

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 11, 2011
Student Senate Room, LSU Student Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (President, English) | 2. Pratul Ajmera (Vice-President, Electrical Eng) |
| 3. George G. Stanley (Secretary, Chemistry) | 4. Ken McMillin (Member-at-Large, Animal Sci) |
| 5. Priscilla D. Allen (Member-at-Large, Social Work) | 6. Joan King (new FS member-at-Large, Food Sci) |
| 7. Bill Daly (Past-President, Chemistry Emeritus) | |

Parliamentarian: Charles Delzell (present)

Senators present:

1	Mary Aime (Plant Path/Ag)	26	✓	Joseph Francis (Compar BioMed/Vet)	51	✓	Rebecca Owens (Curricul & Instruct/Ed)
2	✓ Pratul Ajmera (Elect Eng/Eng)	27	P	Juhan Frank (Physics/Sci)	52		John Protevi (French Studies/HSS)
3	✓ Priscilla (Lilly) Allen (Social Work)	28	A	Craig Freeman (Mass Comm/MassCom)	53	P	Suresh Rai (Elect & Comp/Eng)
4	P Gabriel Beavers (Music/MDA)	29	✓	Stephen Gaunt (Pathobiological Sci/Vet)	54	✓	Lawrence Rouse (Coastal Studies/C&E)
5	✓ Melissa Beck (Psychology/HSS)	30	✓	Wes Harrison (Ag Econ/Ag)	55	✓	Kresimir Rupnik (Chem/Sci)
6	Dana Bickmore (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)	31	P	Dominique Homberger (Bio/Sci)	56	✓	Michael Russo (LSU Libraries/Lib)
7	Michael Bowman (Comm Studies/HSS)	32	P	Andrea Houston (Info Sys & D Sci/BA)	57	✓	Cristina Sabliov (Bio & Ag Eng/Ag)
8	Kathleen Bratton (Political Sci/HSS)	33	P	Jennifer Jolly (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)	58	✓	Bhaba Sarker (Const Manage & Ind/Eng)
9	✓ Stephanie Braunstein (LSU Libraries/Lib)	34	✓	Benjamin Kahan (English/HSS)	59		Frederick Sheldon (Bio/Sci)
10	Renee Casbergue (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)	35		Rajgopal Kannan (Comp Sci/Sci)	60	✓	George Stanley (Chemistry/Sci)
11	✓ Paolo Chirumbolo (Foreign Lang/HSS)	36	✓	Joan King (Food Sci/Ag)	61	✓	Suzanne Stauffer (Lib & Info Sci/SLIS)
12	✓ Aaron Clopton (Kinesiology/Ed)	37		Jeff Kuehny (Horticulture/Ag)	62	✓	Padmanabhan Sundar (Math/Sci)
13	✓ Kevin Cope (English/HSS)	38	✓	Joseph Legoria (Accounting/BA)	63	A	Gail Sutherland (Phil & Relig/HSS)
14	✓ Larry Crumbley (Accounting/BA)	39		Michael Leitner (Geog & Anthro/HSS)	64	✓	Carol Taylor (Chem/Sci)
15	P Jennifer Curry (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)	40	✓	David Lindenfeld (History/HSS)	65	P	Dianne Taylor (ELRC/Ed)
16	✓ William Daly (Chemistry/Sci)	41	A	Michelle Livermore (Social Work/SW)	66		Jeffrey Taylor (Geology/Sci)
17	✓ Josh Detre (Ag Econ/Ag)	42	A	Mandi Lopez (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet)	67	✓	Phillip Tebbutt (Interior Design/A&D)
18	Neila Donovan (Comm Sci Disord/HSS)	43		Kevin McCarter (Exp Stat/Ag)	68	✓	Justin Walsh (Art/A&D)
19	P Kerry Dooley (ChemE/Eng)	44	✓	Alison McFarland (Music/MDA)	69	P	Wanjun Wang (Mech Eng/Eng)
20	P Susan Dumais (Sociology/HSS)	45	✓	Patrick McGee (English/HSS)	70		Michael Wascom (Environ Studies/C&E)
21	✓ Kristi Dykema (Landscape Arch/A&D)	46	✓	Ken McMillin (Animal Sci/Ag)	71	✓	Edward Watson (Info Sys & D Sci/BA)
22	✓ Bruce Eilts (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet)	47	✓	Reem Meshal (Phil & Relig/HSS)	72	✓	Hsiao-Chun Wu (Elect & Comp/Eng)
23	✓ Guillermo Ferreyra (Math/Sci)	48	✓	Louay Mohammed (C & Environ/Eng)	73		Yi-jun Xu (Renew Nat Res/Ag)
24	✓ John Fletcher (Theatre/MDA)	49		Jeff Nunn (Geology/Sci)	74	✓	David Young (Physics/Sci)
25	✓ Kristopher Fletcher (Foreign Lang/HSS)	50		John Nyman (Renew Nat Res/Ag)			

Guests Attending:

Holly Carruth	Thomas Rogers	Robert Doolos	Gil Reeve
Karen Denby	Todd Barre	Runa Bakshi	JoAnne Henson
Yanni LeJune	Kathy Saichuk	Ravi Rau	Erin Kenna

Consideration of Minutes for the meeting of March 15, 2011

Approved unanimously (provisionally, later revision possible)

Presentation by Jim Purcell Commissioner of Higher Education

- Faculty need input into the big decisions that are being made for higher education, which is going to change over the next few years. The institutions that survive will be those that are close to their customers and speed to market.
- Three general goals that will guide us for future plans from 2011 to 2025: increase the educational attainment of Louisianans; invest strategically in university research; and to become a more efficient and accountable enterprise.
- Many of the decisions will be made under the Board of Regents and via the legislature. My office will be involved in many of these.

- Funding for higher education has decreased by \$300M but enrollment has increased by 22,000 students. This has further stressed the system.
- Ideally, a low income state like LA should have low tuition and high state support. Unfortunately, state support is not going to increase over the short run. I ask you to support the revenue-raising proposals that will be put to the legislature. All of these have to happen for the higher education budget as proposed by the Governor to work.
- Relevance of education to our economy is important and is how many public institutions will be judged. Jobs in our state that require college graduates need to increase or by 2018 we will rank near the bottom of states with job opportunities for higher education graduates.

Q&A Summary:

Mike Russo: If higher education is critical to the economy and we want more and more people to be educated, why are we limiting educational opportunities to students by raising fees and tuition.

Jim: I agree, but we have a serious budget shortfall and higher education needs funding to operate. LSU's tuition is low even by southern standards so there is room for increases without hurting students too much.

David Lindenfeld: Have you had a chance to look at the LSU Flagship agenda and do the changes you're talking about fit in with the agenda.

Jim: I have the details on the Flagship agenda, but in general I want to see a Flagship act like a Flagship. The LA-GRAD act asks for progress comparisons to your peers. The question is who are your peers? We've agreed to use national peers for LSU in all areas. You want to compete against the nation.

Rebecca Owens: Why is higher education so vulnerable in our state budget if we are so important?

Jim: It is the way our state budget is structured. That is why coupling higher education to jobs and workforce development will strengthen the case for higher education. A lot of people don't see the value of higher education in this state. We need to educate these about the importance of higher education for the state.

Wes Harrison: Can you comment further on the comparison between public and private institutions and how we need to think and plan for the future. Also on job training?

Jim: There is a need for vocational training and the relatively new community college system is doing a lot of that. Previously a lot of these students went to 4-yr colleges, which was not the most efficient way of training these students.

Wes: What about the private-public comparison you made?

Jim: Higher education needs to be less dependent on state funding and more on tuition and fees to reduce the percentage of state support. This will insulate higher ed from these budget cuts.

Kevin Cope: Are you thinking about educating our legislators about the benefits of higher education?

Jim: Yes, a lot of that is one-on-one interactions. I am getting out to speak to the public via Rotary and such. I think these conversations will have some educational impact.

President's Report

- The retention committee has begun meeting on a regular basis. They are looking at high impact activities that will specifically help freshman. You'll be hearing more about that in the upcoming weeks.
- The visit by J.K. Haynes this week was quite successful. His presentation will soon be available on the FS web site.
- HRM is trying to streamline the promotion and tenure process. Specifically automating CV's in the PS-36 format. There is a very short timeframe for this project, so if you have any suggestions for this please contact me or Mimi Ruebsamen (mimir@lsu.edu).
- The FSEC is trying to upgrade commencement regalia from standard black. Inclusion of LSU logo's, some added color, and reasonable cost is underway.
- The April 14 meeting of the FSEC will concern the Graduate School and Council. The main sticking point is the election of members to the Graduate Council.
- The resolution concerning PS-29 is currently being circulated amongst the Deans and preliminary feedback is that it will be approved.

- At the system level some ugly rumors are circulating about the UNO-SUNO merger. If UNO would slip from the LSU system the contract rules for faculty could be downgraded. We are discussing this with John Lombardi to avoid any negative changes in the faculty contracts.
- We have been fighting to keep LOUIS alive. The strategy has been to have various faculty senates pass resolutions and keep this in the news. Even NPR had a story about LOUIS.
- The state is studying a common course numbering system for higher education. There are dangers in this in regards to maintaining quality of the courses. There is now a faculty committee looking into this and trying to ensure that the quality is kept high.
- AG Monoco (head of HRM) has a very interesting column in this month's FS Newsletter that I suggest you read.
- The Consortium of Louisiana Colleges and Universities (CLCU) and the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates (ALFS) will hold a joint annual meeting starting at 10 AM on May 9 at the Lod Cook Alumni Center. More details will be sent out in an E-mail a week or so in advance of this meeting. Our own Chancellor, Mike Martin, will be there along with a financial update by Jim Richardson and discussions with Jim Purcell, Commissioner of Higher Education.
- The next state-wide college collaborative meeting will be held on Saturday, April 16 at 10 AM at LSU-Alexandria. All interested faculty are invited to attend. Belle Wheelan, President of SACS will be speaking on academic freedom.
- This weeks' Chronicle of Higher Education carries an interested salary survey. LSU ranks a bit above average, but the average is not very high as many smaller schools are included in the list.

Q&A Summary:

None.

Presentation by Beverly Major on the LSU Foundation regarding a new Faculty-Staff Fundraising effort.

Postponed to later meeting.

Election of Members of Faculty Senate Committees that are Staffed by Vote Rather than by Appointment of Application

This was a ballot vote for the Budget & Planning Committee; the Committee on Committees; and the Faculty Grievance Committee. Secretary George Stanley counted the votes after the meeting and the results are as follows:

Budget & Planning Committee: Paul Hoffman was elected.

Committee on Committees: Patrick DiMario, Ed Smith, Wesley Shrum, Jennifer Baumgartner, & Jusan Barthelemy were elected.

Faculty Grievance Committee: Carole Jurkiewicz, Arthur Penn, Gary Ginter, & Faik Koray were elected.

Election of Faculty Senate Officers for 2011-12

- Kevin Cope is elected unanimously as Faculty Senate President
- Ken McMillin is elected unanimously as Faculty Senate Vice-President
- George Stanley is elected unanimously as Faculty Senate Secretary despite pleading for other candidates.
- Member-at-Large Election: Joan King (Food Sci/Ag), Louay Mohammed (Civil & Environ/Eng), and Larry Rouse (Coastal Studies/C&E)

Joan King and Larry Rouse were elected to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee via paper ballot.

Old Business

Second and Final Reading of:

Resolution 10-18, “Increased Spending on Higher Education and the Timely Pursuit of Excellence”

Sponsored by Senator Justin Walsh

Delayed till May meeting

Second and Final Reading of:

Faculty Senate Resolution 11–01

“State Subsidies for Athletic Programs and the Higher Education Budget Crisis”

Introduced at the request of Professor Hugh W. Buckingham

Whereas Louisiana is presently undergoing the most severe cuts in the utilization of taxpayer support for higher education in its history; and

Whereas many of our universities are accordingly forced to eliminate faculty, departmental academic programs and majors, and even whole departments or interdepartmental programs; and

Whereas an alarming number of universities in our state continue to spend goodly proportions of taxpayer money for sustaining athletic programs; and

Whereas many of these “goodly proportions” come up to several million dollars of taxpayer money (See Jordan Blum article in the Morning Advocate, July 2010); and

Whereas in these situations, all universities are eliminating faculty members, while coaches remain on taxpayer salary;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate calls on all Louisiana state representatives to make this information clearly apparent to the taxpayers of the state, whose tax money it is that is being siphoned off to sport athletics, while at the very same time faculty are being dismissed and academic programs eliminated.

Q&A Summary:

Rebecca Owens: I think you might get some push-back from legislators whose school’s athletic programs might be cut and the impact on the local economy.

Hugh: That’s true, but it is still tax money being spent on athletics at all schools except LSU.

Joey Legoria: If this is passed I presume that you will try to get the Advocate to do an article on this.

Hugh: I’ll try for the New York Times.

Kevin: I routinely let the press know about any resolutions that pass.

Resolution passes with a few voice dissents.

Second and Final Reading of Resolution 11-03, “The Thanksgiving Break Schedule”

Sponsored by Senator Joshua Detre

Delayed till May meeting so more information can be collected

Second and Final reading of:

Faculty Senate Resolution 11-05

“Rapid Implementation of Curriculum and Related Changes”

Sponsored by Senator Joan King

Whereas the Board of Regents has recently moved up their timetable of program review from every three years to every year; and

Whereas the Board of Regents has changed the review rules so that the review history of program completers is now based on an average of the last three years instead of the last five years; and

Whereas several of the LSU A&M programs have been identified as low completers in the last 2 years with 28 identified in April 2009 (with accelerated review of these in October 2009) and 34 identified this January 2011; and

Whereas faculty must devote critical time to defend programs through appeals and/or on restructuring of curricula related to these programs at risk; and

Whereas curricula changes affect strategic planning, curricula assessment efforts and student recruitment; and

Whereas current, transfer and potential new students that have been recruited are directly affected by the changes in curricula and some students have decided not to attend LSU A&M or transfer away from LSU A&M due to the uncertainty in timing of implementation of curricula changes; and

Whereas the university has moved away from providing printed catalogs which used to be published four times a year including April, June, July and August, and now mainly publishes the catalog online so that curricula changes could now be easily and timely placed into the catalog in the online system; and

Whereas in the past, curricula changes approved at all required levels by the end of Spring semester were implemented by the university the following Fall semester;

Be it resolved that the LSU A&M Faculty Senate requests that all changes to curricula be implemented immediately the next semester after all required approvals, beginning this Fall 2011 semester with curricula changes that were and are approved in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011.

Q&A Summary:

Joey Legoria: What does PS-45 say about this? Isn't this all under PS-45?

Joan: The implementation part is not covered under PS-45.

Wes Harrison: If you make a change in Fall, it would become effective the following Spring. If we approve this, who will update the catalogs in a timely manner?

Robert: The hard copy catalog is updated once a year. One of the issues with this proposal is that there is only one catalog per year. So what does the student follow?

Joan: The students would already be in a program and following CATS and the degree audit.

Robert: The degree audit is catalog driven so I don't know how this would work.

Joan: They would follow the degree audit and there are already substitutions allowed in the degree audit.

Robert: But the problem, once again, is that the catalog is the master document and the degree audit follows that.

Joan: I think the substitution process can handle these changes relative to the catalog.

Stephanie Braunstein: I think what you are saying is that your catalog rights are where you begin and whatever timeframe when you begin the catalog that is in effect at the moment is what is followed. The only exception is when courses are dropped or replaced.

Joan: Yes.

Wes: So what is the advantage to the student under this system? If changes are made how does this work if the catalog doesn't reflect the change?

Joan: A student starting in the spring would be under the new curriculum even though it wasn't in the catalog.

Wes: So what is the advantage?

Joan: We have 27 students waiting to get into our new curriculum but can't because it hasn't been formally approved.

Robert: I think that there are ways around this without adopting this resolution.

Pratul: In effect there will be two catalogs per year?

Robert: No, we only publish one catalog per year.

Resolution fails on voice vote

Second and Final reading of:

LSU A&M Faculty Senate Resolution 11-06
Transfer and Re-Entry of Students into Curricula
Sponsored by Senator Joan King

Whereas there is a written statement in the General Catalog stating, "The catalog that determines the curricular requirements for an undergraduate degree is the catalog that is in effect at the time of the student's entry. This catalog may be used for a maximum of 10 years provided enrollment is not interrupted for two consecutive semesters. Students whose enrollment is interrupted for two or more consecutive regular semesters may choose

no catalog earlier than the one in force at the time of re-entry.” (These students are considered to be native students); and

Whereas the General Catalog also states, “Continuing students may elect a subsequent catalog when a new major is selected or when a catalog reflects a revised curriculum. Transfer students may use the catalog in effect at the time of their first entry into an accredited higher education institution, provided that the transfer to LSU is made within five years of the first entry.” (Transfer students are considered to be non-native students); and

Whereas the General Catalog also states, “The University will make a reasonable effort to honor the statement of curricular requirements in the chosen issue of the catalog. However, because courses and programs are sometimes discontinued and requirements are changed as a result of actions by accrediting associations and other external agencies, the University, having sole discretion, shall make the final determination whether or not degree requirements are met.” (1); and

Whereas returning and within LSU A&M transfer students are directly affected by changes in curricula (2); and

Whereas there is an unwritten policy that prevents students from transferring from one curriculum to another during the semester; and

Whereas there is no strong rationale to delay the internal transfer of students from one curriculum to another even though a list of majors for each curriculum must be determined at specific times; and

Whereas undue restrictions on internal transfer or choices in curriculum catalog for transfer or continuing students may result in a decrease in student graduation and/or retention rates;

Be it resolved that the LSU A&M Faculty Senate requests that students who have been matriculating in any program at LSU be allowed to transfer between programs at any time during the year provided they meet the entry requirements of the related college and/or degree program.

Be it further resolved that the LSU A&M Faculty Senate requests that students who matriculated in any program at LSU, who were unable to complete the last semester of their curriculum in a sequential manner due to extenuating circumstances, be allowed to complete that degree program upon re-entry regardless of whether the program was terminated previous to the student graduating in that degree program.

Footnotes:

- (1) In The Daily Reveille on February 25, 2011 page 11 a story stated “Jeannine Kahn, Regents assistant commissioner for academic affairs, said the faculty and students work together to ensure success when programs are terminated or institutions merged. Also in the same article, Jeannine Kahn was quoted as saying “it is common practice for students to be able to complete their degree programs if affected.”
- (2) For example, several internal transfer students, in the past year, missed the opportunity to transfer prior to administrative changes in their program and were unable later to transfer to curricula that were in the process of being merged due to Board of Regents termination. For another example, at least one student, when returning after sitting out for one year due to financial reasons, was unable to complete the last semester of their degree program and will now be required

Q&A Summary:

[Secretary note: There was quite a bit of discussion that I summarized to what I think are some the key points. Please see the recording for the full discussion]

Justin Walsh: That last sentence “be allowed to complete the degree program upon re-entry regardless of whether the program was terminated previous to the student graduating in the degree program.” How will this work if a student comes back after several years and courses needed are no longer offered or the degree program doesn’t exist? How long would you hold the university to this?

Joan: If the course or professor is no longer offered then either another equivalent course would be substituted.

Justin: We have an example in the School of Art with a jewelry and metal smithing program for a concentration that no longer exists. When that faculty member retires what will we do if a student wants to return to take that course in order to finish their concentration or major? There are no similar courses.

Joan: Then the university would have to decide what other course(s) the student would have to take or recommend that the student transfer to another school.

Louay Mohammed: But I thought that this resolution says that they be allowed to finish regardless of whether the program was terminated. How can the university do that?

Joan: This was based on one student in our curriculum who had to take a one-year leave of absence for financial reasons. When they returned to finish their last semester their program was now in limbo due to BOR termination issues and being combined into another program. They were then forced to pick another major and had to spend another year finishing, which was a financial burden.

Justin: I propose a friendly amendment that if there are no currently enrolled students in a terminated program that a returning student to the university not be allowed to complete that program.

Friendly amendment is approved.

Josh Detre: What about a student that has failed one or two semesters and was on probation?

Joan: They would still have to meet the entrance requirements in order to get back into the program.

Louay Mohammed: I'd like a clarification about a student changing their major anytime during the semester. Isn't the 14th day enrollment used to set the program enrollments?

Joan: The 14th day enrollment is just a snapshot of enrollment. I propose to use the end of semester enrollment instead. BOR is also using completor data, which is end of semester.

David Lindenfeld: It seems that your two "therefores" address different topics and should be considered separately.

Kevin Cope: Do you want to propose that as a friendly amendment?

David: I propose that we separate the two "therefores [be it resolved]" into separate resolutions.

Friendly amendment is approved. First "be it resolved" is 11-06A, second "be it resolved" is 11-06B.

Joey: Our advisors are adamantly opposed to being able to switch majors in the middle of a semester.

Wes Harrison: What happens if a student switches majors because they are doing poorly and then go on academic probation. Are they then dropped from both programs? I just think it is cleaner to wait till the end of the semester to switch majors.

Resolution 11-06A fails unanimously

Resolution 11-06B passes 15 to 12.

New Business

First Reading of:

LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 11-08 "Smoke-Free Entranceways"

Introduced at the request of Luigi Marzilli with co-sponsorship from Joan King

Whereas the 2006 U.S. Surgeon General's Report states that "Exposure to secondhand smoke causes excess deaths in the U.S. population from lung cancer and cardiac related illnesses; and

Whereas the 2006 U.S. Surgeon General's Report also states that "Approximately 60 percent of nonsmokers in the United States have biologic evidence of exposure to secondhand smoke"; and

Whereas the 2006 U.S. Surgeon General's Report also states that "Sidestream smoke (released by the smoldering cigarette), generated at lower temperatures and under somewhat different combustion conditions than mainstream smoke, tends to have higher concentrations of many of the toxins found in cigarette smoke (USDHHS 1986)"; and

Whereas there is a national trend to minimize exposure to smoke on university and college campuses; and

Whereas the State of Louisiana Division of Administration Office of State Buildings Facilities Manual from January 26, 2011 page 7 states that "Smoking shall be confined to "designated" exterior smoking areas at each facility" and "There is no smoking allowed within 30 feet of any entrance/exit door for all facilities"; and

Whereas there is an ordinance (#13349) adopted by the Metropolitan Council of the Parish of East Baton Rouge and City of Baton Rouge on August 10, 2005 which amends Title 12 (Nuisances), Chapter 9 entitled "Clean Air Act"; and

Whereas in the Clean Air Act in Section 12:602 entitled Prohibition of Smoking in Public Places part b.1. it states that "Smoking is prohibited in the following public places, whether or not in an enclosed area: (1) within twenty-five (25) feet of the entrance or exit to any public building or public facility occupied or operated by the City-Parish or any of its agencies";

Therefore be it resolved that PS-76 be revised in the following manner to minimize exposure to second hand smoke while entering and exiting buildings on the LSU A&M campus.

PS-76 University Policy on Smoking

REVISION as PROPOSED by LGM, 7 40pm March 28 2011

DATE to take effect: July 1 2011 (changes coded mostly in red font and underlined)

POLICY

It is the policy of Louisiana State University to provide its students, faculty, staff and other members of the University community including children of all members of the community with a tobacco smoke free environment within its facilities and along pathways utilized by the community, especially before, between and after classes and during events scheduled to benefit the community. The University does not presently otherwise prohibit the smoking of tobacco by its students and employees and does not consider the use of tobacco products in employment decisions. However, this employment decision aspect of the policy is subject to change in view of the large number of peer institutions that have changed to or are considering changing to smoke free campuses.

Accordingly, except as otherwise provided by this policy and often by state law, smoking is prohibited within all covered University facilities. Persons choosing to smoke outside University buildings and other facilities should avoid

exposing others to smoke. Therefore, no smoking is permitted within 75 feet of the entrance and exit areas of all buildings (including loading docks, etc.) and in any extended walkway.

1. Smoking in University residential buildings and food service areas shall be in accordance with state law. State law prohibits smoking within buildings with the few exceptions to the state law, such as bars, not common on our campus.
2. Smoking at special events open to the general public shall be in accordance with state law.
3. Requests for exemption to this policy shall be directed to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs, which will coordinate and monitor the review process with the Building Coordinator and others concerned for recommendation to the Office of the Chancellor for action. However, any exemption shall be in accordance with state law.
4. Smoking policies developed for exemptions to allow smoking in outdoor areas in accordance with Number Two and Three above shall address the following considerations:
 - a. Whether benefits to students, employees and visitors outweigh health, safety and environmental factors.
 - b. The specific area for which exception is to be made and appropriate signs for such designation.
 - c. Measures to protect the rights of non-smokers.
 - d. The time period for which the exception is requested.
 - e. No exception may be made which conflicts with PS-29, "Environmental Control in the Classroom" nor where smoking has been proscribed by the State Fire Marshal.
5. Smoking is prohibited in all University vehicles even if there is only one occupant.

Accepted into debate.

Q&A Summary:

Guillermo Ferreya: Does this include state rental cars?

Luigi: Not sure about that.

Senator: According to state law smoking is allowed within 30 ft. You are putting in 75 ft. Why?

Luigi: That is what Emory University put into place and what I consider to be reasonable.

Senator: I agree with you that we are in violation of state law and I'm in favor of a smoke-free campus. But I think it is difficult to implement the 75 ft distance. I think you have precedence for 25 or 30 ft, but not 75 ft.

Chip Delzell: I suggest including the state law as an appendix or footnote.

First reading of:

Faculty Senate Resolution 11-09
“Resolution to Declare the Campus to be Tobacco-Free/Smoke-Free and to
Establish a Task Force for this Purpose”

Sponsored by Senator Michael Russo, Senator Stephanie Braunstein, Dr. Judith L. Sylvester, General Librarian JoAnn Henson, and the Student Health Center Administration

Whereas, the Surgeon General of the United States, in 1964, clearly established a direct link between cigarette smoking and its harmful effects on human health; and

Whereas, twenty-nine Surgeon General's reports since 1964 have confirmed and strengthened the Surgeon General's original conclusion; and

Whereas, according to the Surgeon General, cigarettes kill one thousand people every day in the United States; and

Whereas, the Surgeon General's report of 2006 concluded that there is no risk-free level of exposure to second-hand smoke; and

Whereas, the Surgeon General's report of 2010 validates and enlarges the conclusion of the 2006 report by detailing the mechanisms by which the toxins in cigarette smoke act against the body's systems, and

Whereas, the Surgeon General's 2010 report identifies and explains the *immediate* cardio-vascular effects of exposure to even a small amount of tobacco smoke, and

Whereas, the 1986 report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General on the health consequences of using smokeless tobacco declares that smokeless tobacco “is not a safe substitute for smoking cigarettes,” and

Whereas, the Surgeon General's 1994 report on preventing tobacco use among young people concluded that “Adolescent smokeless tobacco users are more likely than nonusers to become cigarette smokers,” and

Whereas, approximately 500 college and university campuses in the United States are now 100% tobacco-free, including the University of Florida (Gainesville), the University of Kentucky (Lexington), the University of Arkansas (Fayetteville), and the University of South Carolina (Upstate); and

Whereas, in Louisiana, the Louisiana University Health Sciences Center in Shreveport, Nicholls State University, Our Lady of the Lake College, and Louisiana Delta College are 100% tobacco-free;

Therefore, be it resolved that the campus of Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College shall be declared tobacco-free and smoke-free; and

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate of Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College calls upon the university administration to establish a task force to make ours a tobacco-free/smoke-free campus by the beginning of the 2012/2013 academic year.

Accepted to debate.

Q&A Summary:

Statement by Runa Bakshi (LSU student): There are many students on campus that suffer from asthma and I've personally experienced problems with cigarette smoke.

George Stanley: Why not just ban smoking and skip the task force? I'm all in favor of no smoking on campus.

Judith Sylvester: You just can't do this overnight. We believe that there needs to be a process to consider all aspects and get staff, student, and faculty input and opinions on this. Thus, our proposal of a task force to study this and build as much internal support as possible. Other LSU campuses are studying this as well.

Joan King: Do they have some way of enforcing it at other universities?

Judith Sylvester: We have been smoke-free for many years indoors with no enforcement. I think we need to do this to change the culture. But that is a good question on how to enforce no smoking.

Bruce Eilts: Shouldn't you also include a whereas stating the dangers of tobacco-products including chew and dip. You focus mostly on smoking but then put tobacco-free and smoke-free in the one therefore.

Judith Sylvester: Second-hand smoke is our main concern and its effects on people nearby. What we really want is a task force to study this and make a policy.

Kevin: Please pass on any suggestions that you have to the authors so we can move on with the other resolutions.

First reading of:

**Faculty Senate Resolution 11–10
“On the Working Conditions of Instructors”**

Sponsored by Senator Patrick McGee in consultation with Professors Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Anna Nardo, Barbara Heifferon, and the Executive Committee of the Department of English

Whereas the Department of English provides two required courses for all LSU undergraduates, both of which, **given the financial resources of the university**, are possible to deliver only by employing Instructors;

Whereas the Department of English supports efforts to improve retention and graduation rates for LSU undergraduates, which may be endangered by the release of Instructors;

Whereas for the third consecutive semester, LSU has delivered notices of termination to Instructors;

Whereas term-to-term employment leaves the Department vulnerable to the loss of some of its most-experienced Instructors;

Whereas such an employment practice makes it difficult to replace these losses with comparable candidates;

Whereas the Department of English has long supported Instructors with full-time positions, adequate office arrangements, meaningful career reviews, travel to professional meetings, and some degree of job security;

Whereas many English Instructors have taught at LSU for over twenty years;

Whereas the Modern Language Association and the Coalition for the Academic Workforce have deplored “policies based on outdated assumptions that non-tenure-track faculty members are short-term employees who will make up no more than a small proportion of the faculty” (MLA Issue Brief: The Academic Workforce);

Whereas Section 2-7 of the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors states clearly that Instructors “after two or more years of service” on campus require notice of termination at least a year before the expiration of an appointment¹;

Whereas the Department of English has unanimously approved a petition to award three-year, rolling contracts to Instructors who have passed a rigorous sixth-year review, **and in this petition has requested a revision of Section 2-7 of the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors to include an exception clause for Instructors in English modeled on the clause concerning the Pennington Biomedical Research Center²;**

And whereas other departments on this campus that hire Instructors to teach large numbers of students in required basic courses face a situation similar to that of the Department of English;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate expresses its objection to the practice of semester-by-semester, rolling termination notices as **violating the spirit of Section 2-7 of the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors and as counter to the pedagogical mission of the university as well as the academic well-being of**

students. **The Faculty Senate hereby expresses its support for the petition of the Department of English on three-year rolling contracts for senior Instructors, and** calls on the university administration to create appropriate professional working conditions, including a reasonable degree of job security, for its Instructors **in every program**, possibly modeled on the current petition of the Department of English.

Footnotes:

Here is the relevant passage from the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors:

- ¹ When an employee, other than an Associate, is not to be reappointed, written notice to the employee will ordinarily be provided in accordance with the following schedule:
1. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of the year; or, if an initial one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
 2. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if an initial two-year appointment terminates during the academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
 3. At least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years service on that campus.
 4. When an Associate is not reappointed, the Associate shall be given written notice of termination no less than ninety (90) days prior to the expiration of the employment contract.

² **Here are the relevant passages from the petition dated April 20, 2010:**

In the following specifications regarding rolling contracts, we are following models adopted by the Pennington Biomedical Research Center (See Section 2-7 of the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors), and under consideration by the LSU School of Veterinary Medicine:

Instructors in the Department of English do not acquire tenure through the passage of time. Upon individual recommendation and approval by the President, Instructors who have passed their sixth-year review may receive three-year rolling contracts, i.e., they may be appointed for terms of three years. Instructors with rolling contracts are reviewed annually and reappointments are for three-year terms. A recommendation not to reappoint is with a three-year contract. The Instructor will be notified of a decision not to renew the appointment at least three years before the end of the appointment. Instructors with rolling contracts or on terminal appointments may be terminated for cause at any time with due process.

In developing English Department Instructor policies and the above recommendation, we have consulted both the Board of Supervisors Regulations and PM-23.

Section 2-7 of the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors states, "Those who rank as Associate or Instructor shall be appointed for a specified term and shall not be considered for indeterminate tenure; provided, however, Associates and Instructors hired for an initial term greater than two years may be terminated at the end of the first year if given notice during the first nine months of that year. Otherwise, the provisions of Section 2-7(1)-(4) shall apply."

PM-23, II.B, says "An appointment as an Instructor will be for a specified term, ordinarily no more than one year" (p. 4). "Faculty panel reviews are required as part of the procedure for reappointment decisions in which the term will be for a period longer than one year. . . . The length of reappointment shall be consistent with Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors" (p. 22).

Both these documents assume that Instructors may hold terms longer than one year.

Accepted and moved to debate.

Q&A Summary:

Pratul: You will have to change the Board (system) regulations to make this effective. Perhaps this should be further resolved to include changes to the appropriate board regulations.

Patrick: I'd be happy to include any suggestions you have.

Ken: I have some issues with your first "Whereas" where you state that it is only possible to deliver these classes via instructors. I'd like to see you change the wording to make it clear that there are economic reasons to use instructors for these classes instead of tenure-track faculty.

Patrick: OK

First Reading of:

Faculty Senate Resolution 11-11
"Call to Support and Join LSUnited"
Sponsored by Senator Patrick McGee

Whereas LSU has suffered financial setbacks since 2008 that have dramatically damaged its morale and the intellectual climate here for research, teaching, and learning;

Whereas the Louisiana legislative bodies have cut critical taxes and failed to propose new ones that support higher education without proposing or permitting adequate alternative means of funding, particularly at LSU as the state's flagship university;

Whereas in the most recent statistics on Gross State Product from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Louisiana ranks 23rd in the country¹; and at most flagship universities in states that rank below Louisiana in GSP, including Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, and Wyoming, faculties have higher average compensation (salary and benefits) than the LSU faculty, according to AAUP figures for 2009-2010;

Whereas the Chancellor has been forced by the economic and political circumstances in this state to support unilateral actions of the LSU administration in order to cut the budget of LSU, and has had to seek and endorse private solutions to the university's financial problems;

Whereas as a result of this crisis, termination notices are being extended from term-to-term to critical though untenured LSU faculty members, many of whom have either resigned or are seeking employment elsewhere;

Whereas students suffer from this crisis either directly through the loss of teachers and programs or indirectly through the instability of the faculty and staff of this university;

Whereas collective bargaining is a democratic practice that has played and continues to play a historical role in improving the conditions of labor, both intellectual and physical, in this country and elsewhere;

Whereas unionized research university faculties usually receive higher overall compensation by comparison with the LSU faculty²;

Whereas unionized faculties can speak with one voice to influence the educational agenda in their states;

Whereas unionized faculties can negotiate collective bargaining contracts that better protect faculty rights and limit managerial discretion through the construction of formal rules and procedures;

Whereas the Faculty Senate appointed the Ad-Hoc Committee on Bargaining and Representation, which led to the formation of LSUnited, the emerging LSU faculty union affiliated with the Louisiana Association of Educators and the National Education Association;

Whereas the general goals of LSUnited are: 1) to enhance job security, 2) to seek adequate and consistent compensation, 3) to improve and protect faculty benefits, 4) to create a rational work environment, and 5) to give the faculty a greater voice on the issues that these goals address;

And whereas the success and effectiveness of LSUnited depends on the free involvement of large numbers of faculty from different backgrounds and fields, who can determine the specific goals of the organization through democratic procedures and elect a leadership that will work with the faculty to achieve those goals;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate as a body hereby expresses its support for LSUnited and calls on its own members and their constituencies in the colleges, schools, and departments on this campus to join LSUnited in the struggle to improve the working conditions of the LSU faculty and the overall quality of this university.

-
- 1) See "Gross Domestic Product by State in Current Dollars 2008" on the site of the U.S. Census Bureau. The source of this table is the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) at the U.S. Department of Commerce. Another table at BEA ranks Louisiana 23rd in 2009 in "Chained (2005) Dollars" for "Per Capita Real GDP."
 - 2) For example, University of California—Santa Cruz by 30.5%, University of Connecticut by 27.8%, University of Delaware by 29.9%, University of Florida by 10.1%, University of Hawaii—Manoa by 21.3%, University of Massachusetts—Amherst by 7.9%, Wayne State University by 3.2%, Rutgers University—New Brunswick by 36.4%, State University of New York—Albany by 21.4%, University of Cincinnati by 5%, University of Rhode Island by 17.2%, and University of Vermont by 2.1%.

Accepted into debate.

Q&A Summary:

Hugh Buckingham: Seems like there are two themes in this resolution, the economic situation in our state and our administrators.

Patrick: I don't think our administrators have effectively represented our faculty. But this resolution is not meant to criticize them specifically.

Paolo Chirumbolo: How many numbers does LSUnited have so far?

Kevin: Just over 100

Adjournment at 5:45 PM