

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, April 18, 2017
Student Senate Room, LSU Student Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

1. Kevin L. Cope (President, English)
2. Ken McMillin (Vice-President, Animal Science)
3. Bill Daly (Past President, Chemistry)
4. Joan King (Secretary, Food Science)
5. Lillian-Bridwell Bowles (Member-at-Large, English)
6. Mandi Lopez (Member-at-Large, Vet Science)
7. Paul Hrycaj (Member-at-Large, Libraries)

Parliamentarian: Louay Mohammed

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

1	X	William Adkins (Math/Sci)	23	X	David Donze (Biological Sciences/Sci)	45	X	Steven Pomarico (Biological Sci/Sci)
2	X	Fakhri Al-Bagdadi (Comp. Biomed Sci/Vet)	24	P	Brooks Ellwood (Geol and Geophys/Sci)	46	X	Laura Riggs (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet Sci)
3	X	Austin Allen (Landscape Arch./AD)	25		Kenny Fasching-Vamer (Education/HSE)	47	X	Tracey Rizzuto (SHREWD/HSE)
4	P	Paul Anderson (Foreign Language Lit./HSS)	26	X	Mette Garde (Physics/Sci)	48		Laurel Romeo (TAM/Ag)
5		Frank Anselmo (French/HSS)	27	P	Angeletta Gourdine (English/HSS)	49		Christopher Rovee (English/HSS)
6		Paula Arai (Philosophy & Relig Studies/HSS)	28		Gregory Griffin (Chem Eng/Eng)	50	A	Michael Russo (LSU Libraries/HSS)
7		Christopher Austin (Biological Sci/Sci)	29	X	Gundela Hachmann (Foreign Lang Lit./HHS)	51	X	Carlos Slawson (Finance/Bus)
8		Emily Beasley (Kinesiology/HSE)	30		Aixin Hou (Environ. Studies/Coast and Envir.)	52	X	Daniel Sheehy (Physics Astro/Sci)
9	A	Brett Boutwell (Music/Music & Drama Arts)	31	X	Paul Hrycaj (LSU Libraries/HSS)	53		Alan Sikes (Theater/Music Dramatic Arts)
10	X	Lillian Bridwell-Bowles (English/HSS)	32	A	Yongick Jeong (Mass Comm/Mass Comm)	54	X	Andrew Sluyter (Geography/HSS)
11		Konstantin Busch (EE & Comp Sci/Eng)	33	X	Lisa Johnson (Kinesiology/HSS)	55	X	Kevin Smith (Chemistry/Sci)
12		Areendam Chanda (Economics/Bus)	34	X	Brendan Karch (History/HSS)	56		Arash Dahi Taleghami (Petro Eng/Eng)
13		Joseph Clare (Political Sci/HSS)	35	X	Ingeborg Langohr (Pathbio Sci/Vet Med)	57	X	Sabrina Taylor (RNR/Ag)
14		Jon Cogburn (Philosophy Rel Stud./HSS)	36		Keri Larson (Inform Sys Decision Sci/Bus)	58		David Terry (Comm Stud/HSS)
15		Christine Corcos (Law/Law Center)	37	X	Catherine Lemieux (Social Work/HSE)	59	X	Jose Torres (Sociology/HSS)
16		Belinda Davis (Political Sci/HSS)	38	X	Kanchan Maiti (Coast Stud/Coast and Envir)	60	X	Arend Van Gemmert (Kinesiology/HSE)
17		Jeff Davis (Entymology/Ag)	39		Alison McFarland (Music/Music and DA)	61	X	Dottie Vaughn (Math/Sci)
18	X	Fabio Del Piero (Pathobiol Sci/Vet Med)	40		Jean McGuire (Management/Bus)	62	X	Muhammed Wahab (Mech Ind Eng/Eng)
19	X	Charles Delzell (Math/Sci)	41	X	Ken McMillin (Animal Sci/Ag)	63		Gregory Watson (Architecture/AD)
20	X	Margaret Denny (Education/HSE)	42	X	Louay Mohammed (Civil Environ Eng/Eng)	64		John Westra (AgEcon/Ag)
21	X	John Devlin (Law/Law Center)	43		Evgueni Nestrov (Chemistry/Sci)	65		Hsiao-Chun Wu (Elect Eng Comp Sc/Eng)
22		Cyndi DiCarlo (Education/HSE)	44		Jim Ottea (Entomology/Agri)	66	X	Yejun Wu (Library Information Sci/LHSE)

Guests:

Jane Cassidy	Ann Jolissaint	Robert Doolos	Ryan Landry	Dana Hollie
Stephen Beck	Clint Wilson	Damon Andrew	Arthur Penn	Brian Ainsworth
Matt Lee	Andrea Ballinger			

Consideration of the Minutes from March 22, 2017

Moved by Sabrina Taylor and seconded by Fakhri Al-Bagdadi.
 Approved unanimously with potential corrections.

President's Report

1. One great concern is the non-invoicing of grant providers. There are some grants for which invoices have not been submitted for up to nine months now. This apparently bringing some research project to a stand still. We brought this to the attention of the Provost and Chief Financial Officer who has the immediately administrative responsibility for it. We have been assured that some sort of solution is in process. This is a serious economic matter.
2. There is a follow up underway with Chief Financial Officer (CFO) on parental leave policy. He is not exactly sure where that stands. That was recommended under resolution 16-08 which was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate a few months ago. There is considerable faculty interest in advancing that resolution and more importantly the concessions that it will bring quickly.
3. The third item in the list of items in progress is an update concerning efforts to enforce the nonsmoking policy. We have addressed this issue. It is unfortunate that although Chief Rabelais and Lt. Scott who met with us a few months ago are trying hard, the problem is not ceasing. We have asked the Provost and CFO to brainstorm and come up with some other means of enforcement.

Ken McMillin discovered that in fact there is a law prohibiting smoking within 25 feet of buildings and therefore the claim that this cannot be enforced because it is not a law is not altogether true. This is a work in progress.

4. A little more progress has been made on the forum on the captive tiger and the use of animals in iconic and totemic ways on the campus. We have received a list of candidate speakers from various members of the senate that were presented to the Provost and been approved. Many of those speakers have been contacted to find when they might be available. Originally we planned to hold the forum on April 27, but no one on the speakers list was available. With regret we have transferred the forum to the beginning of fall. It will happen, it is funded and the organizational structure is in place. He is receiving texts and emails from Emily Hartfield in the Office of Academic Affairs who has been put on this task.
5. We have asked the provost to seek from the upper administration that is from the president, some clarification about what he plans to do regarding the resolution concerning the Professor Watchlist. A meeting or two ago we passed a resolution asking the top level of administration to make a statement suggesting the targeting of faculty in this way with impromptu websites and social media was not a good thing and that the university stood behind its faculty. Unfortunately he cannot say exactly who gave him the information but let's say it was from the highest authority. The response is that the resolution is simply going to be ignored. In the ten years he has not covered up things like this and he thinks it is important for the faculty to understand that occasionally this is what has happened. This matter protecting the faculty and standing up for academic freedom is a crucial function of the university and its administration. It is to him startling that the very top of the university would decide not to act on such a resolution, but never the less that is the case. If you are contacted by people seeking an evaluation by search firms wanting to know where somebody else might go for a job that is the sort of thing to remember. We had a similar response with the resolution concerning immigration policy. Again he finds this shocking, never the less he thinks the faculty ought to know we are taking a stand still approach to these crucial issues that most universities choose to make one of their principle areas of concern.
6. We have a bit of progress on academic calendar reform. About ten years ago when the Bayou Country Super Fest began the academic calendar began gravitating backwards for a variety of reasons, to make room for this festival, to make time between the intersessions and to accomplish other administrative necessities. It has always been the position of the Faculty Senate ratified a number of times that the academic calendar should not be governed a) by a country music festival and b) by the ghost of the country music festival. The Provost and Vice Provost Matt Lee are quite sympathetic to this issue and are at this moment working on the academic calendar reform with an eye towards gravitating it a bit further in the future so we will be starting at the end of August and concluding at the beginning of December, starting up after the Martin Luther King holiday, concluding in the first week of May as was the case for so many years.
7. The Alexandria Summit meeting will take place on April 29. Anyone interested in faculty governance and educational policy statewide is welcome to attend. It will feature Andria Ballenger our Chief Technology Officer talking about the future of cross system, cross campus statewide computing for academic purposes, as well as many another other presentations by many another colleague.

Q&A Summary:

None.

Presentation by Vice-Provost Jane Cassidy regarding the revision of PS-36 in its various versions

About three years ago they were getting calls from departments around promotion and tenure time about clarification of policy, things that were contradictory in the policy and things that were difficult to find in the policy. It had been about 15 years since the policy had been revised. They decided to do a wholesale revision of PS-36 instead of little pieces here and there. Eighteen months ago they pulled together a group that had faculty and administrators, people who represent as many different factions on campus who would be dealing with the policy. The committee was composed of Daman Andreu, the Dean of College of Human Sciences and Education; Steve Beck, Associate Vice President of the Office of Research and Economic Development who brings the research perspective in; Brooks Elward as the representative from Faculty Senate, assigned by Kevin Cope and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and is a professor in geology and geophysics; Dana Holly, Associate Professor from Accounting; Ann Joe, Senior Instructor from Biology; Leanne Lackridge, Professor of Law; Janet McDonald, Professor from Psychology who had been a former Dean; Arthur Penn from CBS in the Vet School who was chair of the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee; Mimi Singer Lee from Human Resources Management and Clint Wilson from Civil and Environmental Engineering. They have been meeting for a long time. They have draft 3.0 which is close to finished. They have out the past six weeks presenting the substantive changes. They met with the Deans, Associate Deans, all of the department chairs; they met with the Graduate Council, Academic Affairs, the Office of Research and Economic Development; and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. They hope to have the 3.0 version finished in time to broadcast it this semester. They would like to have faculty if they are interested to take a look at it and see what things are clear and what things are not clear. One of the things they came up with after doing all of this is that when you hear the changes they present today which they consider substantial changes, there really are not that many and not many that are controversial. They wanted to get rid of inconsistencies, making sure the language was correct, making sure the titles were correct for different people, whose decision it was and who signed off on things, the organization of the policy that didn't change the policy so much but made it clearer. A handout was provided of 14 substantive changes.

Clint Wilson

They tried to clear up procedural aspects that were fuzzy or left up to too much interpretation or resulted in a lot of phone calls and sometimes different answers depending on who you call. They wanted to make sure the language was consistent in terms of definitions in all sections. The section on academic freedom had already been drafted by Faculty Senate Committee and is under review Academic Affairs and will be a stand-alone policy. Number 2, 3 and 4 get into clarifying the voting rules such as majority votes. They added a few other additional items regarding unless the unit by-laws specify that. The wanted to clarify that if a unit had by-laws that is not less restrictive than the policy that that is okay and you just have to be aware of that. Number 5 has more emphasis on the international aspect, the broader student education, and community engagement to ensure they are valued and recognized in the promotion and tenure package. Number 6 goes back

to procedural aspects for hiring a faculty member with tenure has been codified such as who has to vote and who has to have approval. When the draft goes out to the faculty it will be version 3.0 so the document provided today will correspond to the version that goes out. Numbers 7 and 8 go into specifics about joint appointments starting from when the person is hired to make it clear who are the primary and secondary departments and what the expectations are. Part of that is to make sure the persons being hired is clear on what the expectations are. Number 8 is in regard to the secondary department in ensuring that they are involved. Sometimes people get up to the promotion stage and the secondary a department has not really been involved. Number 9 makes sure that for annual reviews of faculty some form of teaching evaluations are mandatory or needs to be conveyed to the faculty member so that every year your teaching effectiveness if being commented on. Number 10 goes to specificity with regard to third year reappointment reviews. It is more of a procedural aspect. There is confusion on the wording for years of service and timing of review. Number 11 goes to departure of the tenure clock to make that clearer to the faculty and unit heads; making sure what this means in every department, when you apply and when it starts. Number 12 language has been made more restrictive for early review. It should be clear in the minds of the people going up for review as to what an early review is because the unit heads and those above need to justify an early review. It gives more examples about what it means to go up early. Number 12 covers what circumstances provide an opportunity to appeal and if you want to appeal the steps are clearer. Number 14 is related to senior instructors in the PS-36NT and providing a little more opportunity for instructors. It provides examples to make it clear for reappointments, contracts and titles.

Q&A Summary:

Arend Van Gemmert

The secondary department in joint appointments, is the appointment is in the same institution or different institutions?

Jane Cassidy

If two different campuses they have a PM on it, for example the AgCenter and Pennington. If they are two departments on campus it covers it.

Arend Van Gemmert

So Senior Instructor, does it include professional practice in number 14?

Jane Cassidy

The professional people have a career path, but instructors did not. Previously an instructor had to be here for 12 years to get Senior Instructor title. Now after one year they can go up for three year contracts. After another 6 years they will go up for Senior Instructor. They have not come up with a title for that intermediate position. There would be a small raise also. The general librarians are like instructors, so they are the same. She apologizes for the lateness of this. They will try to get version 3.0 out to you. There will be the ability to send comments on this. Please let them know if you have questions or if something is not clear.

Clint Wilson

The diversity of the units on the committee allowed them to do a good job with revision. It will also be available online so you can jump to a table of definitions and then back again.

Arend Van Gemmert

The language of early review has been made more restrictive, does that affect people coming from other universities carrying over years to LSU?

Clint Wilson

It refers mainly to people who started at LSU.

Gundela Hachmann

Is it immediately applicable to people going up this year?

Clint Wilson

Deans and department heads have been notified that this will be in effect this fall.

Jane Cassidy

There is so little in here that would affect people going up this year. For the ones who go up early there will have to be flexibility the first year.

Clint Wilson

All the chairs have had the opportunity to see an early draft.

Election of Faculty Senate officers for the 2017-2018 term (Arend Van Gemmert, Chair)

Kevin Cope

Parliamentarian is an appointed position. He thereby reappoints Louay Mohammed as parliamentarian. He would like to recognize Bill Daly who served two years as president, an unknown number of years before that, ten years as Past-President and on the University Planning Committee. He asked for additional nominations for officers from the floor. Officer nominees gave speeches.

Officers Elected:

President: Ken McMillin unanimously elected

Vice-President: Mandi Lopez unanimously elected

Secretary: Joan King unanimously elected

Member-at-Large: Arend Van Gemmert and Gundela Hachmann, Fabio del Piero withdrew his candidacy due to an abundance of good candidates, leaving eight candidates.

Old Business

Second Reading, Resolution 17-03, “Amendments to Article VI of the Louisiana State University Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws”, Sponsored by Arend Van Gemmert, Michael Russo, and Andrew Sluyter

Read by Arend Van Gemmert

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 17-03
Amendments to Article VI of the Louisiana State University
Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws
Sponsored by Arend Van Gemmert, Andrew Sluyter, & Michael Russo

Whereas Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised 11th edition, 2011 states with regard to proxy voting that any questions concerning the correct use of proxies, the extent of the power conferred by a proxy, the duration, revocability, or transferability of proxies, and so forth, must be found in the provisions of the law or bylaws which require or authorize their use¹;

Whereas Riddick's Rules of Procedure, 1991 has a provision for proxy voting, which provision declares that Proxy voting gives the power of attorney to a member to cast the votes for another legal vote holder²;

Whereas the definition for proxy³ is 1) the agency, function, or office of a deputy who acts as a substitute for another or authority, or 2) the power to act for another; thus per definition when a member of the decision-making body, i.e., a faculty senator gives a proxy, the senator delegates the voting power to another member of the faculty senate to vote in the senator's absence;

Whereas faculty senators are foremost faculty members with teaching, research, and service responsibilities which responsibilities may require them to miss one or more faculty senate meetings;

Whereas a replacement as defined in resolution 10-014 and Article VI of the By-Laws of LSU Faculty Senate⁵ may not be readily available to attend a faculty senate meeting to act on behalf of the senator unable to attend;

Whereas Article VI of the By-Laws of the LSU Faculty Senate contained a provision to allow proxy votes before February 18, 2010, but that provision was removed by passage of Resolution 10-01 on said date;

Whereas it is not desirable to give a senator undue voting power as result of proxies, thus giving the senator the capability to form a voting bloc using solely proxies;

Therefore, be it resolved that Article VI of the By-Laws of LSU Faculty Senate, which presently reads:

1. By written notice to the President submitted before the meeting, a member of the Senate may choose another faculty member representing the same college or division as a replacement at that Senate meeting. Such a representative must be eligible for election to the Senate.***
2. Replacement representatives shall be announced by the President at the start of the meeting.

3. If a member of the Senate is absent from the campus for a semester or longer, this position will be taken for that period by the eligible non-elected person who received the next highest number of votes in the last regular election in that college. If there is no person thus qualified, a special election will be held.

4. The seat of a member of the Senate who has been repeatedly absent from Senate meetings can be declared vacant by a three-fourths vote of members of the Senate attending a meeting, if a request for such action has been made in writing by at least five percent of the faculty of the college represented. The motion to remove a member of the Senate shall be voted on at the meeting of the Senate immediately following the request.

5. If for any reason a vacancy occurs, as determined by the Executive Committee, the position will be filled by the eligible nonelected person who received the next highest number of votes during the election of that seat. If there is no such qualified person, then the position will be filled by the eligible nonelected person who received the next highest number of votes in the next most recent regular election in that college. If there is no person thus qualified, a special election will be held.

Be amended to read⁶:

Article VI. Alternate Representation

1. By written notice to the President submitted before the meeting, a member of the Senate may choose another faculty member representing the same college or division as a replacement at the Senate meeting. Such a representative must be eligible for the election to the Senate.***

2. In lieu of choosing a replacement representative, a member of the Senate may, by written notice to the President, give a proxy vote to another member of the Senate not holding another proxy vote (i.e., only one proxy vote per Senator is allowed).

3. Proxies and alternate representatives shall be announced by the President at the start of the meeting, recorded by signature on the sign-in roster, noted in the minutes, and the proxies will be counted during a second call to vote for proxies when the first call to vote was taken orally.

4. If a member of the Senate is absent from campus for a semester or longer, this position will be taken for that period by the eligible nonelected person who received the next highest number of votes in the last regular election in that college. If there is no person thus qualified, a special election will be held.

5. The seat of a member of the Senate who has been repeatedly absent from Senate meetings can be declared vacant by a three-fourths vote of members of the Senate attending a meeting, if a request for such action has been made in writing by at least five percent of the faculty of the college represented. The motion to remove a member of the Senate shall be voted on the meeting of the Senate immediately following the request.

6. If for any reason a vacancy occurs, as determined by the Executive Committee, the position will be filled by the eligible nonelected person who received the next highest number of votes during the election of that seat. If there is no such qualified person, then the position will be filled by the eligible nonelected person who received the next highest number of votes in the next most recent regular election in that college. If there is no person thus qualified, a special election will be held.

¹A “proxy” is a means by which a member who expects to be absent from a meeting authorizes someone else to act in his or her place at the meeting. Proxy voting is not permitted in ordinary deliberative assemblies unless federal, state, or other laws applicable to the society require it, or the bylaws of the organization authorize it, since proxy voting is incompatible with the essential characteristics of a deliberative assembly. As a consequence, the answers to any questions concerning the correct use of proxies, the extent of the power conferred by a proxy, the duration, revocability, or transferability of proxies, and so forth, must be found in the provisions of the law or bylaws which require or authorize their use. [RONR (11th ed.), pp. 428-29.]. Retrieved from <http://www.robertsrules.com/faq.html#10> on 2/23/2017

²Riddick, Floyd M.; Butcher, Miriam H. (1991), Riddick's rules of procedure : a modern guide to faster and more efficient meetings, Lanham, Md.: Madison Books.

³2017 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/proxy> on 2/23/2017

⁴Resolution 10-01, “Amendments to Article VI and Article VII of the LSU Faculty Senate By-Laws”. Adopted February 18, 2010

⁵ LSU Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws, with footnotes as amended through October 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.lsu.edu/senate/FSCB.pdf> on 2/23/2017

⁶The new inserted text has been underlined.

Q&A Summary:

None.

Vote of resolution: Unanimously approved.

Second Reading, Resolution 17-04, “A Surcharge on Football Tickets to Aid Conservation Efforts”, Introduced at the request of James Wilkins

Read by James Wilkins

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 17-04
A Surcharge on Football Tickets to Aid Tiger Conservation Efforts
Introduced at the request of James Wilkins

Whereas keeping a live Bengal Tiger mascot has been an LSU tradition for eighty-four years;

Whereas the LSU community has derived many benefits and much pleasure from having six live tiger mascots and seems likely to continue that tradition;

Whereas captivity is not the ideal life for a wild animal;

Whereas there are many who oppose LSU having a live tiger mascot;

Whereas the use of a magnificent wild animal for human amusement carries with it moral responsibilities to treat the animal in the most humane and respectful way possible;

Whereas tigers are critically endangered in the wild;

Whereas the single most important gesture humans can make towards wild animals from which they derive so much benefit is to do everything possible to ensure the survival of their species in the wild;

Whereas helping to ensure the survival of tigers in the wild is a fitting and moral price for keeping a tiger captive for human amusement;

Be it therefore resolved that a one dollar surcharge be levied on every ticket sold for LSU football games in Tiger Stadium, to be donated directly to the World Wildlife Fund and used exclusively for the conservation of tigers in the wild.

Q&A Summary:

James Wilkins

Someone suggested that Louisiana Law regarding cruelty to animals is somehow triggered or implicated due to this resolution. He is not suggesting that the tiger is being treated in any way cruelly from any physical standpoint. His physical needs are very well provided for. Dr. Baker is a great man and he is attentive to the tiger’s wellbeing. This is not the point of the resolution. It is about social consciousness and our evolving attitudes towards animals in the environment. Animal cruelty statutes are not relevant at all. One comment was made about tigers having no rights except what we give them. It is a circular argument. It wasn’t long ago that we had the same attitude towards other human beings. Many people now believe that animals have certain rights. We have already decided this tigers has rights, not to be paraded around the LSU football stadium during games, the right not to be displayed so he can withdraw from human interaction to his cage. We recognized that the tiger had a certain amount of autonomy. Dr. Baker told him stories about they made the decision not to force Mike in the trailer to parade him around the football stadium, he got a lot of angry mail. One man seriously suggested this, take Mike out and let him run around in the jungle for 30 days and capture him again and Mike having seen how hard it is in the jungle will want to go into the tiger cage. This resolution is about a much larger issue than our mascot. It’s about a species that is critically endangered. The use of tigers for human purposes creates a market incentive for poaching and for taking those animals out of the environment. Doing this resolution will give the tiger’s captivity a higher purpose. As for the legality of having a surcharge, he did some preliminary research into TAF and LSU how they apply proceeds from tickets sales and the mandatory donations they have for seating. TAF being a nonprofit might have more leeway into how we issue the money and LSU could look at that issue more closely. He believes the details can be worked out and if legislation is

required he would be happy to spear head the effort. As far a passing this resolution, this doesn't have a force of law and is only advisory in nature. It was suggested that donations for voluntary. This is a wishy washy type of a statement. This could be a goal line for LSU and TAF. We could get other SEC schools with tiger mascots to get in on it and we could take it national wide. He believes the fans need to help pay for it. Someone else objected to the WWF. He is open to other ideas on how to use the money. He is not convinced they are a bad actor. He is open to other suggestions. He just wants to make sure the money gets to the right place.

Gundela Hachmann

You said you are open to alternatives. Would be open to removing WWF and replace it with language such as 'to an appropriate agency that helps to protect tigers in the wild'?

James Wilkins

He would be open to that as long as we ensure it does get to the right place.

Kevin Cope

If you want to present that as a friendly amendment we would need to vote on it.

Gundela Hachmann

She would like to offer that as a friendly amendment.

Amendment seconded.

Kevin Cope

Please rephrase your amendment.

Gundela Hachmann

'an appropriate agency that protects tigers in the wild'

Vote of amendment: Motion passes with one abstention.

John Devlin

For a second friendly amendment, he thinks James came to a similar conclusion. On the last paragraph cross out the words 'be levied' and change it to 'resolves that TAF levies' just to make it clear we are trying to make a state institution do this.

James Wilkins

That would be okay but I haven't really researched what LSU is allowed to do with their money that they receive through donations for the seat.

Sabrina Taylor

Can we use a term more like the Foundation, the university foundation?

John Devlin

He hasn't done research on that. Adrienne Wood, a student of mine said she was working with you on this.

James Wilkin

Yes. He also did talk to a former member of TAF. Limiting it to just TAF is not good.

John Devlin

His understanding is that it can't be a ticket office; it has to be a non state organization. Is that correct?

James Wilkins

There are two pots of money, one for the tickets and they have a mandatory donation for each ticket also. That donation money is what he doesn't know what the leeway is. It is about who does the collecting and distributing.

John Devlin

His issue is a different one, it is not what pot it comes out of but rather who does the collecting and the distributing. His understanding is that cannot be LSU it has to be something other than. Did Adrienne tell you something different?

James Wilkins

She didn't tell me that. The person he spoke to with TAF didn't say that either, so he not exactly sure. That is something we need to look into. We can amend it to say LSU and/or TAF.

Sabrina Taylor

Right now it is vague and doesn't actually say LSU and maybe we should keep it vague.

Arend Van Gemmert

All of these questions bring up that it is premature to vote on this. He thinks this should be tabled until we need know what is legal, what is not legal, what we can do, where it's going, etc. At the moment he doesn't think we can vote on this deal. He makes a motion to table this until such a time that we know the legality and when we figure out where the money will be going.

Kevin Cope

It there a second.

Seconded by Andrew Sluyter.

Vote on tabling: passed with some nays.

New Business

First Reading, Resolution 17-05, "Tuition Remission and Fee Reduction for LSU Faculty Children", Introduced at the request of the Faculty Senate Benefits Advisory Committee

Read by Sabrina Taylor

FACULTY RESOLUTION 17-05 TUITION REDUCTION AND FEE REMISSION FOR LSU FACULTY CHILDREN

Introduced at the request of the Benefits Advisory Committee

Whereas the merit-based TOPS is unavailable to the children of incoming faculty who have not graduated from a Louisiana high school;

Whereas the cost of an LSU education for faculty children has increased because TOPS now covers only 62-69% of tuition¹ and fees are high²;

Whereas seven of LSU's thirteen Flagship Peer institutions offer 50% tuition reduction to faculty children, and most state universities in the South do the same³;

Whereas the new merit-based Louisiana Tiger Legacy Scholarships require a minimum ACT composite score of 24, and thus they are unavailable to many faculty children⁴;

Whereas the Tiger Legacy Scholarships offer only \$500-1000 (depending on ACT score), which is far too little to offset the recent decrease in TOPS (approximately \$3000); Whereas the recruitment and retention of faculty is crucial to LSU and faculty flight is a growing problem for the University;

Whereas twenty-seven of thirty-six LSU deans, chairs, and directors said in a recent poll that a new tuition benefit and a full remission of fees for faculty children would help "very much" or "some" in the recruitment and/or retention of faculty in their units⁵;

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends a new benefit for faculty children enrolled at LSU: they should receive (1) a 50% tuition reduction or TOPS, whichever is greater; (2) a full remission of fees; and (3) the merit-based Louisiana Tiger Legacy Scholarships.

¹ TOPS covered 100% of tuition in 2015-16. Tuition in 2016-17 was \$8046, and TOPS paid \$5032-5571.

² Fees at LSU in 2016-17 are \$2768. Fees are significantly lower at nine of the thirteen Flagship Peer institutions and at most of the state universities in the South. See Appendix A.

³ See Appendix A.

⁴ Approximately 40% of LSU students have ACT scores less than 24, and the percentage of faculty children with similar ACT composite scores is probably similar.

⁵ See Appendix B for the poll and results. The new tuition benefit in the poll was what this resolution proposes below. Twenty respondents answered "very much"; seven answered "some"; nine answered "only a little."

Appendix A to Resolution 17–05: Reduced Tuition/Fees for Dependents of Faculty, 2016-17

<u>LSU</u>	<u>Benefit</u>	<u>Annual Tuition + Fees</u>
	\$500-1000 annually ⁶	\$8046 + 2768 = \$10,814 ⁷
<u>Flagship Peer Group</u>		
University of Maryland	100% of tuition ⁸	\$8314 + 1866 = \$10180
Purdue University	53.9% of tuition ⁹	\$9208 + 894 = \$10,002
University of Tennessee	50% of tuition	\$10914 + 1810 = \$12,724
University of Arkansas	50% of tuition	\$7204 + 1615 = \$8820
Mississippi State University	50% of tuition ¹⁰	\$7780 (no fees)
University of Illinois	50% of tuition ¹¹	\$12,036 + \$3662 = \$15,698 ¹²
University of Nebraska	50% of tuition	\$6750 + 3841 = \$10,59113
Colorado State University	50% of tuition	\$8716 + 2334 = \$11,05014
Texas A&M University	100% of fees ca.	\$8000 + 2000 = \$10,000
Virginia Tech University	\$400-1000 one time	\$10786 + 2076 = \$12852 ¹⁵
N. C. State University	\$1000 annually	\$6406 + 2474 = \$8880
University of Georgia	no benefit	\$9364 + 2270 = \$11,634
Iowa State University	no benefit	\$7098 + 1121 = \$8219 ¹⁶
<u>Other Universities</u>		
University of Alabama	50% of tuition ¹⁷	\$11,270 ¹⁸
Auburn University	50% of tuition	\$10,696 ¹⁹ , \$11,216, \$11496, \$15016 ²⁰
University of Missouri	50% of tuition ²¹	\$10,716 (no fees)
University of Mississippi	50% of tuition	\$7644 + 100 = \$7744
University of Kentucky	50% of tuition ²²	\$10665 + 655 = \$11,320
University of Florida	100% of tuition/fees ²³	\$8951 + 3808 = \$12,762
Florida State University	\$500	\$9280 + 3734 = \$13,014
University of South Carolina	no benefit	\$11,482 ²⁴
Clemson University	no benefit	\$13,418 + 900 = \$14,318
University of Texas-Austin	no benefit	\$9626-11,060 ²⁵

⁶ The new Louisiana Tiger Legacy Scholarship Program annually awards \$500 for a 24-25 ACT score; \$750 for a 26-27 ACT score; \$1000 for a 28 or above ACT score.

⁷ TOPS pays 67.43% of the annual tuition in 2016-17, which amounts to \$5031.

⁸ This benefit is for the spouse and dependent children of employees who have worked two or more years.

⁹ In addition to this benefit, a partial remission of fees is given to children of staff members who are employed at least half-time for a period of time expected to continue more than one year on a recurring academic or fiscal year.

¹⁰ If both parents are employees of MSU, 100% of tuition is reduced.

¹¹ This benefit is for children of faculty who have 50% or greater employment over a minimum of 7 years at one of the Illinois senior public universities. The 7 years need not be consecutive.

¹² Higher tuition (\$17,040) is charged for Engineering, Chemistry, and Life Science majors.

¹³ Higher tuition is charged for the Business College (\$8400) and College of Engineering (\$9690). The annual fees include \$2094 for health insurance.

¹⁴ For 15 hours, tuition is actually \$5483 per semester, but the College Opportunity Fund (state tax dollars) pays \$1125 in tuition.

¹⁵ The benefit is given to children of university employees who are freshmen or new transfer students.

¹⁶ Some majors have higher tuition, e.g., Architecture (\$8380), Business (\$8852 in junior and senior years), Engineering (\$9410 in junior and senior years).

¹⁷ This benefit is given to children of faculty and staff with at least 6 months of employment.

¹⁸ There are few or no fees at Alabama.

¹⁹ The fees at Auburn are small, maybe 0.

²⁰ The higher three figures are respectively for colleges of Business, Engineering, and Architecture.

²¹ This benefit is for spouses and dependent children of employees who have 5 or more years of continuous full-time service immediately prior to the first day of the semester in which the spouse or dependent is enrolled.

²² The percentage reduction depends on the employee's length of service: 10% for one year; 20% for 2 years; 30% for 3 years; 40% for 4 years; 50% for 5 or more years.

²³ This benefit is given to 50 children of full-time employees, randomly selected each year.

²⁴ This figure includes a technology fee (perhaps as much as \$500).

²⁵ Tuition varies between colleges. If there are any additional fees, they are small.

Appendix B to Resolution 17–05: Questionnaire for Deans, Chairs, and Directors

The Faculty Senate Benefits Advisory Committee is studying the possibility of a **new faculty benefit** that would make undergraduate education at LSU more affordable for the children of LSU faculty. Faculty children enrolled at LSU would receive the following:

- 50% reduction of tuition or TOPS, whichever is greater
- Full remission of fees
- A Louisiana Tiger Legacy Scholarship

TOPS and the Legacy Scholarships are merit-based. A 50% reduction of tuition and the full remission of fees would not be merit-based, and so all faculty children could receive them.

If this benefit were in place at LSU, would it help your department/school/college to recruit new faculty and retain current faculty?

- (1) Very much.
- (2) Some.
- (3) Only a little.
- (4) Not at all.
- (5) I don’t know.

POLL RESULTS

The questionnaire went to 54 deans, chairs, and directors in the ten colleges at LSU; 36 responded.

- 1 Very much: 20
- 2 Some: 7
- 3 Only a little: 9
- 4 Not at all.

Breakdown of responses according to college:

	Very much	Some	Only a little
H&SS:	5	1	3
Science:	2	1	1
MDA:		1	
Art and Design:	3	1	
Business:	1		1
Engineering:	1		2
HSE:	3		1
Law:		2	
Agriculture:	5	2	1
Coast and Env:	1		

Note: The entire faculty of the School of Veterinarian Medicine was given the questionnaire. All responded, “Very much.”

Moved to discussion.

Q&A Summary:

Arend Van Gemmert

He likes the resolution. Why only children why can't spouses be included?

Sabrina Taylor

They discussed that, some universities do provide spousal tuition benefits. The benefits committee is open to that type of amendment.

Andrew Sluyter

How do you define faculty? Would this include children of teachers at the LSU lab school?

Sabrina Taylor

They define faculty as not including staff members. She is not sure how teachers at the lab school are classified. That also came up for discussion. On the one hand they see this as addressing an issue with faculty retention and they are on the faculty senate committee, there is a separate staff senate committee. There are about 1200 faculty at LSU with an unknown percentage of students who are college age and would choose to go to LSU. They feel that it probably being quite a small number that it has a lower ticket cost to it and it might be easier to pass with the administration. On the other hand they are not adverse to including staff on this if the faculty senate wishes to include them.

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles

Would the resolution include instructors?

Sabrina Taylor

She is not exactly sure how the university classifies employees. Would they fall into a university classification as faculty?

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles

She is not sure, but she would like to be clear that we include instructors in this. She would like argue that their salaries are so low it is the very least we can do. They have an instructor in her department who has been here for decades and is making \$35,000 a year and he cannot send a child to LSU with that current salary. She very strongly requests that we specifically include instructors in this.

Mette Garde

In number three of the therefore be it resolved, it should be called something else if we decide to also give a scholarship. It is normally merit based and for faculty children to not have it merit based it sounds complicated.

Sabrina Taylor

The Louisiana Tiger Legacy Scholarships are merit based and if an LSU faculty member does not meet those requirements under merit standard then they would not receive it.

Judith Sylvester

On another one of those it says receive TOPS, how would they be eligible for TOPS if a faculty person is not from here? Are you saying these would only be available to people that would ordinarily qualify for TOPS because we don't decide who gets TOPS right?

Sabrina Taylor

Faculty could fall into one of two categories, one would be that their children are eligible for TOPS in which case that's referring to they would take whichever is greater, the TOPS or the 50% tuition reduction. Faculty coming in with college age students who wouldn't qualify for TOPS wouldn't be able to get TOPS so therefore they would get the 50% deduction.

Andrew Sluyter

Is this only for undergraduates or is it also for graduate students?

Sabrina Taylor

That is a good point. The committee actually didn't specify that; it could be graduate or undergraduate students, but the committee didn't think of that point.

Andrew Sluyter

It should be specified more what includes faculty members, what degree programs, that sort of thing.

Sabrina Taylor

They scheduled another committee meeting after this meeting so she can report back on your feedback so they can make modifications to the resolution based on your comments.

Charles Delzell

The definition of faculty is well known in all the LSU document like in the Board of Regents, PS-36 and various other statements. I think you can go by reference to that rather than creating a possibly new and conflicting definition. These one, two and three in the therefore, it says and 3, but he thought she said earlier that it would be 1, 2 or 3. We are mandating that all students get it.

Sabrina Taylor

It would be all three if they qualify for all three but not all students will qualify for all three of these points particularly the Tiger Legacy Scholarships which are merit based. Are you suggesting that it be and/or maybe?

Charles Delzell

He just wants them to clarify what they mean, he has no recommendation. He didn't understand the earlier discussion about the merit based scholarship in number 3, but yet we are mandating that all children should get it.

Sabrina Taylor

We are mandating that all students who qualify would get it.

Charles Delzell

Wouldn't they get it anyway without us mandating it?

Sabrina Taylor

We are only suggesting that they get those all three of those if they qualify. Not all undergraduates will qualify for that.

Charles Delzell

Then why do we have to suggest it? Isn't it automatic? Won't they get it if they apply and meet the requirements?

Sabrina Taylor

I think you don't necessarily get the scholarship if you maybe have TOPS as well, or maybe they want to make the clarification that you could get a 50% tuition reduction and a scholarship, that they are not mutually exclusive.

Charles Delzell

As long as you think about that is all he asks. It looks fine to him with his limited knowledge on the document. That is all he sees. What he would like to know is what would be the broader impact on the budget, presumably a small impact. Once we had the budget person from the university who knows all the numbers and once before we were talking about some benefit of tuition waiver for veterans. We had the discussion many years ago and he right off the top said he could estimate how much effect this would have. Whether it means as slight reduction in hiring of faculty or fewer less frequent raises, something like that might be interesting to know if there is any impact on dollars or you could just look at it purely in isolation and vote yes.

Sabrina Taylor

The problem is we don't have access to the number of how many faculty have college age children that could take advantage of this. I don't know where you get those numbers from.

Andrew Sluyter

Benefits I guess.

Sabrina Taylor

But not all college age students are going to go to LSU.

John Devlin

For number 3 just add the words 'and can be eligible for the merit base'. The deeper question goes to staff. You said you guys thought about it but didn't research it much. It does seem to him that both instructors and staff need this even more than some senior faculty do and also that it's likely to have a much larger budget impact on the university. Is there some way we can request you guys to look into that? They are the folks that need it the most.

Gundela Hachmann

Is there a way that we can make this available to those people who have really low salaries that need this as opposed to giving it to everybody, to that faculty and staff that have better salaries and do not really need it? Can we this available to faculty members that have a certain level of benefits or salary? If we make it available to all faculty and staff up to a certain limit wouldn't that be more effective in terms of helping those who really need it?

John Devlin

If could be phased based on salary level, up to 30%, another point up to 40%, another point up to 50% or something like that?.

Sabrina Taylor

The main point of the resolution was dealing with faculty flight not necessarily based on how much money you are making.

Mandi Lopez

How do other universities do it, is it just across the board?

Sabrina Taylor

They looked at a few peer groups in Appendix A. There those that include staff and spouses, there are others who don't. There are some that provide benefits and other that don't. There are mixed results.

Steve Pomarico

Have you considered the academic ramifications of this at all? Won't it make students in high school work less?

Sabrina Taylor

I can't answer that.

Steve Pomarico

TOPS is in fact a driver for academic performance at high school.

Sabrina Taylor

They are interested in faculty retention and if this is a benefit that is going to improve faculty retention, that to her is more of a secondary issue. I don't know how many students we would bring in that are poor scholars based on doing this, but its hard to imagine it is going to bring down the standards of the whole university.

Steve Pomarico

It is hard to imagine that but he would also be worried that if it impacted a student negatively even if it didn't change the standards at LSU or bring down our overall numbers. If it impacts the student negatively it is not something we should be trying to do.

Sabrina Taylor

We could compare it other universities and see whether their benefit has decreased their standing but there are some pretty highly ranked universities on this list for example Virginia Tech University is on here who offered some tuition benefit to their students, University of Tennessee the same thing.

Judith Sylvester

We should have the same standards on receiving this that regular TOPS students have. It should not just be handed to them without getting any kind of performance out of them. You have to say if they have TOPS for all four years they should be held to the same standard.

Sabrina Taylor

The committee felt this is was issue of faculty retention and faculty flight and this is a benefit to prevent that from happening. If the senate as a whole feels there should be some sort of GPA imposed on this I don't think the committee would be adverse to putting that but she is not sure that would solve the problem of faculty retention.

Judith Sylvester

You have to follow TOPS rules. They would have to meet TOPS standards. The again we don't decide TOPS, that's decided somewhere else. We can't just say well these people have to maintain a certain GPA to maintain TOPS but faculty's kids don't.

Sabrina Taylor

Sometimes in TOPS you would be receiving more than what a 50% tuition waiver would be so there is some benefit to children of faculty who went to a Louisiana high school were qualified to get TOPS they would still get a little bit more money than if they just had a 50% tuition reduction. Other universities provide tuition reductions to children of their faculty members regardless of what their grades are.

Arend Van Gemmert

He is against TOPS. We are attracting faculty from all over the United States and maybe even from overseas and how are we going to compare somebody who had some high school in Nebraska and know that that qualification is exactly the same as what we are doing here in Louisiana. He thinks already in Louisiana it is difficult to compare schools. He is against it and thinks it will not help with retention and recruitment and will follow why he thought this was coming up.

Steve Pomarico

How about something like ACT score?

Arend Van Gemmert

It might be an alternative, I don't know, but definitely not TOPS.

Austin Allen

Faculty could look at it as an investment; by saying I want my children to go here. It goes beyond the question of money in terms of the relationship.

Sabrina Taylor

Do you mean in terms of building the LSU community or something along those lines?

Austin Allen

Yes.

Andrew Sluyter

Do we have any statistics on faculty flight?

Sabrina Taylor

That we may be able to get, it depends on the department. Some departments have more issues than others. We could re-poll the deans and units heads to see what numbers they have seen in the past five years or something like that.

All moved to adjourn at 4:30 pm.