

**LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**3:00 P.M., Monday, March 15, 2010**  
**Student Senate Room, LSU Union**  
**Attendance**



*Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (Senate President, English)      | 2. Andrew Christie (Member-at-Large, Accounting) |
| 3. William Daly (Past-President, Chemistry)       | 4. Renée Casbergue (Secretary, Education)        |
| 5. Ken McMillin (Member-at-Large, Animal Science) | 6. Pratul Ajmera (Vice President, Engineering)   |

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

*Senators present:*

1. Fred Aghazadeh	2. John Battista	3. Mary Catherine Aime	4. Gabriel Beavers
5. Jennifer Curry	6. Charles Delzell	7. Josh Detre	8. Susan Dumais
9. Bruce Eilts	10. Joseph Francis	11. Juhan Frank	12. Craig Freeman
13. Steven Gaunt	14. Wanda Hargroder	15. Dominique Homberger	16. Lisa Johnson
17. Jennifer Jolly	18. Boryung Ju	19. P. Lynn Kennedy	20. Jeremy King
21. Jeff Kuehny	22. Ed Laws	23. Joseph Legoria	24. Michael Leitner
25. Mandy Lopez	26. Kevin McCarter	27. Alison McFarland	28. Patrick McGee
29. Rebecca Owens	30. Erwin Poliakoff	31. Lawrence Rouse	32. Michael Russo
33. Joseph Siebenaller	34. Edward Song	35. George Stanley	36. Dianne Taylor
37. Jeffrey Tiger	38. Muhammad Wahab	39. Justin Walsh	40. Paul Wilson
41. Yi-jun Xu			

*Replacements for absent Senators:*

Justin Walsh for Kristi Dykema	Jeremy King for Kristopher Fletcher
Rick Holden for John Fletcher	Will Hires for Paul Hrycaj
Erwin Poliakoff for Richard Kurtz	Erwin Poliakoff for Kresimir Rupnik
Warren Waggenpack for Kelly Ann Rusch	Robert Perlis for Dottue Vaughn
Daphne Cain for Priscilla Allen	Jeremy King for Sue Weinstein

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

Linda Allen (1)	Brittan Barker (7)	Michael Krom (7)	Michael Bowman (2)
Kathleen Bratton (4)	Kristi Dykema (2)	Andrea Houston (3)	Wes Harrison (1)
Kevin McCarter (1)	Heather McKillop (3)	Evelyn Orman (2)	John Protevi (2)
Steve Ross (2)	Phillip Tebbutt (3)	Cristina Sabliov (1)	Richard White (5)
Fred Sheldon (1)	Gail Sutherland (1)	Ed Watson (1)	

*Guests Attending Meeting:*

Gregory Molchan	Robert Doolos	Casey Kayser
David Constant	Stacia Haynie	Sherri Thompson
Jacob Most	Andy Nyman	

**Consideration of the Minutes from February 2010**

Motion to accept minutes (Freeman; Delzell second) - Passed unanimously.

## President's Report

### *LSU-BR News:*

- George Stanley is investigating and corresponding with the graduate school regarding rules governing English language proficiency for instructors and GAs. He will approach Associate Dean Richardson with suggestions for streamlining the language proficiency approval process.
- The Chancellor has sent out a missive regarding budget issues and will continue to do so as the situation warrants. The FSEC has sent forward its streamlining report again to the Chancellor and Provost.
- Gary Graham is working with the FSEC to develop a plan for departments to purchase vouchers for those making brief visits on short notice (dropping in on faculty at their offices, etc.) and a system for notifying Easy Streets gate attendants.
- University College has undergone a "metamorphosis" under the direction of Stacie Haynie. A group will be named to help implement / investigate ongoing strategies for continued growth.
- New language will be introduced to PS-1 (governing interim appointments) that will add more order to the procedures for such appointments. This is a major step forward for faculty governance. Thanks to Pratul Ajmera and Chuck Wilson for their work on this.
- Alternative language suggested by Kevin Cope for PS-111 is under consideration by Provost Merget. Care is being taken regarding legal disclosure concerns with regard to personnel issues etc.
- Congratulations to Stacia Haynie for steering the 5 Year interim report to SACS. The Quality Enhancement Plan was completed with thanks to Stacia and Gil Reeves.
- Easy Streets 2 is now being vetted. The draft in process will be published in the next Faculty Senate Website. It includes attempts to maximize street parking, traffic flow, pedestrian safety, and beautification of the campus.
- Chancellor Martin is considering lifestyle issues on campus.
- "Change, Focus, and Autonomy" are the focus of the Chancellor's agenda to release the LSU flagship campus from the current level of state control.

### *System News:*

- The EBR public works department will reroute the sewer system to address ongoing problems (especially along Nicholson), and will cover the \$4 million cost for doing so.
- The system has settled a lawsuit with Bernard Contractors for cogeneration of power, costing LSU \$9.6 million.

### *State News:*

- Kevin spoke at Southern University and found that faculty to be actively supporting the actions of our senate, particularly with regard to ORP issues.
- Bradley Wood (Philosophy) is working in support of state identified "low completer" programs.
- The Statewide Articulation and Transfer Council has formally accepted proposals for the first 39 hours of a portable 60-hour two-year degree. It closely mirrors LSU requirements and explicitly names some LSU courses as worthy of preservation. The remaining 21 hours are still being debated, with some LSU concerns regarding controls for academic rigor. One model being debated (preferred by LSU) is to have students enter with junior status - but no guarantee of admission to particular programs or majors. The second option is to have students automatically admitted to majors based on the concentrations they pursue in that 21 hours. This should be decided by May 22.
- Issues regarding benefits packages are being discussed across multiple campuses and with the Board of Supervisors. Carolyn Hargrave is working hard on this and is staying in touch with faculty senate representatives.
- The Board of Regents is working on statewide admission standards and will have a new draft circulating soon. The LSU faculty maintains that this is faculty prerogative.
- A forum featuring both LSU and Louisiana Tech chancellors will be held on April 15 and will focus on the future of research institutions. This is designed to help institutions with common research goals. Cooperative undertakings will be explored.
- The Louisiana Faculty Senates Association will meet on the LSU campus in April.

## Special Announcement

The FSEC quest for information related to admissions and other issues raised by faculty regarding the Lab School have thus far been rebuffed, but will be addressed shortly. A delegation of FSEC and other faculty senate members will meet with Wade Smith at the Lab School in the next two weeks. Discussion will move forward after that.

Discussion Summary:

Russo: What are the admissions issues?

Cope: One is the representation of faculty children among the admissions class. Should the number be expanded? Stay the same? There are also issues related to curriculum, especially at the upper levels.

Laws: Is there a written policy regarding admissions?

Cope: On the lab school website - 15-20 qualifications are listed. There is a review by an admissions committee. It is not clear what the legal standing of the policy is.

## Presentation by Chief Information Officer Brian Voss concerning a proposal for a new IT governance policy

Background: A taskforce was established to suggest changes to the IT governance structure. Those suggestions now need to be formalized. The proposed structure incorporates decision-making structures that already exist. The focus of today's presentation is on a new Faculty IT Advisory Council. The goal is to mesh with faculty senate governance structures to avoid disconnects that have existed in the past (as, for example, when MDAC acts outside of faculty governance). The recommendation is that the senate name chairs and suggest people to fill committees from multiple constituencies. (See Attachment A for an overview of proposed governance structure.)

Poliakov: Should MDAC be a subcommittee of Teaching and Learning?

Voss: Yes - that's what I attempted to show in the graphic.

Wilson: How will disagreements among committees and units be handled?

Voss: This will be advisory to me. I have to make some decisions. If there are issues / conflicts among groups, that is the purpose of getting advice from the broader group.

Cope: Thanks to Brian for facilitating ongoing work and significant achievements thus far.

**First Reading of Resolution 10:08** (Read by Andrew Christie)

## Faculty Senate Resolution 10-08

“Establishment of an IT Governance Model”

*Introduced at the recommendation of Chief Information Officer Brian Voss*

*Whereas* information technology is an essential component of LSU's National Flagship Agenda and the Flagship IT Strategy (FITS) was created through the leadership of the LSU campus community, including faculty; and  
*Whereas* the Flagship Information Technology Strategy (FITS) was fully supported by LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 06-11; and  
*Whereas* the implementation of the FITS Recommendation 10, Action Item 1 calls for the establishment of a formal IT governance model; and  
*Whereas* the existence of a formal IT Governance model is a critical component of further strategic advance of IT at LSU and also its ongoing operational activities, which are of importance to the faculty (and students and staff) of LSU;

*Therefore be it resolved* that the LSU Faculty Senate endorses the establishment and maintenance of a formal IT Governance Model as proposed by the Vice Chancellor of Information Technology & Chief Information Officer in March 2010, and will actively engage in leadership and participation in the governance of the deployment and operation of information technology infrastructure and services at LSU in line with that model.

Move to debate (Stanley; second Rouse)

Discussion:

Rouse: Who will appoint people to committees?

Voss: Chairs will be appointed by the senate, then work with the senate to appoint members. I envision this as a collaborative process.

Cope: A mechanism to have representation across units is needed.

Xu: Faculty senate committees already exist that address these issues. How will this be integrated?

Voss: Historically there has been an IT committee. I would like to fold this into that and work among committees as always.

Cope: How often will they meet?

Voss: much like FITS process - an organizational meeting with IT staff to update faculty, then twice a year or as needed. For example, the change to Moodle required significant effort with many meetings; electronic mail issues are looming that will require faculty input.) In general, this should not be an onerous load (on committee members).

Christie: I agree. This will probably require intensive meetings for a brief period, then only sporadic meetings.

Ajmera: What about analysis of costs for distance learning?

Voss: The level of online education envisioned is not currently supported with the platform available. We need video capture, storage, streaming, and human support for faculty who want to do this. We're not yet well positioned to do that. We plan to look at companies that offer this support. Later, we'll see if we can do it alone more efficiently and economically. The "Adobe Connect" contract will help.

Stanley: Please post the graphic as an addendum to the resolution. (Posted as Attachment A)

### Old Business

(Minutes recorded in person by George Stanley and from video by Renee Casbergue from this point forward. Sincere gratitude to George!)

*Second Reading by Andy Nyman*

### Faculty Senate Resolution 10-03

“Replacing the Current System of Appointments with a New System of Elections for Members of the Graduate Council”

*Proposed by Associate Professor John Andrew Nyman*

*Sponsored by Senator Y. Jun Xu*

Whereas the Faculty Senate is a major institutional component of shared governance at LSU and is charged to establish curricula, fix standards of instruction, determine requirements for degrees, and generally determine educational policy for the University, subject to the authority of the Board of Supervisors;

Whereas PS-45 states that “All actions involving graduate degree programs are considered by the LSU Graduate Council. All actions involving individual courses or undergraduate degree programs are considered by the Courses and Curricula Committee of the LSU Faculty Senate, after consideration by the relevant College or School level committee

Whereas the LSU Faculty Senate is an elected body and thus academic policies regarding undergraduate education are developed in a manner compatible with principles of shared-governance;

Whereas policy regarding the Graduate Council at LSU states that “The Graduate Council is composed of faculty who consider policy matters related to the Graduate School and advise the Dean of the Graduate School in the administration of academic affairs and polices of the Graduate School. To provide membership representing the breadth of disciplines on the LSU campus, the Graduate Council shall consist of one member from each College or School overseen by a dean and that offers a graduate program of study at LSU, and three additional members appointed at large. Members will be graduate faculty with outstanding records of scholarly and creative activities, who do not currently hold administrative positions. The overall membership of the Council will represent the diversity of faculty and students. The Dean of each College or School will nominate at least two but not more than three graduate faculty members from the unit, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will also be asked to submit up to three nominees for each position. Appointments for the College and School positions selected from these nominations will be made by the Graduate Dean with the concurrence of the Provost. Members at large will be appointed by the Graduate Dean with the concurrence of the Provost. Members will serve a term of five years, with membership end dates staggered to provide for continuity of the Council Activities;”

Whereas the Graduate Council is appointed by the Chancellor and thus academic policies regarding graduate degree programs

are developed in a manner incompatible with principles of shared-governance

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the election of all members, other than ex officio members, of the Graduate Council and reaffirms its commitment to and responsibility for shared governance in establishing curricula, fixing standards of instruction, and determining requirements for graduate degree programs;

Therefore be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the following policy be sent forward to the LSU System as policy regarding the Graduate Council on the LSU campus

#### Graduate Council Membership

The Graduate Council is composed of faculty who consider policy matters related to the Graduate School and who advise the Dean of the Graduate School in the administration of academic affairs and policies of the Graduate School. To provide membership representing the breadth of disciplines on the LSU campus, the Graduate Council shall consist of one member from each College or School overseen by a dean and that offers a graduate program of study at LSU, and three additional members appointed at large. Each College or School overseen by a dean and that offers a graduate program of study at LSU are represented on the Graduate Council such that units that award less than 9% of graduate degrees are allocated one member on the Graduate Council whereas units that award more than 9% of the graduate degrees are allocated two members on the Graduate Council. Allocations will be recalculated each decade; allocations for 2010 through 2019 are based on degrees awarded from 1999-2000 through 2008-2009 as reported by the LSU Office of Budget and Planning. Members will be graduate faculty with outstanding records of scholarly and creative activities, who do not currently hold administrative positions, who are full Professors, and who are full Members of the Graduate Faculty. The overall membership of the Council will represent the diversity of faculty and students. The Dean of each College or School will nominate at least two but not more than three graduate faculty members from the unit, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will also be asked to submit up to three nominees for each position. Appointments for the College and School positions selected from these nominations will be made by the Graduate Dean with the concurrence of the Provost. Members at large will be appointed by the Graduate Dean with the concurrence of the Provost. Members will serve a term of five years, with membership end dates staggered to provide for continuity of the Council Activities. The Graduate School will hold elections within each College or School as needed to fill positions; all Graduate Faculty within those Colleges or Schools are eligible to nominate and vote. Members of the Graduate Council will elect from themselves a Chair who will serve a one-year term. The Dean of the Graduate School and the Associate Dean of the Graduate School are ex officio members with the same rights as other members except that they may not serve as chair of the Graduate Council or chair of subcommittees of the Graduate Council.

Allocating the members of the Graduate Council among the colleges and schools overseen by a dean and that offer a graduate program of study in a manner that represents the diversity of faculty and students.

Unit	Depts.	M.S. programs	Ph.D. programs	M.S. <sup>a</sup> degrees	Ph.D. degrees	total <sup>b</sup> degrees	% of degrees	membership allocation
Ourso College of Business Administration	3	5	62	521	157	2678	18.2	2
College of Arts and Sciences	11	17	11	1503	911	2414	16.4	2
College of Education	2	3	3	1458	354	1812	12.3	2
College of Engineering <sup>a</sup>	6	7	6	1147	382	1529	10.4	2
College of Agriculture <sup>a</sup>	12	15	11	983	527	1510	10.3	2
College of Basic Sciences	7	9	7	778	643	1421	9.7	2
School of Social Work	1	1	1	995	20	1015	6.9	1
School of Library and Information Science	1	1		717		717	4.9	1
School of Music and Dramatic Arts	2	2	3	377	210	587	4.0	1
School of Art and Design	3	4		387		387	2.6	1
School of the Coast and Environment	2	2	1	226	93	319	2.2	1
Manship School of Mass Communication	1	1	1	151	20	171	1.2	1
School of Veterinary Medicine	3	3	3	68	97	165	1.1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>11,349</b>	<b>3,414</b>	<b>14,763</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>19</b>

<sup>a</sup> These data were not adjusted to reflect that M.S. degrees with a major in Biological and Agricultural Engineering are awarded by the College of Agriculture but are reported by the Office of Planning and Budget as in the College of Engineering.

<sup>b</sup> The number of graduate degrees were determined from data available on the website of the LSU Office of Budget and Planning for the years 1999-2000 through 2008-2009. These numbers were modified to remove degrees credited to the Graduate School, which is a practice that ended in 2000-2001.

## Discussion Summary:

Cope: If there are no objections, I'd like to ask Dean Constant to offer his comments and then begin debate.

Dean David Constant: While I may not agree with the basis of the resolution or the basis of the division of the membership, we welcome shared faculty governance. My concern is whether this will provide better guidance for the graduate school and an improved system for improvements to graduate programs and curricula. That's what is key to me and how we go about doing that is up to you to debate.

Cope: This is the second reading of this resolution, and the floor is now open for debate, comments, what have you.

Pratul: Why five years? Why not three years? What's the advantage of five years? It seems like an awfully long time...

Nyman: We picked that to fit the current term of the graduate council. It maintains the status quo - not too many elections or turnover.

Pratul: How do members serve their terms now?

Constant: They are staggered right now in five year blocks, so you see anywhere from two to four rolling off each year.

Owens: What is the advantage of an elected system over the appointed system? Are the criteria for election the same as for appointment? And if so, what is the advantage of this system over the current system?

Nyman: The advantage of elected is just the principle of shared governance, having us involved more directly. Regarding qualifications, in the petition we formalize the apparently informal requirement - the existing policy doesn't specify that faculty need to be full members of the graduate faculty. This resolution goes ahead and puts it in the code.

Constant: They are full members, but they could be associate members who are full professors - which can cause a bit of a problem. So that part about council members being full professors and full members of the graduate faculty is a good thing.

Owens: You (Dean Constant) seem to express reluctance to implement this new system. What about this plan is unacceptable to you?

Constant: Well, having been in the saddle about eight months or so, this significant change is bit of a perturbation to the system. The system we have now is not one of simply receiving nominations from the chairs and going over them a little bit with the provost or the chancellor to approve them. It's a lot more complex than that and requires a lot of study of the qualifications, of course, and the fit with the full council. (Gives example of the recent need to add a member from the Ag Center to balance A&M membership and get specialized input regarding Vet School / Ag Center issues.) I'm an engineer. If it ain't broke, don't fix it, and I don't see where it is broken at the moment.

Owens: Could the faculty senate have a little more input in the vetting system?

Constant: In the current structure, the faculty senate - specifically the FSEC - provides the dean with nominations. And I hope that's in the resolution if it passes. Does that still happen?

Nyland: No.

Constant: So we lose the faculty senate input if we go to an elected system. It would strictly be elected.

Owens: So the faculty senate does have some part in the vetting process?

Constant: Yes, in the current nomination process.

Cope: Under the current system, the general process is that Dean Constant tells me the general areas that need representation, and I consult to come up with recommendations. However, the recommendations I make are not appointments, they are recommendations.

Stanley: I'm strongly in favor of this election model. And to partially answer your question, I don't know the exact number, but probably for a good 18 years, Chemistry, which has the largest Ph.D. program on campus, did not have any representation on the Graduate Council. That's 18 consecutive years of no representation. And on many occasions when I went to the Graduate School with various issues, the graduate dean (in the past) would say, "Oh, the Graduate Council - let's take that to the Graduate Council. It's the Graduate Council that makes the rules." So they were pawning things off on the council, but it was an appointive thing. So I much prefer this elected system - assuming you can get people to run and serve.

Cope: Actually, if you remember, we did have trouble getting senate positions filled from the college of basic sciences. What is your perspective about whether people will run for election?

Stanley: I think most of us who have gone through this feel that the graduate programs are very important. We rely on graduate students for our research programs and I think there's a much more immediate connection with the graduate council than with the senate. This would be a way of keeping people much more in touch with the graduate council. And it will be no problem getting participation - certainly from Chemistry where a number of us are concerned about graduate issues. And I think that is true for a number of departments.

-----: One of the concerns over the years has been stratification. We have to wait four or five years for a chance to have representation. A three or four year term would help.

Ajmera: I agree - a four-year term would be better. I think a little rotation is good and lets more people know what the graduate council is doing - rather than just a few people from inside who serve long terms.

Stanley: I offer a friendly amendment to change five to four years. (Second by Delzell).

**VOTE on amendment: Passes unanimously.**

Perlis: Point of clarification. The proposed resolution requires full professor and full member of the graduate faculty who do not currently hold administrative positions for membership on the council. What if one becomes an administrator after election to the council?

Constant: Our practice has been, you're off the council.

Perlis: That should be clarified. Also, there are full members who get demoted. Are they therefore off the council?

Constant: Yes.

Perlis: I suggest that it might be helpful to have a few of those demoted people on the council.

Constant: If they are not full members, they can't serve unless we go back and change the whole thing.

Perlis: I'm not asking about the present policy. I'm asking about the proposal.

Constant: Let me offer this. Since they vote on grad faculty status, they would not be able to vote on full graduate faculty status. I think this would be bad procedure to have them on the evaluation body voting on promotion and tenure if they are of a lower rank. I think we'd be opening up a legal can of worms. But do as you wish.

Rouse: What's the rationale for having some colleges/schools having twice as many representatives as others?

Nyland: If you look at the size of those units, the rationale is that for some units with 11 departments and one person to represent such a diversity of perspectives, the students and faculty in those units are less represented than those in other smaller units with one representative to five departments.

Rouse: Why isn't it according to the relative number of graduate faculty members in those units rather than according to graduate degrees?

Nyland: We looked at that and left the FSEC with about five options - one was just per faculty members; then you end up with a graduate council about the same size as this faculty senate almost. That's just too unwieldy. So then we went down to one member for each department and you still ended up with 54 members - still too big. And so we just went down - the only thing we could do was give some units two and others one. I was trying to maintain the council at about the same size - 16 members - so that any unit to get representation would have to have 6.25 percent of the graduate degrees. And if you do it that way, some units would lose representatives, and we didn't want to do that.

King: On your chart, are those just generic labels for degrees?

Nyland: Yes, they are. There are some degree programs, like the MFA, I did not carry over to the Ph.D.. I didn't feel competent to do that. So degrees like the MFA that are terminal degrees, I left in the M.S. column.

King: And an M.A. could be in the M.S. column as well?

Nyland: That's correct.

Christie: In the College of Business Administration we should have five departments....

Nyland: We'll fix that.

Constant: One of the concerns I have with the methodology is that we're saying that, as in a congressional election, a larger district should have more representation. It concerns me that that will cause biased input into the Graduate Council based on sheer numbers alone, while some outstanding units only having one, while others have two will probably cause some noise. Units that are "foundations of excellence" may only have one representative there, there will probably be some noise coming from there as well. Those are my concerns - that we'll throw it out of whack based simply on productivity. There are some programs that are highly productive, but maybe in smaller numbers, that we need to worry about.

-----: I'm a member of the graduate council and a faculty senator. I believe that the graduate council operates in an excellent fashion. I understand the proposal to move from appointed to elected membership, but I wonder if the authors of this resolution can offer us some examples of how an elected system will improve the situation. Why add members to an already large, bulky committee? I look around this body today and see 50-60% attendance - the Graduate Council has 100% at its meetings. It operates very well. I'm looking for some stated advantage to an elected body.

Nyland: Well I feel like I should give a discourse on shared faculty governance, but I'm not going to do that. I will emphasize the changes to the current council. We want to have the least changes possible. Currently there are 16 members, 13 from the units you see here. Every unit is guaranteed a single member, and every unit under the new proposal will have a single member at least. Currently the three at large members have to come from somewhere. They are not going to come from smaller units. They are probably coming from the larger units already. Finally, it should be a transition because we're not going to abolish the current council and elect everyone at one time. As people go off the board, we'll hold elections from the units that need it and then gradually the whole board will be elected. This will also help spread out the tremendous workload of the council. We can better share the load with up to 19 people.

Owens: What do peer institutions do? I'm not sure that this seems to be a better solution than the current situation even given concerns with shared governance.

Nyman: I did not look at other universities and see how they do that. As far as other alternatives, I did not look at anything other than electing and trying to keep it the same size.

Constant: I looked at some other graduate programs, but not with respect to this question.

Beavers: Is this resolution changing both how members are selected and the make up of the council?

Nyland: Both. We're changing to election and changing the allocation of members. Also realize, we have no authority. It's a process. Passing this means that it has to go to the upper administration and Board of Supervisors for approval. Our approval

here is the first step in a potentially long process.

-----: What is the current make up?

Nyland: The current make up is one member from each of those 13 units, and three members at large. Right now they are from the Vet school, Arts and Sciences, and Basic Sciences.

Rouse: The dean of each college nominates a number of people. Who makes the choice? Does the Grad School dean make the final choice?

Constant: He or she may narrow it down, then it is finally decided in consultation with the provost.

Rouse: Call the question. Stanley (second).

**VOTE: Resolution passes with one abstention and a few nays.**

Cope: FSEC will consult with provost and communicate with system office.

## ***Second Reading***

(Kevin Cope reading- This resolution is meant to prod the system and state to improve our benefits - especially retirement.)

## **Faculty Senate Resolution 10–04**

“Full Disclosure of Benefits Packages for Job Candidates”

Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

*Whereas* the suite of benefits offered to all university employees, whether faculty or staff members, supplies a large portion of the compensation received during a working life and, in many cases, accounts for nearly all financial resources during retirement;

*Whereas* research by the Benefits Advisory Committee and by Faculty Senate Assistants convincingly demonstrates that LSU, the LSU System, and Louisiana higher education all lag far behind comparable institutions, systems, and states with respect to the benefits packages offered to higher education employees;

*Whereas* the first qualification to become a great university is a commitment to truth and truthfulness;

*Whereas* zeal for the advancement of LSU and its sister campuses has led recruiters to stress the advantages of working at LSU while sometimes downplaying the shortcomings of our institutions;

*Whereas* LSU faculty governance officials and committee members have worked and bargained in good faith with campus and systems officials;

*Whereas* the progress in the development of adequate benefits packages has been definitive but extremely slow, in large measure owing to the intransigence of state government;

*Whereas* the inadequacy of benefits, especially in retirement programs, inflicts a “loyalty penalty” by reducing lifelong compensation in proportion to length of service;

*Whereas* participants in the Optional Retirement Program have been singled out for excessive surcharges to satisfy an “unfunded accrued liability” for which they have no responsibility and with regard to which they can exert little influence owing to the unorthodox and unfair method of managing retirement funds for higher education professionals;

*Therefore be it resolved* that if, by the end of the 2009–2010 academic year, satisfactory progress toward improving the benefits package and especially toward resolving the problems with the retirement programs has not been made, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee may either provide or may require Human Resources Management provide all finalists for academic appointments at LSU with a plain-language explanation of the limits on and instabilities of the LSU benefit packages; and

*Therefore be it further resolved* that Human Resources Management may not allow the appointment of any new faculty member or staff member earning a salary above \$40,000.00 per annum until that job candidate has signed an appropriate form acknowledging receipt and understanding of the aforementioned truthful benefits explanation.

## Discussion Summary:

Kuehny: In the second to the last paragraph, how do you define "satisfactory progress?" I'd just drop that.

Cope: This is not a solitary effort on the part of LSU. The other schools in the system and other schools throughout the state would not like this resolution if we removed this "qualifier." We want to get other schools to adopt this. One of the problems is that when you bring a resolution such as this to a statewide body, the immediate question is, "Do you have widespread, grassroots support?"

Rouse: Who defines "satisfactory?"

Cope: The faculty senate. What we have seen so far is not satisfactory - it is piecemeal. Satisfactory would be some evidence that the state is taking some real action. As the situation stood 8 months ago, people weren't even aware of the problem. There are now people in the system willing to work on it, but there is some progress. If this trajectory continues, we might declare that to be satisfactory.

Rouse: I'm asking which body makes the declaration.

Cope: We would bring it back to vote into the faculty senate.

Walsh: 6th whereas.... First therefore..... (not audible)

Cope: I will make that correction.

Homberger: Could we re-cast this in a more positive fashion? Could the wherefore be recast so all hires - not just those earning over \$40,000 - get a clear statement of benefits?

Cope: I agree philosophically. I will admit that this is somewhat punitive in tone. But we want to use this as leverage to try and get the state to do a better job of improving our benefits. I would appreciate it if you would prepare a separate resolution that refers to all employees for our later consideration.

King: Should we say that this is from research in comparison to benefits at other universities?

Cope: I think that is fine and I accept it as a friendly amendment. (Cope moves; Christie seconds - motion passes).

Walsh: Either we supply a plain language explanation or HRM supplies a plain language statement that we approve.

Ajmera: We should have HRM provide it and we approve it.

Cope and Walsh: Agreed.

Ajmera: But can we get HRM to do this? Do we have any authority to get HRM to act?

Cope: I believe so. We can push publicly for this with administrators and the system.

Homberger: We need a standing committee to track this. Perhaps we can keep Roger Laine's standing committee to do this.

We want to track how these changes are implemented.

Cope: Yes. It's a permanent committee that will continue to deal with this.

Homberger: Perhaps we can wrap this up into one revised statement in the resolution. But I can't come up with the language right now.

King: We didn't vote specific language for this yet.

Cope: An amendment is that Justin and I will come up with appropriate language to satisfy the discussion of all the changes we've discussed.

VOTE on amendment: unanimous.

Aghazadeh: When we are talking about job candidates, we are talking about faculty and staff, right?

Cope: The resolution refers to anyone earning over \$40,000. That should include "and staff."

Aghazadeh: Because the final part refers to "candidates for academic positions."

Cope: You're right. I'll fix that and add staff.

McGee: To whom is this resolution directed? Who is the ultimate audience?

Cope: The Board of Supervisors and the state. But we need to provide a model to other campuses to build up statewide support. There are five or six different entities involved in benefits.

McGee: If one took out the long if clause that addresses satisfactory progress, throwing down the gauntlet, we're throwing down the gauntlet - for what? It seems like we're saying, "If you don't make progress, we're going to disable ourselves from hiring." Won't faculty and administrators at other institutions think that this is going to make things even more difficult for them? Couldn't we put it in the form of a straightforward statement that we want a plain language statement of benefits, making clear any drawbacks, etc. Then we will be setting a clear policy for truthfulness.

Cope: I agree. But I think this is better for another resolution. I don't want to make this a generalized resolution that might elicit a negative response from legislators and so on who don't understand these issues as well as we do.

Homberger: This resolution is a mix of strategy and policy. We need to consider what we have in hand to really carry out a threat. I think this resolution should have better policy and less of a "threat." I think if it is less threatening, more will adopt it.

Cope: I think that you underestimate the power of argument and public declaration.

Homberger: I support you. I just worry about overly strong language for garnering support from everyone because it's a benefit for not just faculty, but for the state. I suggest the second therefore should be shortened to say that all candidates will be provided with the strengths and weaknesses of the LSU benefits packages.

Cope: I am sympathetic with your position. I wish you would present that as a separate resolution particular to this campus. The TRSL is completely dismissive of what the faculty senates are going to do. It is better to cajole them a little bit.

Homberger: I will defer to your wisdom and retract my motion. Obviously you have a strategy and you know how people will react.

Stanley: When Kevin first ran this by me, I was completely against it. I think we will lose some people if we give them something that tells them how rotten our benefits are. I like the language that gives us some wiggle room, and that's the only way I can vote for this. I view this as a stick to try to improve the benefits for all of us.

McGee: One last-ditch effort: I still believe that a lot of assumptions are being made here. I have some confidence in you as a political leader. But have you run this by all the other campuses? Are they on board?

Cope: Yes. They are all supportive of this effort.

McGee: My feeling is, who is going to publicly say we don't want to speak truth to new hires. All Dominique is saying is strengths and weaknesses. That's what all universities do, in a clear pamphlet that tells the truth. So what you're simply saying is you will put the information out there in a much more dramatic fashion than we do now, and that will not be a benefit to this organization that wants to keep things in the dark. So it seems to me it's a politically smooth tactic. And while it irritates them, they can't really react against that.

Cope: This is not the end of it. This is the next step. And I hope we can revisit this in the fall and see where we stand. You ask who will stand up against truth? I think it's certainly true for departments we deal with every day, but I will submit that the material published by the governing bodies of both plans (TRSL and ORP) is not only misleading, it is mendacious. It is propaganda regarding a set of benefits that are not actually there.

McGee: I don't disagree with you there. I'm going to go along with you on this, but reserve the right to revisit it in the future.

Kuehny moves to vote - Stanley seconds.

**VOTE: Passes unanimously.**

***Second Reading - Ken McMillan reading for Dydia Delyser.***

## Faculty Senate Resolution 10-05

“Revision of PS-22: Excused Absences from Class”

Introduced at the Request of Faculty Athletic Representative Dydia Delyser

*Whereas* it is the desire of the Faculty Senate to ensure that all LSU's policies and procedures are fair to all faculty, staff, and students; and

*Whereas* it has come to the attention of the Faculty Senate that irregularities exist in regards to the implementation of accommodations for students excused from class under LSU's PS-22; and

*Whereas* the Faculty Senate is aware that some of those irregularities have resulted in students being penalized for their excused absences; and

*Whereas* the Faculty Senate is aware that accommodating students with excused absences is the responsibility of the instructor, even when it presents additional work for the instructor;

*Therefore, be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate recommends the clarification of PS-22 amendment of the text as follows.

Paragraph one, reading:

Class attendance is the responsibility of the student. The student is expected to attend all classes. A student who finds it necessary to miss class assumes responsibility for making up examinations, obtaining lecture notes, and otherwise compensating for what may have been missed. The course instructor will determine the validity of a student's reason(s) for absences and will assist those students who have valid reasons.

shall read instead [new text in bold]:

Class attendance is the responsibility of the student. The student is expected to attend all classes. A student who finds it necessary to miss class assumes responsibility for making up examinations, obtaining lecture notes, and otherwise compensating for what may have been missed. The course instructor will determine the validity of a student's reason(s) for absences and will assist those students who have valid reasons. **The course instructor will accommodate those students with valid absences in such a way that they retain an equal opportunity for success in class and are not penalized for having missed class with a valid reason.**

Paragraph four, reading:

The student is responsible for providing reasonable advance notification and appropriate documentation of the reason for the absence. Should the instructor and student disagree over the validity of a reason for an absence, the student has the right to appeal the instructor's decision according to the general appeal procedure in PS- 48.

shall read instead [new text in bold]:

The student is responsible for providing reasonable advance notification and appropriate documentation of the reason for the absence. Should the instructor and student disagree over the validity of a reason for an absence, the student has the right to appeal the instructor's decision according to the general appeal procedure in PS- 48. **Should the instructor and student disagree over the accommodations offered by the instructor, the student has the right to appeal the instructor's decision to the Department Chair or Program Director (in accordance with PS-48).**

Discussion summary:

Daniel Walsh: My concern as a regular student is that I have had very different experiences with excused absences. One instructor might immediately make accommodations, with no mention of any policies. Others simply make a blanket statement that I don't accept excuses. These policies are here to protect students. Right now there is a process for appeal, but PS-48 can take a long time if a student has to go that route. It can take 14 days, which means that you will be in class for two weeks while you are bringing a case against your professor. Nobody wants to be in that situation. Appeals for final grades are done afterward. I think an amendment should be added that instructors approve excused absences as they occur and that would preclude any overarching policy that says, "I don't accept excuses."

(Inaudible discussion.....)

Walsh: PS 48 is so convoluted that people don't even go there. They just drop a course.

-----: Does your instructor have the "no excuses" policy on the syllabus?

Walsh: That's been the case for many courses.

-----: Faculty have to be concerned about differential treatment of different students.

Haynie: So are you saying faculty respond that way when students have excused absences for band or sports activities?

Walsh: When the dean of students says that it is an excused absence, they accept that. But when a student shows up with two medical excuses that say "I was sent home with the flu," it's a completely different story. They cite the "no excuses" policy.

Haynie: (Inaudible) There are some professors who say I don't take any excuses, and that's how they function.

-----: Why is this necessary?

Walsh: Because they don't have to address issues on a case by case basis.

Haynie: (Inaudible)

Melissa Hart (Student representative to the Athletic Committee): Over time, I have seen students denied adequate opportunities to make up work even with excused absences. I have seen this problem personally. My freshman year, my brother went to Iraq and I wanted to see him off. But I didn't want to miss class. And I did not miss school. When he came home, I had to tell him that I didn't think it would be an excused absence. To hear that some instructors don't allow time to make up assignments....when students represent the university in great ways..... They need the opportunity to show faculty that they are great students. We are in full support of this resolution.

----: How can a student make up an unannounced quiz - or class discussion? What's a good way to do it?

(Inaudible discussion)

Bob Newman (Economics): We're okay with the language as it is currently written. We have a situation that I've discussed with Dydia, and I think she understands it now. In our 2000 level courses, 80% are covered by graduate students who are instructors of record and supervised by faculty. Our tests are all guarded and we are very concerned about security issues. We have a no make-up exam policy. But we do accommodate students with an excuse by assigning extra points on the final exam, or the questions on the final that are from that test are counted as a separate grade. Under the wording of this resolution, we are in compliance.

Battista: I assume this is laid out in your syllabus and explained, and all students are treated the same way whether it is a university excused activity or an individual student who is ill.

Newman: Yes. The excuse has to be documented.

Battista: I question defining excused absences. The term excused absence applies to a lot of things. I just want to make sure we're not talking about one type of student vs. another - it applies to all excused absences.

Newman: We treat all students the same - they all have the same options.

-----: The thing that bothers me is the term "excused" or "valid" absence. I've had excuses that I think are valid for all kinds of reasons. I think this resolution misses the target. If you're trying to keep people from being unfair, then perhaps the resolution should address what you think is wrong with the system instead of trying a blank solution.

Haynie: I can't speak for Dydia. (Much inaudible....)

-----:There was a faculty senate member last month asking what was fair in terms of the length of time a student should be allowed to make up work.

Haynie: There are some instructors who will never allow students to be tested on that material.

(More inaudible discussion)

Newman: Dydia's concerns about student athletes were addressed through back and forth discussion. Students can take my exams, but not for a grade, and so are fully aware of what my exam was like, and how they would have done. Then they know what to expect on the final. We decided this was a fair policy and that we'd like to retain it, giving every student the same options.

-----: Last time I was critical of this and I didn't see what it added. I can vote for this, but I don't actually see that it accomplishes anything. Everything hinges on interpretation of the word "accommodate" and I don't want to figure out what constitutes a valid excuse. We're still in exactly the same situation as before.

-----: If a teacher can disregard the clear language of PS-22, why would they not disregard this?

Xu: In my course, I couldn't implement such a policy because a huge portion of my course is math. I had a student show up for the first time last week for the midterm exam. I can't redo this course for him. It is impossible to accommodate this situation. My question is also should we even discuss this in the absence of the person who proposed this resolution?

**QUORUM NOT MET AT THIS POINT.** Further discussion delayed, along with second reading of Resolution 10-06, and first reading of new resolution 10-07: Sunshine Regulations.

Meeting adjourned.







## Attachment A - IT Governance Structure

**IT Governance at LSU**

Presentation to the LSU Faculty Senate for Consideration

March 15, 2010

*Brian D. Voss, Vice Chancellor for Information Technology & Chief Information Officer*

***We shall never be able to remove suspicion and fear as potential causes of conflict until communication is permitted to flow, free and open, across boundaries.***

*Harry Truman, former United States President*

**RECOMMENDATION X:**

Develop IT advisory and communication channels to ensure the continued involvement of the LSU community in the implementation of the flagship IT strategy and ongoing day-to-day provision of IT services to the campus.

**ACTION ITEM 10.01**

The campus community must be involved—as a full-fledged partner with both authority and responsibilities—in the development and implementation of IT strategies and service directions taken at LSU. Essentially, the Flagship IT Strategy planning process must evolve a long-term role for the task forces, to facilitate ongoing input from the community, as well as a venue to help communicate IT directions more broadly on campus.

**1. Background/History of IT Governance at LSU**

- a. Pre-2005 – Only Student Technology Fee Oversight Committee
- b. FITS Process (Fall 2005-Spring 2006) - Five Task Forces formed to advance the FITS
  - i. Information Systems Task Force (Joel Tohline Chair)
  - ii. Infrastructure Task Force (Chuck Wilson & Barrett Kennedy co-Chairs)
  - iii. Research Task Force (Sumanta Acharya Chair)
  - iv. Teaching & Learning Task Force (Bill Wischusen Chair; Ray Ferrell Chair 2006-07)
  - v. Student IT Enablement Task Force (Michelle Gieg & Heath Hattaway Co-Chairs)
- c. Various groups within these Task Forces continued to meet through 2007 to discuss a number of FITS Action Item implementations, most notably the analysis and recommendation of a single Learning Management System platform (Moodle).

**2. FITS-outcome Quasi-Governance**

- a. High Performance Computing Resources Allocation Committee (HPCRAC) 2006
- b. Information Systems Priorities and Allocation Committee (ISPAC) 2006
- c. IT Security & Policy Advisory Committee
- d. Software Acquisition Committee
- e. Moodle Development Advisory Committee (MDAC)

**3. FITS Recommendation 10 Action Item 1 Fulfillment (2010)**

- a. Proposed IT Governance Model
  - i. Formalizes IT Governance and closely integrates with LSU Faculty Governance
  - ii. Establishes IT Governance outside of ad-hoc involvement based upon the proclivity and nature of the VCIT/CIO and ITS Leadership
  - iii. Sets the stage for a mid-course review of the FITS and continued implementation planning as funding returns (hopefully!)

**4. Requested of the Faculty Senate March 2010**

- a. **Review and input on the IT Governance Model**

- b. Formal Resolution of Support for the IT Governance Model**
- c. Integration of the structures therein, into the Faculty Senate committee structures**
- d. Appointing of Chairs for the three main committees, the Faculty IT Advisory Council, and also the MDAC**
- e. Suggestions of faculty to participate as members of the main committees; review and endorsement of any suggested by OVCIT**

**IT GOVERNANCE (Proposed Model)****March 2010**

Information technology governance at LSU continues to evolve following completion of the Flagship IT Strategy in 2006 and initial implementation planning in 2007. A formal governance model is called for in FITS Recommendation 10 Action Item 1. Following is such a structure including decision making entities and advisory councils. (New proposed entities are in **RED**.)

The following *decision making entities* serve as a result of directives of Administration (or statute in the case of STFOC):

- Student Tech Fee Oversight Committee (STFOC) – This committee is comprised of a majority of student representatives and includes faculty and administrators. The committee determines how student tech fee funds will be spent. This committee is currently chaired by the Provost or her designate (VP Chuck Wilson as of February 2010).
- HPC Resource Allocation Committee (HPCRAC) – This committee is comprised of faculty and administrators, and is charged by the Vice Chancellor for Research & Economic Development with determining what large scale computational research projects will be awarded cycles on the University's supercomputing resources. This committee is currently chaired by Joel Tohline.
- Information Systems Priorities and Allocations Committee (ISPAC) – Comprised of executive level administrators (vice chancellors, vice provosts), and representatives of Deans, department chairs, and faculty, this committee determines priorities in the acquisition, development, implementation, and maintenance of data/information systems employed at LSU, and allocates human resources within ITS needed to accomplish those priorities. This committee is currently co-chaired by Vice Chancellor for IT (Voss) and Vice Chancellor for FAS (Monday, Interim)

The following *advisory councils and committees* would be the result of directives of the Vice Chancellor for IT & CIO and/or University Administration, and resolutions of the LSU Faculty Senate, LSU Student Government, and the LSU Staff Senate:

- **Faculty IT Advisory Council** – Comprised of faculty, provides broad direction to VCIT, ITS, and the campus for IT enablement of the teaching and research missions of the University. This role involves oversight of related functional committees, and provides broad counsel concerning ITS services and the provision of IT infrastructure for scholarly pursuits on campus. This council and the advisory committees herein would be structured to be a part of larger faculty governance at LSU (i.e., they would formally a part of the LSU Faculty Senate, either as a part of existing IT-related committees in FS, or as a replacement structure within the FS structure):
  - **Research IT-Enablement Advisory Committee**: Comprised of faculty that would advise VCIT/ITS on the scholarly resources, tools and services needed to enable research at LSU. Given the role of the CCT in this area, coordination between CCT advisory functions, OVCIT/ITS, and this committee should be fostered. This committee would be chaired by a faculty member with strong interests in research.
  - **Teaching & Learning IT-Enablement Advisory Committee** – Broadly addresses the use of IT to enable pedagogy; acts as the primary guiding force behind IT services and infrastructure provided by ITS. This committee would be chaired by a faculty member with strong interests in pedagogy.
    - **Moodle Development Advisory Committee (MDAC)** – Comprised of faculty with ITS staff as ex-officio, this committee reviews requests for changes to the Moodle code and environment, and works to prioritize these changes and allocate human resources within the ITS Moodle development team. MDAC is a quasi-decision making entity, meaning that ITS will largely defer to its judgment on the substance, priority, and schedule of changes to Moodle. This committee is currently chaired by Randy Hall.
  - **Infrastructure and Support Advisory Committee** – Comprised of faculty, staff, administrators, and students, with ITS leadership and staff as ex-officio, this committee addresses broad issues of general purpose IT infrastructure (data/voice networking, identity management and portal presentation, etc.) and support for the use of IT (help desk and online support, distributed support services, education and training, etc.) in a fundamental sense. This committee would be chaired by a faculty member with strong interests in general IT enablement.
- **Student IT Advisory Council** – Students remain one of ITS's most important customers. ITS relies upon this group to act as a sounding board for ideas and as a mechanism for receipt of concerns and advice for the future of IT at LSU. This group is separate and distinct from the decision-making entity of the STFOC, but should be a part of the Student Government structures (i.e., structures within the LSU Student Senate).

- **IT Security & Policy Advisory Council** – This council was formed by the VCIT to develop LSU IT Policies, to review and make adjustments to existing IT policies, which are then moved through the University’s Policies and Procedures process for inclusion as formal LSU Policies (Statements). This committee consists of faculty, ITS staff (as ex-officio), IT support personnel from across campus, and administrators, and is chaired by Chief IT Security & Policy Officer, John Borne.
- **Technology Staff Advisory Council (LSU “Tiger Techs”)** – This is a coalition of IT support personnel in colleges and departments across campus who work closely with service and technical staff within ITS. LSU Tiger Techs discuss ways in which to meet disparate needs, build community, and maintain cohesive professional growth when possible.
  - **Software Acquisition Committee:** Provides and reviews suggestions for TigerWare and advises ITS on what tools to offer in labs and to departments, or which products to pursue for broader licensing and distribution via TigerWare. The committee is charged to also consider the financial aspects – to help assemble necessary funding for any recommended additional products. It is currently chaired by a LSU campus technology support provider – currently Brian Melancon, LSU Libraries. *{This committee should also be ‘connected’ to the Faculty-led Infrastructure & Support Advisory Committee.}*

