

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, February 18, 2012
Student Senate Room, LSU Student Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (President, English) | 2. Joan King (Secretary, Food Science) |
| 3. Ken McMillin (Vice-President, Animal Sciences) | 4. William Daly (Past President, Chemistry) |
| 5. Stephanie Braunstein (Member-at-Large, LSU Libraries) | 6. Larry Rouse (Member-at-Large, Oceanography) |
| 7. Judith Sylvester (Member-at-Large, Mass Comm) | |

Parliamentarian: Louay Mohammed

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

1 X Fakhri Al-Bagdadi (Comp. Biomed Sci/Vet)	22 X Neila Donovan (Comm Sci Disord/HSS)	44 X Carl Motsenbocker (Horticult/Ag)
2 P Sibel Ales Bargu (Oceanography/C&E)	23 X Kerry Dooley (ChemE/Eng)	45 Jeff Nunn (Geology/Sci)
3 X Austin Allen (Landscape Arch./AD)	24 P Dorian Dorado (Foreign Lang Lit/HHS)	46 X John Nyman (Renew Nat Res/Ag)
4 X Linda Allen (Chemistry/Sci)	25 X Susan Eades (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet)	47 X Seth Orgel
5 P Melissa Beck (Psychology/HSS)	26 P Kenneth Fasching-Varner (Ed T Pol Pract/Ed)	48 X Evelyn Orman (Music/Music & DA)
6 David Bertolini (Architect/A&D)	27 X Juhan Frank (Physics/Sci)	49 X Irvin Peckham (Eng/HHS)
7 P Dana Bickmore (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)	28 A Stephen Gaunt (Pathobiological Sci/Vet)	50 X Rosemary Peters (French/HSS)
8 X Graham Bodie (Comm Studies/HSS)	29 X Jeff Gillespie (Ag Econ/Ag)	51 X Suresh Rai (Elect & Comp/Eng)
9 P William Boelhower (English/HSS)	30 X Gundela Hachmann (Foreign Lang Lit/HHS)	52 X Margaret Reams (Environ Studies/C&E)
10 A Dorin Boldor (Biol Eng/Ag-Eng)	31 X Jong Ham (Plant Path/Ag)	53 X Lawrence Rouse (Oceanography/C&E)
11 X Stephanie Braunstein (LSU Libraries/Lib)	32 Richard Holben (Drama/Music & DA)	54 A Gary Sanger (Finance/BA)
12 John Caprio (Bio Sci/Sci)	33 X Stuart Irvine (Philos Relig/HHS)	55 P Bhaba Sarker (Const Manage & Ind/Eng)
13 P Russell Carson (Kinesiology/Ed)	34 X Dorothy Jacobsen (Kinesiology/Ed)	56 X Andrew Schwarz (Info Sys Dec Sci/Bus)
14 X Paolo Chirumbolo (Foreign Lang/HSS)	35 X Jennifer Jolly (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)	57 X Katherine Stamps Mitchell (Soc Work/HHS)
15 Aaron Clopton (Kinesiology/Ed)	36 Carol Jurkiewicz (Public Admin/BA)	58 Suzanne Stauffer (Lib & Info Sci/SLIS)
16 X Kevin Cope (English/HSS)	37 X Joan King (Food Sci/Ag)	59 X William Stickle (Biological Sci/Sci)
17 X Larry Crumbley (Accounting/BA)	38 X Vince LiCata (Biological Sci/Sci)	60 X Padmanabhan Sundar (Math/Sci)
18 X William Daly (Chemistry/Sci)	39 X David Lindenfeld (History/HSS)	61 X Judith Sylvester (Mass Com/Mass Com)
19 X Jeffrey Davis (Entomology/Ag)	40 X Mandi Lopez (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet)	62 X Carol Taylor (Chem/Sci)
20 X Charles Deizell (Math/Sci)	41 X Ken McMillin (Animal Sci/Ag)	63 Wanjun Wang (Mech Eng/Eng)
21 X John DiTusa (Phys Astron/Sci)	42 Reem Meshal (Phil & Relig/HSS)	64 Christopher Weber (Polysci/HSS)
	43 P Louay Mohammed (C & Environ/Eng)	65 Hsiao-Chun Wu (Elect & Comp/Eng)

Guests:

Paul Sylvester	Brian Ainsworth	Maribel Dietz	Catherine David	Robert Doolos
Joseph Skillen	McKenzie Womack	Bill Matten	Patti Beste	Anna Castrillo
Elissa Plank	Ryan Landry	Jonathan Hyde	Ron Moreau	Elaine Giles
Guillermo Ferra	Jane Cassidy	Koran Addo		

Consideration of the Minutes from January 24, 2012

Motion by Crumbley, seconded by Bagdadi
 Approved unanimously with potential corrections.

President's Report

1. Faculty expressed interest in an Roth IRA offering on campus. That suggestion was well received and may be available soon.
2. The Faculty Senate passed a resolution for domestic partner benefits. The resolution received favorable reception in the Provost meeting, and a working group is being put together for that.
3. Faculty Senate previously passed a resolution to establish repeat-delete policy or grade exclusion policy. There are some circumstances where a student cannot repeat-delete if found guilty of an infraction of the student code of conduct such as academic dishonesty, but were asked by Dean of Students to allow them to make decisions on these cases where there appeared to be an infraction but appears on compelling evidence to be unintentional. This has been passed on to Academic Affairs and is meeting no controversy so an adjustment in the policy is expected.
4. The issue of the College of Agriculture in relation to AgCenter has been discussed with Provost and will be discussed tomorrow. We have not given up the case but are commenting on the issue.
5. The transition advisory team held an immersion meeting in the Coastal Resources Building and held online. It was not an overwhelmingly productive meeting, but with bold expressions and not much in detail. Only one of the subcommittees have met to date. Kevin Cope is on one of them. The initial report is supposed to be on March 15 (changed to March 18 post minutes) at next BOS meeting.
6. The LSU System presidential search has a tradition of secrecy. The LSU System has turned down a public records request and turned down another sort of public information request based on the right o know candidates for high office in Louisiana agencies. The AAUP has recently issued a statement about presidential searches.

7. The Benefits Advisory Committee is developing a pamphlet to serve as a quick start guide to some of the more troubled areas of the retirement plan.
8. On February 2 the state wide collaborative covering all systems of the state had Herbert Dixon speak at the meeting. They have invited Sandra Woodley , ULL System President, to the April meeting.
9. Tonight at 6 PM there will be a panel of education commentators, which Kevin will be, at the old McKinley High School auditorium. The public forum is sponsored by the Louisiana Association of Educators and the American federation of Teachers at the old McKinley High School Auditorium at 1520 Thomas Delbert drive.

Q&A Summary:

None.

Announcement of Financial Education seminar for faculty members Ron Moreau Campus federal Credit Union

A related planning questionnaire was handed out called “Market Research Survey – Investment Seminar”. They cannot have financial seminars under the credit unions domain so they are partnering with ThirtyNorth Investments. The survey had questions about 401K’s/403B’s, retirement related questions, investment information, economic outlook, risks and returns from drop in financial markets. They asked for additional topics we would want them to consider also. They collected questionnaires before leaving the meeting.

Kevin Cope comments

There will probably be announcement in the coming weeks about seminars. He requested that questionnaires also be handed out in the gallery to faculty there.

Q&A Summary:

None.

Presentation by Elaine Giles on behalf of Margo Jolet et al. of Student Life concerning a day of service sponsored by Student Life

Elaine Giles is Student Director of Go Big Baton Rouge. We want 1000 students to participate in community service on April 20th. They want help from faculty to encourage students to volunteer. Volunteering is great for students to do outside the classroom. Five easy ways to help is to write Pledge to Go Big on blackboard, email GoBig@lsu.edu to get info and ask for a presentation from them, faculty can sign up and volunteer, copies of the forms can be distributed, and can also use social media to advertise. The impact can be \$76,000 for 1000 students.

Q&A Summary:

None.

Presentation by Jonathan Hyde for Catherine David of Residential Life concerning the Faculty-in Residence program

They built two apartments for faculty to live at in the residential community with students. They are looking for input for people interested in doing this. They are having a March 5th open house from 3 to 7 PM. Faculty will dine with students in dining halls, participate in workshops with students and there will be programs and events. One opening will be in Lavelle Hall and the other in the residential college complex. The goals are to enhance the faculty presence and role modeling and to assist with engaging the students in social and cultural programs. These relationships have a lot of benefits to students. The web link is www.lsu.edu/fir. They are asking for a CV and recommendations from three people. There will be a panel reviewing applicants including rectors from halls, residential life coordinators and Bob Roley, Director of Faculty, in residential colleges. Applicants must be full-time faculty members for 6 years. Compensation includes an apartment, meal plan and opportunity to purchase parking outside complex.

Q&A Summary:

None.

Expert presentation by Professor Paul Sylvester of the University of Louisiana at Monroe on newly discovered inequities in state funding formula

ULM is suffering poorly in terms of funding and balancing the budget and they have done remarkable things in terms of getting by with less money, so other campuses are using them as a model on how to budget money more efficiently. They have done extremely well in terms of recruiting, graduating numbers, etc. They had green grade for three years in a row. They looked up information at the Board of Regents (BOR) and found inequities in the funding formula. The constitution requires equitable distribution of funds. The BOR uses this formula for funding each campus for operating money. The funding allocation does not work very well and there is inequity particularly when the legislature cuts across the board. Some programs need to be maintained or enhanced and other programs cut. The formula is designed to generate sufficient funding so a university can function effectively. The formula treats state funds and tuition as a single entity. The state legislature controls funding and formula and the tuition. They cut the state funding and tell universities to make up funds with your own money, but campuses cannot raise tuition. The formula is based on student credit hours. Not all programs cost the same for different majors. Liberal Arts is given a 1. Undergraduate engineering has a weight of 3. Graduate engineering is weighted at 6. Pharmacy students are weighted at 13 and the Pharmacy PhD is weighted 19. ULM has only 8000 students so it cannot raise much money if it raises tuition. ULM has a high percentage of high cost programs. ULM has the highest percentage of graduate students in their population, and the highest number of PhD students compared to undergraduates. LSU used to have the most high cost programs with ULM in second, but this past year ULM passed LSU in number of high cost programs. LSU costs \$475 million to run, but the budget is only \$439 million so short \$35 million to run it. To run ULM it costs \$95 million, but they have a deficit of \$21 million. They are claiming they are doing across the board budget cuts but based on the formula some are being over funded and some underfunded. Low cost program schools are funded at the 95 to 100%. The high cost program schools are underfunded with LSU and ULM in that category. The state funded 53% of the university operating costs. In the last 4 years the beginning of the year and mid year cuts bring the amount down to 32% based on the formula. The governor wants it down to 25%. Everyone is funded the same, but the costs are higher at some universities. UL-Lafayette and ULM are around 70% funded. Lost cost programs can make it up by tuition, but for high cost programs the state will always pay 32%. Tuition is constant no matter which major it is, but what stays the same is what you can get for tuition so the total costs are not covered. At ULM, pharmacy has been allowed to raise their tuition more than other ULM programs. Pharmacy is being funded at 53% of the costs. The schools that are most productive according to the LAGRAD Act are being hammered the most due to high cost programs. ULM restricted funds have been used to operate the university to cover the gap in funding. They only have \$16 million in restricted funds of which ULM used \$9.9 million. UL-Lafayette has the largest restricted fund account, \$60 million, but this last year they used \$16 million to cover the gap there. How can we cut the budget at a university? We cut programs, faculty, students choices and then enrollment declines. They land up cutting supportive infrastructure and then you lose experienced faculty, this decreases state generated funds due to failure to meet LAGRAD Act, then you use restricted funds and then it leads to financial exigency. There will be domino effect of exigency. Across the board cuts are a chicken way of doing things. They are not shutting down universities to cover others.

Q&A Summary:

William Stickle

Have you looked at administrative costs to running a university?

Paul Sylvester

At ULM they have cut everything. Over 60% of budget is personnel related, so can only cut so much before personnel. Universities are coming to them to get ideas on how to be more efficient.

William Stickle

If the administrative budget has increased but the faculty budget has not, you have to look beyond.

Larry Crumbley

What do you suggest?

Paul Sylvester

Paul asked the ULL System President if she was going to continue dismantling the universities as the governor minion? Her response was you have to do more with less, this is the new normal, quit whining. We have to have control over at least tuition. At a previous university freshman and sophomores paid less for tuition than Juniors and Seniors. At ULM they would have to raise tuition 102% to meet declines in funding. Making some adjustments would help deal with some of the budget. The legislators are scared of the governor and universities are taking the brunt of this. Paul has been meeting with his legislators about issue and the economic impact. ULM is the biggest employer in the city. Legislators are blindly following the governor.

Judith Sylvester

How do they decide the value of a course and ranking as a 1, etc.? Is it based on information the university provides?

Paul Sylvester

It's on the BOR website and it's based on a mathematical formula based on the cost of running a program.

Update on the recent history of Faculty Senate Resolution 11-21 from John Andrew Nyman

In October 2011 coverage of graduate students tuition on grants became required and would charge existing accounts also not just new ones. In Nov 2011 Faculty Senate passed a resolution to remove current accounts from being charged. This pass November 2012, he was looking at his ledgers and on one account they were charging tuition and insurance. Four other people he asked are having the same problem. Dr. Klei is looking at this issue. Nyman encourages people to look at old accounts from before July 1 2012 to see if they are taking money out. Contact John Nyman if you have any information.

Q&A Summary:

None.

Presentation by Registrar Robert Doolos and Associate Registrar Patti Beste regarding the new LSU online catalogue

They found a vendor to provide the presence that LSU should have. They worked with Herb Vincent and his group to find the software to use. The current catalogue is now on the web. Patti Beste demonstrated the online catalogue. Everything is searchable. They will be using the system to make changes electronically for departments and colleges. There can be videos and links on it. The new one will be out soon, April 3. They now have a phone application for smart phones. M.catalogue. lsu.edu, click on 2012-2013 general catalogue, click on LSU icon and add to screen. Students are already using it a lot. It would help for advising purposes also. Starting with the Spring Invitational they will only have the web and phone versions. It is an actual application

Q&A Summary:

Senator

Is there an actual application for the phone?

Patti Beste

We will send an email to everyone on how to add it to the phones.

Senator

How many years of catalogs do you have?

Patti Beste

They always keep ten years online and previous ones will stay as pdfs. They will not print anymore catalogues. They will print a guide to majors with outlines for incoming students. Robert says there are links to everything and that you can see the course descriptions if you click on the course.

Old Business

Second and final reading, Resolution 13-01, "Adopting a University Policy for Retention and Recruitment of Dual Career Faculty Members", Introduced at the Request of Andrew Schwarz

Read by Andrew Schwarz

Faculty Senate Resolution 13-01

"Adopting a University Protocol for the Retention and Recruitment of Dual Career Faculty Members"

Sponsored by Andrew Schwarz

Whereas the percentage of individuals seeking faculty positions who are part of a dual-career academic couples is significant (35-40%) and is increasing at a rapid rate

Whereas over half of research institutions in the U.S. already have programs in place for the retention and recruitment of dual career faculty members²

Whereas few SEC schools have a formal protocol for the retention and recruitment of dual-career academic couples²

Whereas, without a protocol LSU is at a competitive disadvantage in the retention and recruitment of such faculty^{3, 4}

Whereas the adoption of a protocol would enable LSU to increase the retention and recruitment of top candidates, including those from underrepresented minorities^{3, 4}

Whereas the achievement of the Flagship 2020 Agenda depends on the retention and recruitment of outstanding university professionals⁵ and the failure to adopt a protocol will hinder the retention and recruitment of top faculty

Whereas the availability of employment for a spouse or partner becomes a major determinant in the decision to remain (in the case of retention) or join (in the case of recruitment) LSU

Whereas the failure in adopting this protocol by the administration represents a critical threat to the retention of top faculty at LSU

Therefore be it resolved that the university fully and immediately adopt a Dual Career Opportunity Program for the retention for all affected current faculty that is consistent with PS-36 (hiring of candidates on merit), PS-25 (Nepotism), and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) principles *and*

be it resolved that the university ensure equity is guaranteed for all current faculty affected by this protocol *and be it resolved* that the university fully and immediately adopt a Dual Career Opportunity Program for future hiring decisions that is consistent with PS-36 (hiring of candidates on merit), PS-25 (Nepotism), and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) principles.

References

1. Lisa Wolf-Wendel, Susan B. Twombly, and Suzanne Rice, *The Two-body problem: Dual-Career-Couple Hiring Policies in Higher Education* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), p. 2. See also Marianne A. Ferber and Jane W. Loeb, eds., *Academic Couples: Problems and Promises* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997).
2. LSU University Council on Women White Paper
3. From a recruitment perspective, a recent study found that, within the sciences, 62% of married women with science Ph.D.s were married to fellow science Ph.D.s [Proposal for Recruiting and Retaining Dual-Career Couples The Earth Institute ADVANCE Working Group on Science & Technology Recruiting to Increase Diversity (STRIDE)* October 7, 2005 – numbers from a study, Sonnert, G. and G. Holton, (1995), *Who Succeeds in Science? The Gender Dimension* (Rutgers University Press)].
4. From a retention perspective, 83% of HR directors cite the increase in dual careers as the primary employment concern facing their university (Wolf-Wendel et al, p 5).
5. Flagship 2020 goal 3a states that a strategic goal of the university is to increase the number of tenure-track faculty by race and gender

Andrew Schwarz and others comments

Case studies have been given in the packet, including a loss of faculty due to spouse not being hired, another example was the hiring of a faculty and the spouse. This was covered in a group of policies. This policy was dropped through the cracks. They want faculty senate to support the general guidelines. They do not want to dictate the hiring of a particular person. People say they cannot do this, that their hands are tied. The policy would provide a system for trying to hire spouse of a person hired. Several faculty were lost to other universities. Mirabel Dietz was chair of the subcommittee on this policy. It is not only a retention but a recruiting issue. Many ads state that they have a dual career policy. Dual career hiring is done ad hoc at LSU, but if we have a written clear policy it will become far more open and transparent. It was originally written in 2008 or 2009, but now the AAUP says there has to be a written statement about dual hiring and how it will work. If you are interviewing you do not know when to bring this up. Some people have already inquired to find out about the policy since they are thinking of taking a job here. Susan Pulaski in Schwarz's department, ISDS in College of Business spoke about experience in a different environment, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. As a hiring manager she was hired in as a computer scientist. At the lab they had a policy similar to what is being proposed today. It allowed her to recruit the best, find the stars to get them to consider coming to interview. It was a carrot to bring the best into their company. You may be concerned that standards be lowered, the opposite is true. Tim Slack, Associate Professor, whose wife is Tracy Risuto, Associate Professor in Human Development. She was originally interviewed and offered a position and she made it clear her husband's career was an important factor. He interviewed in two weeks and he had an offer after a week. They came to LSU because they had a joint offer. They have taught nearly 7000 students combined and generated nearly \$9 million in grants. He was honored with the Rain Maker award since he has been here. If LSU had only hired one or the other, then they would have gotten none of it since they would not have come. They also had an offer at another peer institution and offered her a Research Assistant Professorship without tenure track, so that is why they came here. It has also played a roll in retaining them here. During this time they both had opportunities to leave and both stayed due to tenure track appointments and career opportunities here. The political budget context doesn't allow LSU to offer the best salaries, benefits and resources, so moving in this direction can help LSU be competitive. Many people couple in graduate school so this policy could give us a competitive advantage.

Q&A Summary:

Guillermo Ferrara

He is current interim Dean of College of Science. We want to retain faculty at LSU. It is a very important issue. There are five cases of dual issues on his table. He is against the one particular sentence in the protocol. Step number 2 that gives preference of the partner as a preferred candidate. Faculty are hired by PS-36 and all faculty approve the hire, based on the merits of the case. The fact that these cases appear at the dean is to make a case for a dual hire. One case is that someone's spouse has expertise in polish language so this step indicates that a new position must be made to hire this person.

Andrew Schwarz

This is not to overreach who you are to hire, this is not suggesting this. This about the broad strategies of the policy.

Maribel Dietz

The language was never intended to say you must prefer this person. That language was not there before. The hiring and retention was together before. It has been through many revisions. We need something in writing.

Vince LiCata

The same exact issue was brought up last time.

William Stickle

I make a motion to change Step 2 of the protocol to “that gives consideration to the relocating partner as a candidate”.

Friendly amendment motion moved into debate.

Motion to have University Council on Women make this change in the protocol.

One abstention. Passed but not unanimously.

Senator

Is there an EEOP issue?

Maribel Dietz

There is not an EEOP issue for hiring. Some people have used this to help diversify the faculty. The study in Stanford covered this issue. Most other research universities are doing this without a problem.

Speaker

LSU is already doing this. We should look at this regardless of level and make it open and transparent.

Kerry Dooley

Related to the first whereas on second page, I do not see a funding mechanism in the protocol. It’s hard to interpret PS-36 and PS-25, so wants someone to verify that this is similar to these policies.

Maribel Dietz

They were asked to remove the funding issue from the protocol at first.

Senator

Would you consider deleting “includes a funding mechanism”?

Motion to move into debate.

Unanimously approved.

Rosemary Peters

In the hiring part or protocol step 2, what is in place to address questions about partners? Can this be done after the hire?

Andrew Schwarz

The second part is covered by the retention protocol.

Maribel Dietz

Information is included in the advertisement for the position. The second step would be talking to other departments.

Rosemary Peters

This implies that someone would have to accept before talking about the spouse.

Maribel Dietz

The problem is some people do not bring up because they are concerned they will not be a candidate at all.

The point person can say there is potential secondary spouse to hire so they can get the ball rolling to find another department.

William Stickle

Will the committee know about this ahead of time before they hire?

Graham Bodie

You cannot make a policy to require that someone divulge information.

Rosemary Peters

There is noting in the protocol to cover this issue.

Charles Delzell

A handout was provided with definitions of nepotism and examples of websites at other universities covering duel career hires. Preference on a family basis is considered nepotism. PS-25 for nepotism at LSU was mentioned. We recruit persons on the basis of merit. The spouse must be qualified. The issue is not whether we should hire spouses, but we should be voting on the protocol and what it says. In January there was a white paper from the council of women of 25 websites about policies in regards to hiring and that we should give preference to the spouse. None of these other websites say the spouse should be given preference. Ohio University has a Duel Career Network. A book called the Two Body Problem was mentioned and as excerpt read.

Stephanie Braunstein

The problem is in the protocol and the last clause, but someone pointed out that it's not part of the resolution. Revise the protocol and bring the whole thing back later.

Andrew Schwarz

This policy covers nepotism. To not understand people in that situation now is not good. The Stanford study is 110 pages long.

Maribel Dietz

The language was never supposed to be preference, so that will be taken out. They were trying to do what other universities are doing. It is already happening on an ad hoc basis. Having a policy makes this fair overall. Schools with written policies create awareness and if everything is out in the open it makes everything clear. If it's in a single college it is easier. One problem if is it's over different colleges. The subcommittee read material from different policies and debated policies with input from HRM and Academic Affairs.

Ken McMillin

The major point of discussion is, is this body going to approve a protocol which another body needs to change?

Suresh Rai

I agree with Ken. If one person gets tenure will that mean another person gets tenure too?

Andrew Schwarz

No there is not anything to cover this issue, it is silent.

William Stickle

The resolution is out of line by procedures that are not included in the protocol. Motion to table so that there may be further consultation so that all protocol statements and the resolution will be in alignment.

Larry Crumbley

The protocol should be part of the resolution.

Kevin Cope

Motion to table.

Vote: Approved with 4 opposed, 3 abstentions.

New Business

First Reading of Resolution 13-03, "Defacement of Library Holdings: Education and Remedy", Sponsored by Stephanie Braunstein, David Lindenfeld and Elissa Plank.

Delayed until next month.

First Reading, Resolution 13-04, “Public Disclosure, the Presidential Search and Informed Debate” Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Read by Kevin Cope

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 13–04

**Public Disclosure, the
Presidential Search, and
Informed Debate**

*Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with the Endorsement of the LSU System
Council of Faculty Advisors*

Whereas universities are institutions where information is freely disseminated and where open and energetic debate is encouraged;

Whereas state law, in recognition of the centrality of information to a democratic society requires the disclosure of the identity of candidates for positions of authority in state agencies (Louisiana Revised Statute 44:32);

Whereas the LSU System Board of Supervisors violated state laws relating to the calling of executive sessions [see Louisiana Revised Statute 42:6.1A4] by including a student who was not yet appointed to the presidential search in putatively confidential discussions of particular candidates and their qualifications;

Whereas the American Association of University Professors (“AAUP”) has recently issued a statement of principles concerning executive searches that condemns the imposition of secrecy oaths on search committee members and that criticizes the cult of secrecy that surrounds many presidential searches;

Whereas a prominent newspaper, the Baton Rouge *Advocate*, has filed a formal request for information concerning presidential candidates, only to be rebuffed by the LSU System interim General Counsel on the grounds that the requested information is “private” and “proprietary”;

Whereas the aforementioned newspaper, through objective news coverage and ardent editorials, has supported Louisiana higher education in the face of budgetary and political challenges;

Whereas the record of LSU and the LSU System regarding surreptitious executive searches has contributed to constant administrative turnover, with few appointees remaining in office for more than four years;

Whereas great public institutions such as the University of Wisconsin and many other highly-ranked campuses require advance disclosure of multiple candidates for university leadership positions, and that with no impairment of their ability to recruit able presidents;

Whereas the LSU System Board of Supervisors has refused to appoint faculty members who are not administrators to the Presidential Search Committee despite frequent, ardent, repeated, and unanimous encouragement to do so by all the Faculty Senates of the LSU System;

Whereas the LSU System Board of Supervisors has added a student member to the Presidential Search Committee while refusing to include faculty and staff members;

Whereas the characterization by the professional search consultant of his list of candidates as “proprietary” and therefore secret raises a variety of questions about the character of the search, questions pertaining to the propriety of using Foundation funds to support this search or pertaining to a possible violation of “sunshine” laws or pertaining to whether the proprietary list is adequately diverse or pertaining to whether all citizens have an equal opportunity to join the proprietary candidate list;

Whereas the search consultant for the presidential search has repeatedly urged the search committee to bring only one candidate to campus, thereby disallowing comparisons among seekers after one of the most important leadership posts in Louisiana;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate recommends and expects that the LSU Board of Supervisors immediately disclose full and complete demographic and statistical information concerning the current candidate pool for the combined Presidency and Chancellorship, including age, geographic location, vocational background, level of education, ethnicity, gender, income, and similar information, including information regarding whether or not candidates hold earned terminal degrees; and

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate recommends and expects that the Presidential Search Committee comply with the public information request of the Baton Rouge *Advocate* by disclosing the names of and key information concerning the candidates for the LSU and LSU System Presidency.

Motion and second to move into debate.

Unanimously approved.

Charles Delzell

Add terminal degree qualification item to list in the first Therefore.

Unanimously approved as friendly amendment.

Stephanie Braunstein

Why is income included?

Kevin Cope

Qualification and income bracket may be correlated.

Jeff Davis

Can we legally include gender or ethnicity?

Kevin Cope

We cannot require a person to provide information but once known they can be included in information.

Stephanie Braunstein

We are asking for groups of information, not specifics about individuals.

Kevin Cope

This would be for the whole pool.

Judith Sylvester

We can say 'for the current candidate pool', which was the original intent.

Kevin accepts it as a friendly amendment.

Unanimously approved.

Vince LiCata

In the middle of second page instead of 'has resulted in' change it to 'has contributed to'.

Unanimously approved.

Carol Taylor

As to question of income, is that an indicator, that if we look at someone with a higher salary would we have to meet or better that?

Kevin Cope

These correlations are largely superstitious.

Gundela Hachmann

Does the BOS have to comply with our request?

Kevin Cope

No they do not. It could be argued that Faculty Senates are completely useless and should be dissolved. The BOS has made some changes already, the schedule has been extended. We have vestigial reputation as faculty members. We have the regular breakfast with the supervisors. This is a method like cultural change that does not change quickly. Kevin was called to come up with a leadership profile, with some parts are missing but other information remained. The newspaper has relentlessly supported the university and has remained silent when the university through a semi-retired counsel refuses to provide any information is just plain wrong.

Suresh Rai

Are you working as the spokesperson for The Advocate in the last Therefore?

Kevin Cope

I understand the difficulty with extracting information. It behooves all Faculty senates everywhere that hiding information is not a good thing. We have a school of journalism too so we are collaborative with newspapers.

Mandi Lopez

Change to ‘Whereas it is standard practice among peer universities’?

Kevin Cope

I am reluctant to remove the specific example. Can you present it as a motion, not opposed? Can put ‘and many other peer institutions’.

Unanimously approved.

Bill Daly

The faculty are more in a position to be advisory to the BOS and feel that the ‘requires’ term be replaced by the word ‘recommends’ and in second paragraph ‘further recommends’, so we are not antagonistic to the BOS.

Vince LiCata

Motion to suspend rules and vote now.

Unanimously approved to suspend rules.

Final vote on resolution: Unanimously approved.

First Reading, Resolution 13-05, “The Rights of Academic Librarians to Express their Professional Opinions”. Sponsored by Stephanie Braunstein and Elaine Smyth

Read by Stephanie Braunstein.

LSU FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 13-05

TO SUPPORT THE RIGHTS OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS DALE ASKEY AND JEFFREY BEALL TO EXPRESS THEIR PROFESSIONAL OPINIONS

Sponsored by Stephanie Braunstein, LSU Libraries Faculty Senator and Elaine Smyth, LSU Libraries Assistant Dean

Whereas the mission of Louisiana State University is the generation, preservation, dissemination, and application of knowledge and cultivation of the arts, and

Whereas academic freedom is essential to the pursuit of that mission, and

Whereas the faculty of Louisiana State University are therefore strongly opposed to all efforts to censor discussion of research or scholarship and to intimidate individuals or institutions to prevent them from engaging in such discussion, and

Whereas the law suits brought by Edwin Mellen Press against librarian Dale Askey and McMaster University, his employer, threatening them with millions of dollars in liability due to Mr. Askey’s negative professional assessment of the merits of Edwin Mellen Press publications can only have a chilling effect upon the academic freedom of librarians and other faculty to express their professional opinions, and

Whereas the threat of legal action being levied by publishers doing business as the Canadian Center for Science and Education (CCSE) against Jeffrey Beall, Associate Professor and Scholarly Initiatives Librarian at the University of Colorado Denver, for Beall's inclusion of CCSE in blog postings that list publishers he considers as being "predatory" due to some of their business practices can have a similar chilling effect, and

Whereas one of the essential responsibilities of an academic librarian is to assess the merits of academic publishers and publications and to share those assessments with scholars, researchers, instructors and other colleagues;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Louisiana State University Faculty Senate asserts its support for the rights of both Mr. Askey and Mr. Beall to offer their professional opinions of the products and business practices of academic publishers as is appropriate to the benefit of the academic professions, and

Be it further resolved that when Stephanie Braunstein, American Library Association (ALA) Councilor representing Louisiana, works with ALA Council and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), a division of ALA, to bring national attention to these issues concerning academic freedom, she will name LSU's Faculty Senate as a supporter [*pro hac vice*] of librarians' rights of expression.

Moved and seconded to move into discussion.

Unanimously approved.

Q&A Summary:

Dale Askey wrote on his personal website blog about Edwin Melon Press and how it was 'second class scholarship'. Other information was provided in handouts.

Charles Delzell

What is the other side of the story? Do they have a right to sue for libel?

Judith Sylvester

The reason it was filed in Canada and not the USA is due to the first amendment here.

Richard Bengsten

Canada does not have a first amendment and no right to free speech.

Vince LiCata

I am questioning why this should be a resolution and not just a petition.

Stephanie Braunstein

I am basing it more on support for two particular people in the world in which we all work.

Charles Delzell moved to adjourn and it was seconded by Judith Sylvester

Adjourned at 5:34 PM