, etc., but that's not a solution. That money doesn't come to academics regardless.

Stanley: Lay out potential scenarios for athletics to stir up the hornets' nest.

Hamilton: I won't threaten cuts we won't actually make. I have made the analogy (put nine people on the field for at least one play to make the point).

Xu: Is there a plan for mobilizing forces? I received a call from the Alumni Association asking for donations. I suggested she contact downtown on behalf of LSU. Faculty have done enough.

Hamilton: The University and administrators are not allowed to lobby. Faculty and others can lobby as private individuals. More can be done.

Legenfeld: What is appropriate vs. inappropriate for us to do to mobilize students?

Hamilton: It is inappropriate to do it in class. They have a student organization and can decide on their own.

President's Report

LSU-BR News:

- The monthly newsletter has resumed publication. It is being used by others in the state as a de facto faculty newspaper.
- The chancellor's forum drew a standing room only crowd. We will stick with the panel process followed by open questions for future events.
- The Reveille will report on consideration of new rules regarding academic regalia at graduation. Academic Affairs has asked us to consider guidelines for extra ornamentation in terms of upholding the dignity of degrees.
- The full archive of faculty senate videos, dating back a few years, will soon be available.
- PS 44, long under consideration, should be resolved soon. Chip Delzell will hold off on Resolution 10-9 until the latest revision is completed.
- The website has a new format. Buttons will take you to linked pages more directly.
- FSEC elections for the last member-at-large slot are on hold while we wait on the last college to complete its elections.

System/State News:

- IT privacy issues at UNO have been brought to our attention. We were asked to intervene on behalf of faculty there. We have received assurances that IT privacy policies will be upheld. But public records rules must be upheld.
- There are some political actions brewing. There will be a jazz funeral on campus for the university. There will also be a rally in support of UNO at the legislature with support from LSU invited.
- The University of Louisiana System has backed down regarding restructuring faculty contracts. The Chronicle of Higher Education reporting aided this resolution.
- Tom Layzell, now serving as commissioner of higher education on a consulting basis, is supportive of faculty input.
- The process for bringing transfer students to LSU and a website to do so is moving forward. Some aspects of the process are disappointing, but are likely to improve.
- Communication with the legislature can't be organized by the administration. We can't use the broadcast e-mail system to solicit letters to legislators and so on, so we are resorting to paper exemplars that include major points that will resonate with legislators. Draw up your own or reprint this exemplar. We are requesting that each senator recruit five others to send letters. This is an important effort. Most legislators receive no letters, so any will be noticed. The cuts will be real. Any effort will help.

Discussion Summary:

Homberger: Is it allowed for faculty to send this electronically?

Cope: Yes. Not only legal, but encouraged. Use your own computer and private e-mail account, etc. An electronic version is posted on the senate website.

Rouse: Examples of LSU effects across parishes would be useful.

Cope: Students are from all parishes. We have graduates everywhere. Ag extension and research is statewide. We have asked deans to produce talking points. These will be on the senate website.

Presentation by Tiger Athletic Foundation President and CEO, General Ron Richard

I'm here because I respect what you do. After hearing other guests, I'm changing the focus of my remarks. I'm a graduate of LSU and as a result of my education here, I've had the opportunity to be successful. I now use the term "the Flagship" whenever I refer to LSU. The TAF board is attempting to do exactly what we have discussed in terms of lobbying on behalf of the flagship. Thank you to the faculty for the good work you do with lack of pay.

The TAF is here because athletics receives no state funds. The athletic director moves money over to academics (\$6.5 million per year). We are a 501C-3 organization - a nonprofit, charitable organization, with smaller sports the focus of that organization. I want to clear up misconceptions regarding athletics. Please approach me with complaints about TAF or athletics. If we're doing something inappropriate, I need to know. Please understand that we are supporters of the entire university.

Discussion Summary:

Rouse: In what form does the \$6.5 million come to the university? Does that include scholarships? That's not a donation to the university.

Richard: The figure is \$6.5 for electricity, etc. That's over and above scholarships.

Rouse: Electricity, etc. is the cost of doing business here.

Ajmera: Why not include with all TAF mailings a request for donations directly supporting academics? That would bring awareness of the importance of academics.

Richard: Many of those same supporters also give to LSU. What you're referring to is having a certain portion of tickets go to academics.

Ajmera: Not required, but requested.

Richard: I just had a donor ask to give money in support of a specific program. We always mention other programs, like the business school, for example. In order to make that happen, it would take a tremendous amount of trust, discussion, and understanding. There are people who won't give to athletics and others who will only give to athletics. Whatever we do with money has to be requested and approved by the administration and is sometimes up to the administration.

Harrison: Something as simple as a patch on the uniform would bring attention to budget issues.

Richard: The faculty senate can make that request to the chancellor.

Daly: There is precedent for dual donations. (WRKF - Dollars for Scholars, for example)

Announcement

Ludwig (GA for Campus Life and Homecoming Advisor): Our big service event for 2010 will seek 30,000 cans of food for the food bank. We will build a replica of Tiger Stadium on the parade ground. Go to the website to see how to get involved. Register to do an individual can drive, or be a builder. Building days are November 8, 9, and 10. The website is www.homecoing.lsu.edu/CANapalooza.html.

Old Business

Resolution 10-09 is deferred.

Second and Final Reading, Resolution 10-11: "Concurrence with the Revision of PS-70 – Naming of University Facilities" – Background Information by Paul Hoffman, Sponsored by the FSEC.

Whereas the naming of University buildings, venues, and other facilities presents an opportunity for LSU to form productive friendships and alliances with individual, corporate, and organizational donors;
Whereas the wise denomination of structures, objects, and spaces on the LSU campus creates as well as advertises a long-term if not permanent association between the campus and the person, organization, event, or activity that a public facility commemorates;
Whereas the LSU faculty takes a vital interest in both the dignity of the campus and the selection of donors who are worthy of commemoration and who are able to match the naming honor received with magnanimity of an appropriate amplitude;
Whereas the physical plant and architectural corpus of the University comprise an indivisible canon of "Tiger spaces"—a single conceptual, aesthetic, and economic unit that makes a single grand impression and that reminds visitors and supporters of the coherence of all aspects of our educational as well as extra-curricular University programs;
Whereas the Committee on Naming University Facilities, although an advisory panel to the Chancellor, has frequently sought

counsel from the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the Chancellor has expressed a desire for a more coherent policy on the naming of facilities than is available in the current version of PS-70;

Whereas, under the wise leadership of its Chair, Professor Paul Hoffman, the Committee on Naming University Facilities has prepared a thoughtful and thorough revision of PS-70, a revision which takes into account the present economic conditions under which universities labor while also codifying the respect that members of the faculty and community feel toward our institution and its campus;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate affirms its support for the revisions of PS-70 recommended by the Committee on Naming University Facilities and asks the Chancellor to implement that new policy.

Discussion: None

Vote - passed unanimously

New Business

First Reading of Resolution 10-12: Faculty Senate Resolution 10-12 "Health Insurance Coverage for Young Adults"

Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee - Read by Frank Cartledge

Whereas both the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of Louisiana have passed laws requiring insurance companies and health maintenance organizations (HMOs) to provide family coverage policies which include children until the age of 26;

Whereas a large number of insurance companies and HMOs have voluntarily included young adults under the age of 26 under family policies without waiting until the annual policy renewal date following the effective date of the federal laws (September 23, 2010);

Whereas Louisiana law requires insurance companies and HMOs to have an open enrollment period immediately following September 23, 2010 in order to add young adults under the age of 26, but excludes the Louisiana Office of Group Benefits from this requirement;

Whereas the Louisiana Office of Group Benefits (OGB) has the obligation to provide state employees with options for insurance coverage that are reasonably competitive with those provided by non-public employers both in and out of the state of Louisiana;

Whereas OGB has opted to delay implementation of the coverage mandated by both state and federal law until the next insurance renewal date of July 1, 2011;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Louisiana State University calls upon the Louisiana Office of Group Benefits to reconsider their decisions about extension of coverage to children of state employees between the ages of 21 and 26;

Therefore be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate calls upon OGB to reconsider two separate categories of young adults; namely, those under the age of 26 who are not now covered under family health insurance policies and also those under the age of 26 who are now covered under such policies but who will be dropped during the current policy year because they are no longer full-time students at an institution of higher education.

Discussion Summary:

Stanley: Is there a time issue - should be suspend the rules to vote on this today? (Motion to do so)

Delzell: Will this increase premiums?

Cope: the actual cost to OGB would be \$24.00 per policyholder.

Harrison: It's going to change as of July 11 anyway.

Delzell: The rush is - one more month delay.

Cartledge: The sooner we get something to them, the more time there will be for them to act, especially regarding December graduates who will lose health coverage.

Vote to suspend the rules passed unanimously.

McMillen: Friendly amendment - add "to 'immediately' reconsider" in the first "therefore." (Passes with one dissent)

Delzell: Can rates be changed mid year? Is there some legal barrier to what you're proposing to do? For those graduating in December, OGB can't have budgeted for that. I'm not sure what correction will be necessary for those adding dependents back.

Vote on resolution: Passed unanimously.

First Reading of Resolution 10-13: “Withdrawal Date Policy Revisions”

Introduced at the Request of the Student Government Association - Read by Thomas Rogers and Jay Hudson

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.

Explanation: The proposed resolution will make the last day to drop without a W and the last day to add a course fall on the same date.

Stanley: Move to debate.

Discussion Summary:

Bengston: Has this been through ASH?

Cope: (To students) Are you willing to send this to ASH?

Hudson: Yes.

Bengston: I move that the resolution be referred to ASH.

Vote: Unanimously in favor of sending policy suggestions to ASH for consideration.

First Reading of Resolution 10-14: No Confidence in the Budget-Cutting Process; Reclaiming Faculty Authority over the Curriculum; and Recommending an Across-the-Board Furlough over Layoffs

Sponsored by Senator Dominique Homberger, and Endorsed by the LSU Chapter of The American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

Whereas the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors delegate the Board’s authority to “establish curricula” on the LSU A&M Campus exclusively to the LSU Faculty Senate, and not to any campus administrator or to any committee appointed by campus administrators,¹ and

Whereas the Faculty Senate’s authority over “establishing curricula” includes at least a shared authority to decide which academic programs should be created, reorganized, or closed, and

Whereas in August 2010, 14 instructors in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures were notified that their employment, and theirs alone among all LSU faculty, would not be extended beyond January 2011, and hence the LSU curriculum would no longer include instruction in several foreign languages, and

Whereas this action has serious impact on students already admitted in allied programs, such as International Studies and Business Administration, as well as on LSU’s national and international reputation, and

Whereas such allied programs received no warning or notice of the termination of programs, and first learned about them from the newspaper, even though the elimination of the language programs in question has significant impact on the allied programs’ curricula, and

Whereas the Provost and the Chancellor have declined to say how these 14 faculty members were chosen from the entire LSU faculty for termination,² contrary to the AAUP’s Recommended Institutional Regulations,³ which require that administrators give a faculty member, upon request, the reasons for a decision not to reappoint, and

Whereas the FY12 Budget Crisis Committee has proposed terminating 389 faculty members, furloughing zero faculty members, eliminating 50 degree programs, reducing the student population by 8000, “substantially” reducing income generated from tuition, leading to a secondary “layoff of hundreds more faculty and staff”⁴—all of which, in combination with the recent and projected tuition increases, will hurt current and future students, and

Whereas programs and curricula, once terminated, cannot easily be re-established when the budget stabilizes in the future, and
Whereas a budget crisis should not be an opportunity for the administration to make major structural changes to the university,

especially in the absence of a declaration of financial exigency, and without adequate faculty involvement in shared governance on programs and curricula, and

Whereas other options for handling the budget cuts should first be explored, such as an across-the-board furlough of all administrators and faculty members at LSU (analogous to the across-the-board furloughs imposed throughout the University of California System and the University of Illinois System⁵), which would protect more of the curriculum than the Budget Crisis Committee's plan would,

1. *Therefore be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate has no confidence in the current budget-cutting process, including the Realignment Taskforce, the Right Sizing Advisory Committee, the FY12 Budget Crisis Committee, and any other such committees, known or unknown, none of which were appointed by the Faculty Senate, and none of which have shared with the Faculty Senate the rationale for their various recommendations (such as their recommendation to abolish from the curriculum the study of various foreign languages, to be followed by the abolition of 50 other degree programs), and none of which have asked the Faculty Senate or its Courses and Curriculum Committee to evaluate and vote on any of their proposals to change the curriculum, and

2. *Therefore be it further resolved* that the Faculty Senate inform the LSU Board of Supervisors, through channels, that the campus administration has been violating the Board's Regulations as described above, and

3. *Therefore be it further resolved* that the Faculty Senate recommends that no faculty member at LSU be terminated due to budgetary cuts:

(a) until the Faculty Senate has voted to accept the repercussions on the curriculum that the terminations will cause, and

(b) until other options, such as furloughs of all administrators and faculty, to absorb cuts and thereby avoid faculty terminations, have been examined by a committee with substantial faculty representation, such as the steering committee described in the campus exigency policy.⁶

1 At the level of each campus of the LSU System, the Board Regulations declare: "The faculty or Faculty Council [of the campus] shall *establish curricula* [emphasis added], fix standards of instruction, determine requirements for degrees, and generally determine educational policy, subject to the authority of the Board. It ... may delegate its own authority to an elected Faculty Senate and/or to standing committees, whose authority shall be limited to matters which are proper to the faculty and which have been specifically delegated by the faculty." In 1973, the LSU Faculty Council (i.e., the entire body of all faculty members at the LSU A&M campus) delegated its authority over the above matters to the LSU Faculty Senate.

At the college level, the Board Regulations further declare: "The faculty of each college or school not within a college shall define and recommend degree programs for units under its jurisdiction."

And at the department level, the Board Regulations declare: "The departmental faculty shall have jurisdiction over matters concerning its educational policies insofar as these do not conflict with the policies of other departments, [or] the rules and regulations of its own college or school, the campus, or the University System."

2 See "Classics instructors fired, questions remain unanswered," by Andrew Robertson, *The Daily Reveille*, LSU, Sept. 22, 2010:

<http://www.lsureveille.com/opinion/cancel-the-apocalypse-classics-instructors-fired-questions-remain-unanswered-1.2337948>

3 <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/RIR.htm>

4 FY12 Proposed Cuts (Sept. 15, 2010), Level Three: <http://www.lsu.edu/FY12BudgetCrisis/listings.shtml>

5 www.UniversityOfCalifornia.edu/news/article/21511 ; www.uillinois.edu/our/news/budget/2010Furlough.cfm

6 "If the Chancellor is considering a declaration of financial exigency, a Steering Committee (here[in]after referred to as the SC) shall be convened by the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost. The SC shall consist of the following personnel: four faculty members to be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee; the two elected faculty representatives on the University Budget Committee; two regular faculty members of the Graduate Council (to be named by the Provost after the members nominated by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee are named to the SC); the respective presidents of the staff senate and student government association; two deans to be named by the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs; and the Vice-Chancellor for Research and Economic Development. One of the faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate will chair the SC and participate in its deliberations. The Provost will not vote. The Vice-Chancellor for Business Affairs and the Director of Budget and Planning will also serve as non-voting *ex-officio* members of the SC."

http://www.lsu.edu/senate/campus_exigency_procedures_with_FSEC_revisions.pdf

Introduction: There will be some changes at the end of this reading; the print copy distributed for the meeting is not accurate. (*The correct version appears in the minutes above.*) This resolution is in response to the extreme scenario of a 32% budget cut. We are presenting this on behalf of the LSU AAUP chapter.

Discussion Summary:

Ajmera: One point raised by the provost is that we don't know whether furlough is possible.

Homberger: There is precedent for voluntary furlough.

Ajmera: We need an answer to whether we can have mandatory furlough without declaration of exigency. Voluntary does not work. In 1992 only 7 administrators participated.

Homberger: But it was effective and saved the library. I'm in favor of faculty solidarity.

Harrison: A 32% cut would require a declaration of exigency. It seems to me that this is a heavy resolution that requires some serious thought. It needs to be earlier in the agenda given how many people are gone now.

Homberger: I appreciate your comment and in an ideal world, we could have addressed it earlier on.

Cope: For the next reading it will be earlier on the agenda as old business.

K. Fletcher: I suggest we move away from the hypothetical 32% language.

Homberger: What is important is that the faculty reclaims authority over curriculum.

Donovan: I'm curious about issues of control over curriculum and layoffs. How do we get this out to our constituents?

Homberger: Budget cutting committees as now constituted consist of administrators. Faculty is most aware of how programs are interlinked. Specifically regarding cuts to languages, we need to get others in allied programs involved. Faculty needs to be on committees making these decisions - their expertise needs to be consulted. Administrators' comments reveal lack of understanding, for example of what it is to know a foreign language.

Delzell: This does not advocate layoffs but suggests furloughs instead. At the University of Illinois, faculty and students debate what will be cut in an open forum. Why can't we attempt the same here?

Cope: I understand the motivation behind the resolution, but it is somewhat dangerous. The governor is looking for a rationale to say that faculty is overpaid. If faculty acquiesce (by taking a cut in pay through furlough), that reinforces that "painless" cuts can be made. And those cuts will be followed by others. It is important to note that only the regents can dismantle curriculum. That's different from just defunding it. In other states, a more orderly process from the governor to universities is in place. Here, we are left to deal with cut scenarios. We'd do better to go to the Division of Administration (proxy for the governor) or the Board of Regents and let them know that this is no way to run a university.

Homberger: I agree that we can do that too. But I took a cue from our new provost, that is, a previously proposed furlough affecting only staff is morally wrong. It is equally wrong to dismiss lower paid instructors. This is also about students and their needs for internationalization. It is wrong for us to watch fourteen helpless instructors get fired with relief that "it is not me." We have a quandary about perception of the university (looking like county hicks without foreign language), but this is also about standing up for the weakest / most powerless. When something happens to some, it happens to all of us.

Donovan: I worry about speaking up without being on the side of Hitler. Our department is heavily comprised of instructors. We need to separate issues with the university process from no confidence in the board or the state budget people. Better to divide this into three resolutions.

Homberger: We have already started to consider separating the three subjects

Rouse: I agree they should be separated. Also, the "whereases" are based on one specific scenario that may or may not happen. Also, the first "whereas" is a knock against the chancellor.

Harrison: I don't know about the process enough to say I don't have confidence in it. It may be a good process.

Homberger: But if we have more voice, we would have more confidence

Harrison: But our president does sit on the committee.

Cope: I do. I'm sworn to confidentiality as a price for being there. Work happened in the summer in response to commands from the governor. We needed to act quickly.

Delzell: The debate isn't about secrecy vs. free for all senate consideration. This resolution specifies use of a representative committee already laid out.

Cope: Yes. Remember that I wrote the guidelines we are using. Those procedures have been established, but they refer to procedures for "exigency." Word from the governor is that exigency will not be considered any time soon. The Board of Supervisors has already decided that exigency will not be declared.

Delzell: The Board of Supervisors approves exigency, not the governor.

Stanley: The governor appoints 12 of the 16 members.

Cope: A non-antagonistic approach is more likely to work.

McMillen: Better to work with family members of the board.

Homberger: This resolution is not so revolutionary since it draws on procedures established by the FSEC.

Harrison: The language of "no confidence" says that someone needs to be fired. It is strong, inflammatory language.

Delzell: It is not directed at a person - just at a process.

Braunstein: Is there still consideration of breaking this up? This is too much for one resolution.

Homberger: Drop me an e-mail with any changes - less inflammatory language and so on. Would three replacement resolutions be read for the first time, or could they be read as second readings?

Rouse: Move to adjourn. Stanley second. Meeting adjourned at 5:40