

**LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**3:00 P.M., Monday, December 7, 2009**  
**Student Senate Room, LSU Union**  
**Attendance**



*Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:*

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

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

*Senators present:*

1. Fred Aghazadeh	2. Gabriel Beavers	3. Michael Bowman	4. Kathleen Bratton
5. Jennifer Curry	6. Charles Delzell	7. Josh Detre	8. Susan Dumais
9. Bruce Eilts	10. Kristopher Fletcher	11. Joseph Francis	12. Juhan Frank
13. Craig Freeman	14. Wanda Hargroder	15. Wes Harrison	16. Dominique Homberger
17. Andrea Houston	18. Paul Hrycaj	19. Lisa Johnson	20. Jennifer Jolly
21. Jeremy King	22. Jeff Kuehny	23. Richard Kurtz	24. Ed Laws
25. Joseph Legoria	26. Mandi Lopez	27. Patrick McGee	28. Evelyn Orman
29. Lawrence Rouse	30. Kresimir Rupnik	31. Michael Russo	32. Cristina Sabliov
33. Frederick Sheldon	34. Edward Song	35. Gail Sutherland	36. Dianne Taylor
37. Dottie Vaughn	38. Muhammad Wahab	339. Justin Walsh	40. Sue Weinstein
41. Paul Wilson	42. Yi-jun Xu		

*Proxies for absent Senators:*

Wanda Hargroder for Lisa Johnson  
 Frederick Sheldon for Catherine Aime  
 Gabriel Beavers for John Fletcher  
 Larry Crumbley for Joey Legoria  
 Cristina Sabilov for Kelly Rusch  
 Kresimir Rupnik for Erwin Poliakof  
 Pat McGee for John Protevi

Daphne Cain for Priscilla Allen  
 Lei Want for Michael Leitner  
 Larry Crumbley for Ed Watson  
 Bruce Eilts for Steve Gaunt  
 Kresimir Rupnik for Linda Allen  
 Dominique Homberger for Sue Bartlett  
 Renée Casbergue for Rebecca Owens

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

Mary Catherine Aime	Brittan Barker (4)	Kristi Dykema	P. Lynn Kennedy
Michael Krom (4)	Kevin McCarter	Alison McFarland (2)	Heather McKillop (2)
Phillip Tebbutt	Jeffrey Tigg	Richard White (2)	

*Guests Attending Meeting:*

Michael Martin (Chancellor)	Astrid Merget (Executive Vice-Chancellor & Provost)	Robert Doolos (University Registrar)
Lea Goodwin	Brian Ainsworth	Greg Molchan
George Stanley	Casey Kayser	Mariano Hinojosa
Ravi Rau	George Stanley	

**Consideration of the Minutes from November 2009**

Motion to accept minutes (L. Crumbley; second, C. Freeman) - Passed unanimously.

K. Cope introduced Chancellor Martin who thanked the faculty for a great semester and wished everyone happy holidays (when finals are final).

## President's Report

### *LSU-BR News:*

- Attempts to compile records of LSU business have hit a snag in that many records are inaccessible. Working with Elaine Smyth, an archivist with Hill Memorial Library, to inventory senate records and begin storage process until such time as a records manager is hired.
- Easy Streets 2 is underway, attempting to make adjustments to parking, one way streets, and so on for better traffic flow. Kevin continues to stress need to maintain faculty parking at current levels. A total of 32 spaces (not faculty) will be lost temporarily from A parking sites.
- Courses and Curriculum committee reports that its high volume of work and the backlog that created has been address, in part thanks to the provision of laptops for members from Stacia Haynie.
- Search for Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Enrollment Management is coming to a close. Kudos to Chuck Wilson and the Provost for the openness of what was a genuine search process, resulting in good candidates. Hire to be announced shortly.
- Brian Voss reports that an Adobe site license is coming as soon as the purchase is approved at the state level. This means it will be available to LSU community at no cost on Tiger Bytes.
- A website has been established for the Graduate Dean search. A site for reorganization efforts is also under development.

### *System News:*

- A new IT governance policy is in the works for the LSU system, with the process to be facilitated by Brian Voss. The faculty will vet the proposed policy when it is ready.

### *State News:*

- The Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates met on the LSU campus. Guest speaker James Wharton shared information about the Tucker Commission, articulation efforts, possible fee increase proposals, and so on.
- The provost and chancellor will consider proposals regarding continued participation in the LOUIS library system, which is costly to the LSU campus. Issues such as user friendliness need to be explored. Alternative software is being considered.
- General education requirements among systems are being discussed. LSU is attempting to keep the focus on skill levels as the basis for admission to upper level programs and courses. This is viewed as a means to maintain the notion of skills and rigor as opposed to simply accepting students based on compatible course numbers.

### *LSU Museums:*

Judith Shiebout made a presentation of issues related to the Museum of Natural History. She proposes development of a new museum of natural history to gather collections that are scattered around campus. She cited a report prepared by two preeminent consultants and scholars that found 16 scattered collections with "mixed reporting lines." Many of those collections were judged as "superb" by the consultants, who also noted that the frozen tissue collection is "one of the most important on the planet," with "incalculable value to Louisiana." She suggests that a fundraising effort - perhaps through outreach at venues all around the state to showcase travelling collections. (See powerpoint presentation on the Senate website.)

### *Discussion Summary:*

Beavers: Noted work in music - technology committee to explore high tech means of outreach.

Rau: This could also be used to share other collections.

Wilson: One site recommended for a new museum has also been suggested as a location for a parking garage. Can these be combined?

Shiebout: They are not exactly the same location.

Walsh: In art and design, public lectures are recorded and archived. Podcasts are being developed in conjunction with CxC.

Ajmera: Technology is good, but we need human connections - live performance that creates a bond between the community and LSU. We need to inspire high school students to connect and come here. I would put resources there. It takes investment to move beyond the I-10 corridor.

Rau: My first thought was to have touring productions, but that is expensive. Both should be done.

Cope: There are two invisible barriers: 1) getting beyond university sphere of influence, and 2) intersystem cooperation is needed since there are other universities in those areas.

Shiebout: We haven't done joint work, except for lending collections. Lots of expertise is needed - for example, from a science/museum education program. Grants might be an option to fund these efforts.

Rau: We are the state flagship. Our facilities should be available to all.

Cope: Realignment might offer opportunities to extend our leadership in the arts.

Houston: We have a vehicle that takes materials around. The same could be done for this. We'd be interested in helping.

Rau: We have a similar thing in our department.

Guest: Developing interest is one thing, but implementation requires funding. (Gave opera example - now \$250,000 fund based on fundraising from local patrons.) Oil industry has prospered immensely from the state. There is no building on campus funded / directly named by the oil industry. They are looking for a presence here.

Shiebout: We are not allowed to fundraise at this point. \$80 million is needed to build this museum. Austin raised \$300 million from one donor.

Cope: We have a marriage of two minds - question of how much entrepreneurial faculty can raise vs. what foundation etc. can do. Can you two work with Andrea Houston to work out a timetable for the next phase and report back to the senate?

***Presentation of Provost Astrid Merget on Flagship 2020: Listening, Learning, and Looking Ahead. (See powerpoint on senate website)***

Rationale: Conversation about renewed flagship agenda needs to be undertaken now because 1) 2010 agenda expires next year; 2) 2010 is the sesquicentennial year - a time for looking back and forward; 3) Forever LSU - the institution's first professional fundraising effort - will declare victory, signaling a time to start and empower the next campaign; and 4) the Tucker commission needs to know that as a flagship, we are masters of our own fate - we plan for our own future.

Overview of progress and process:

Finding a scientific way to defining peer groups was an early challenge. Comparisons to peer institutions are now systematic. 2010 provided general agreement on what yardsticks to use, but lacked a clear LSU imprint. We now need to move beyond a local and regional presence to develop an international identity.

Major accomplishments of 2010 include gaining official flagship status and catapulting into top tier of research institutions (for two years running).

New goals:

- 1) Finances - diversify funding base. Decrease reliance on state funds.
- 2) Political - build support to include champions of LSU beyond Baton Rouge
- 3) Academic - take a place among the most elite public and private institutions, as indicated by membership in the AAU top 60.

This overview was followed by discussion of the process used to arrive at new "peer institutions" by which we will set benchmarks.

Provost Merget suggested a need to rethink traditional mission of service, scholarship, and teaching, instead substituting "discovery, learning, diversity, and engagement." May also consider adding the concept of "stewardship."

The 2020 Flagship Agenda statement now needs a preamble and postscript that addresses three questions:

- 1) What assets are in place now?
- 2) What are barriers to achieving our goals?
- 3) What opportunities are present?

Opportunities for feedback on the proposed new agenda are available via a Moodle link on the OAA to the University Planning Committee. Provost Merget underscored the importance of the new agenda for garnering support from donors. The next step will be for deans to lead planning at the college level.

Kevin Cope urged those present to visit the site and provide such feedback.

## Old Business

### *2nd reading of and vote on Resolution 09-07 - Conditions and Procedures for Furlough Plans*

## Resolution 09–07 “Conditions and Procedures for Furlough Plans”

Introduced by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at the Request of the Office of Academic Affairs

Whereas it is in the mutual interest of the faculty and the administration to find solutions to budgetary problems that threaten to impair both the national standing and the basic functions of Louisiana State University; and

Whereas the legislative and executive branches of the Louisiana state government have asked the LSU community to propose an array of alternative plans for dealing with the current revenue shortfall while inflicting minimal damage on the state’s Flagship University; and

Whereas the LSU faculty deplors the failure of state government to provide, over the years, a stable economic foundation for higher education, even while applauding the desire for input from university faculty;

Whereas there is no practical way to distribute furloughs in such a way as either to be or to be perceived as fair and equitable to all members of the University, many of whom fear recrimination or reprisal for opposing “shared sacrifice”;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate regards furloughs as an inadequate and unfair solution to budgetary problems that should be used only in the most extreme of circumstances;

But therefore be it also resolved that, although the LSU Faculty Senate questions the need for furloughs, layoffs, or any other form of wage diminution and while it fundamentally opposes the violation of good-faith employment understandings with higher-education faculty, it recommends that any furlough be conditional on the following actions by the LSU administration:

- i. That an impartial, outside expert is retained to confirm that the furlough is necessary and is the best economic option for LSU;
- ii. That, for faculty, employee permanent salaries of record will not decrease;
- iii. That the University provide at least three elective ways of taking the furlough (for example, [i] payroll deductions to go to the University via the LSU Foundation or [ii] one-time donations via check or other payment instrument via the LSU Foundation or [iii] multiple smaller payments or deductions);
- iv. That the furlough would take the form of a percentage of income, e.g., circa four percent or less;
- v. That employees earning less than 150% of the federal poverty line for a family of four would be exempt from the furlough;
- vi. That the Board of Supervisors negotiate in earnest with faculty representatives so as to change financial exigency and furlough procedures so as to minimize the chance of future furloughs, layoffs, or other concessions.
- vii. That the character of the furlough reflect the job description of the furloughed employee (e.g., if a furloughed faculty member is engaged in teaching as well as research, the furlough will apply to teaching time as well as to research assignments);
- viii. That the furloughed employee be allowed a choice among furlough dates and that those dates occur sequentially, as blocks, rather than in segments (i.e., that the employee be allowed “meaningful time off” rather than scattered hours during a working period);
- ix. That a furlough will not be requested from or imposed on faculty members unless a furlough is also required of all other state employees and elected officials.

Revised policy read aloud, with explanation for changes and rationale for each. The document clarifies that faculty is NOT in favor of furloughs, and puts the blame for budget woes where it belongs at the state government level.

### *Summary of Discussion:*

Walsh: # ix - clarify neither/nor. # vi should have already happened before furloughs.

Cope: There is a distinction between Board of Supervisors policies (informal) and LSU's more formal procedures.

Delzell: This is about changing procedures, which can happen now.

Walsh: This should be stated as a "whereas."

Harrison: Is it in the best interest of the faculty to separate furlough from exigency? Does that make furlough more likely?

Cope: Furlough is more often done, with layoffs linked to exigency.

Delzell: I share Harrison's concern. Last spring we said no furlough without exigency.

Cope: That was an explanatory letter without advocating for either.

Delzell: With no declaration of exigency, we should have protection from furlough. I suggest #vi be amended to delete part a and incorporate the policy adopted in 2006.

Cope: It did lay out procedures required prior to declaration of exigency. I see that as a friendly amendment.

Harrison: I suggest dropping vi altogether.

Delzell: Amendment to the amendment.....

McGee: I'd support dropping vi also. The intent is good, but separating the two (exigency and furlough) sets up a convenient system that hurts everyone. We have to be aware of context - an opportunistic state that makes little effort to support the flagship. It is better to create a plan later if furloughs are planned or exigency is declared.

Cope: You are supporting dropping vi and also Delzell's motion to use the 2006 policy?

Delzell: Yes, both.

Ajmera: Take vi out and insert 2006 policy as a "further resolved."

Stanley: My recollection is that the supervisors have not separated furlough and exigency. Chancellor Martin requested more tools to handle budget crises. So no negotiation with supervisors is needed.

Cope: vi is an attempt to bring supervisors in.

Harrison: If there is a sufficient budget crisis to require furlough, that should be documented according to policies.

Cope: The Board of Supervisors could declare exigency for other reasons than budget (as happened post Katrina at UNO). This suggests that guidelines for exigency are needed.

Harrison: How will separation impact Board of Supervisors decisions?

Cope: We were hoping to involve them in some way.

Ajmera: I also have questions regarding what would follow after exigency is declared. Our policy has never been approved by the Board of Supervisors. We need to make sure that a chaotic approach like occurred at UNO doesn't occur.

Harrison: The exigency plan is specific to context - it's not a general plan.

Cope: The plan includes policies for how one declares exigency, then procedures for carrying it out.

McGee: These objections are similar to our last discussion. If this is in the context of an exigency plan, that makes sense. As stated, we're inviting a furlough plan without exigency. The problem is whether we want to present this as a separate plan. You are implying that this isn't in the 2006 plan. I'd suggest a policy for furloughs to be included in the 2006 plan.

Cope: I feel the need to respond for faculty to legislators who view faculty as uncooperative. This shows "forthcomingness" that may preempt negative action.

Taylor: Might # ix be amended in such a way as to make # iv unnecessary?

Harrison: That counters what Kevin proposes as our rationale - since we're more likely to take a hit.

Taylor: It might prompt more considered thinking.

Casbergue: We need to consider constitutionally protected areas. If we say that we will only accept furlough if it applies to all state employees, we're saying no furlough ever since "all state employees" can never be included.

King: Could we move #vi into "whereas" section?

Homberger: I second the motion to strike # vi.

Casbergue: Start by striking # vi, then decide what to put.

Cope: Let's vote. All in favor..... (unanimous voice vote) vi is stricken. New motion: The last "therefore" should be tweaked to link furlough here.

Weinstein: My recollection is that we enacted a policy that said furlough only with exigency. Was that not passed?

Cope: Resolution passed in 2006 and approved by many other campuses, but denied by the system president.

Exigency would never happen. LSU Office of Academic Affairs would like a statement in case. We also need to consider the possibility of force majeure (which is actually what was declared at UNO - not exigency).

Beavers: We should read the 2006 policy first.

Cope: It's on the website.

Delzell: We need a statement that furlough should only be considered in case of exigency. It's unrealistic to expect that the Board of Supervisors will adapt their procedures.

Cope: Exigency offers no protection.

Homberget: I like the declaration in # ix - we should all share the pain; say we will not collaborate in an unfair process. We should not cooperate. Civil disobedience is an important tool that can educate governors, etc. If we keep it in place, we don't need a statement about exigency.

Cope: But could it happen anyway?

Ward: What is the purpose? Who do we want this to go to? It won't please the legislators.

Cope: Good question. There are multiple audiences for this document.

Ward: Dominique is right. We need to educate so that units other than higher education and health are also cut. We can turn the table on accusations of greed etc. by asking, "who are you protecting?"

Cope: We can vote against the resolution.

Dominique: Important point. If we know to whom this is going, we know how to vote.

Cope: Legislators, OAA, LSU System, the general public. They need to know that we are not uncooperative.

Delzell: It is the general public who amends the constitution.

Hargroder: Provost, didn't you address this in your 2020 agenda?

Merget: In order to change budget protection, we need a separate political strategy. Furlough is a different implementation strategy.

Ward: This might be better conceived as a policy to guide internal decisions / procedures.

Merget: Agreed. That's a better audience.

Cope: The first "therefore" clause includes language from vi: faculty senate deplores the fact that system has not fully implemented 2006 provisions for exigency. Vote on this change in wording: approved on unanimous voice vote.

Rouse: # ix - regarding other state employees - add "as constitutionally allowed." (Taylor second)

Homberger: We don't want to fall in line with what the constitution provides. We need to education that it is not acceptable to keep cutting education.

Delzell: I agree with Dominique.

Ward: Take out ix altogether and develop more detailed statement as political tool aimed at legislature and the public. I suggest a second resolution.

Cope: Call for a vote - motion defeated (voice vote).

Dumais: Regarding # v - the poverty line is very low. I suggest changing this to 150% of poverty line.

McGee: Didn't we discuss gradatios?

Walsh: The poverty line is \$22,000. 150% of that takes us back close to \$30,000.

McGee: Can you explain why this is included?

Cope: It provides the sense that those who can bear the weight of sacrifice are faculty and they will pay the social justice mission of the state.

McGee: I move to strike the second "therefore." (Second by.....?)

Weinstein: It's already included in iv and v.

Cope: Vote by show of hands. Motion passes.

Delzell: Does this refer to mandatory or voluntary furlough? I don't see either.

Cope: I believe at your recommendation those words were removed.

Delzell: Furlough is imposed involuntarily. To avoid ambiguity, we should say "involuntary furlough." I recall we wanted two policies.

Cope: I construe the word to mean any kind of furlough. This covers both.

Taylor: I'd like to offer the idea that furlough can't be imposed while the state still has surplus funds it opts not to spend.

Merget: There are serious legal constraints on how that money can be spent. There are triggers required to spend that money.

McMillan: We're losing sight of the purpose for this - an OAA request. I move we close debate. (Kuehny seconds). Motion passes.

Vote on resolution as amended passed.

*Second Reading and vote on Resolution 09-10, "University Admissions Standards and the Restructuring of Louisiana Higher Education."*

## Faculty Senate Resolution 09–10

### “University Admissions Standards and the Restructuring of Louisiana Higher Education”

Whereas Faculty Senates throughout Louisiana are charged with stewardship of the educational missions, curricula, and students service offerings of their institutions;

Whereas the LSU Faculty Senate traditionally takes a leadership position among LSU System Faculty Senates and is often asked for guidance by faculty governance bodies at other universities;

Whereas continuing instabilities in Louisiana’s economy have placed sometimes unreasonable pressures on campus, university system, and state officials to intensify the recruitment of students;

Whereas the establishment of the Louisiana Postsecondary Education Review Commission, colloquially known as the “Tucker Commission,” suggests that major adjustments in the structure of Louisiana higher education will be forthcoming and that with those adjustments will also come new expectations concerning the missions of Louisiana universities and the characteristics of their student clientele;

Whereas all faculty governance units in the LSU System have demonstrated a high degree of responsibility and wisdom in the management of admissions requirements;

Whereas the Admissions, Standards, and Honors Committee (“ASH”) of the LSU Faculty Senate has established a record of prudent guidance in the area of enrollment management as well as in the selection of students and the definition of the LSU educational mission;

Whereas the ASH Committee is also preparing a slate of recommendations for future adjustments to admissions requirements;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate reaffirms its commitment to and responsibility for the maintenance and supervision of admissions requirements at LSU; that it likewise affirms the value and necessity of high admissions standards at the Flagship LSU campus; and that it encourages faculty senates of other Louisiana colleges and universities in their efforts to supervise admissions requirements for their campuses.

#### *Summary of Discussion:*

Perlis: ASH account of history of standards setting: (Refers to today's Reveille - discussion of Tucker commission.) Reviewed ASH processes and actions, noting that ASH has made annual recommendations on admission standards since 1984. Tucker commission wants 75% graduation rate by 2017. This is strongly connected with retention. ASH has introduced CATS to track progress toward major, new withdrawal policy, and online prerequisite checking for over 800 courses, an online wait list, first year experience, and residential colleges - all of which should have a positive impact on retention.

Cope: This is the second reading of this item.

Delzell: The second "whereas" should say LSU faculty senate.

Rouse: Take away quotations marks around "flagship."

No further discussion. Unanimous vote in favor of resolution.

#### **New Business**

Cope: Due to late hour, I suggest we delay Graduate Council discussion.

McMillan: Can you give a brief overview of the issue?

Cope: Go to the graduate website and look at Graduate School documents. The Council is appointed by the chancellor, not elected. As the council now has broader scope, representation is a concern. That should be addressed soon.

First reading of Resolution 09-11, "Timing of Spring Break, Adjustment Option"

## LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 09–11 “Timing of LSU Spring Break, Adjustment Option”

Sponsored by William H. Daly

Whereas last year the Faculty Senate (Resolution 08-03) and the Student Government, with Staff Senate support, recommended that spring break always occur the week of Easter Sunday to synchronize with the East Baton Rouge Parish School District and the East Baton Rouge Catholic Schools spring break,

Whereas Easter Sunday falls on differing weeks relative to the LSU Spring calendar.

Whereas three times in the period beginning on 2014 and ending on 2020, scheduling the spring break the week of Easter Sunday would leave only two weeks between spring break and final exams

Whereas a minimum of three weeks before final exam week is pedagogically desirable

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that beginning with 2014, the academic calendar be adjusted to allow at least three weeks of classes between the spring break and final examinations for the years when the spring break during the week of Easter would result in less than three weeks of classes between spring break and final exams.

Delzell: If this fails, then what is the system? I understand that corrections have already been made for 2011?

Doolos: 2011 is already adjusted, but only for that year. If the resolution fails, I'll need to ask for guidance.

Homberger: I strongly advise against changing the policy. The student body is changing and the discrepancy between LSU break and school break is problematic. The wisdom of the previous resolution was good.

McGee: I agree. I was approached by 5-6 undergraduates for whom this is an issue. This is an issue that is worthy of our concern.

Christie: I reiterate the difficulty of coordinating with multiple school districts.

Frank: If this fails, are we taking the rigid approach?

Doolos: Yes. Week of Easter Sunday.

Stanley: EBR can change its break any time.

Ajmera: We had this discussion last time. This is the result of that.

Delzell: Thanksgiving is also almost a week, and we manage. May be an advantage to only one week before the end of the semester for big projects. I question the wisdom of the change.

Taylor: Has there been any survey of students?

Cope: I've been asked to appear before the student senate twice to give the faculty view on this. I've also heard from many faculty with varying views. There's lots of anxiety out there.

Taylor: A survey might be a good way to solicit opinion of students.

Christie: The faculty senate develops policy, not students.

Homberger: If we are concerned about anxiety, we have an excellent health center. Children do just fine with a full semester.

Houston: I thought when we proposed this, we were more concerned about faculty and staff. We should get staff views. Staff supports congruence with EBR.

Delzell: Staff works during the break - what difference does it make?

Cope: There are probably some quiet understandings in place.

Christie: Let's save discussion for second reading and vote next time. I move we adjourn.

**Motion to Adjourn** - Christie; Rouse second.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:55 P.M.