

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
3:00 P.M., Thursday, May 6, 2010
Student Senate Room, LSU Union
Attendance



Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

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

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

Senators present:

1. Philip Adams	2. Fred Aghazadeh	3. John Battista	4. Gabriel Beavers
5. Kathleen Bratton	6. Jennifer Curry	7. Charles Delzell	8. Josh Detre
9. Susan Dumais	10. Bruce Eilts	11. John Fletcher	12. Kristopher Fletcher
13. Craig Freeman	14. Stephen Gaunt	15. Wes Harrison	16. Dominique Homberger
17. Paul Hrycaj	18. Boryung Ju	19. P. Lynn Kennedy	20. Jeremy King
21. Jeff Kuehny	22. Richard Kurtz	23. Ed Laws	24. Joseph Legoria
25. Mandi Lopez	26. Kevin McCarter	27. Patrick McGee	28. Rebecca Owens
29. Erwin Poliakoff	30. Steve Ross	31. Larry Rouse	32. Kresimir Rupnik
33. Michael Russo	34. Cristina Sabliov	35. Frederick Sheldon	36. Joseph Siebenaller
37. George Stanley	38. Dianne Taylor	39. Dottie Vaughn	40. Muhammad Wahab
41. Justin Walsh	42. Sue Weinstein	43. Paul Wilson	44. Yi-jun Xu

Replacements for absent Senators:

Arend Von Gemmert for Wanda Hargroder	Martin Forrest for Dottie Vaughn
Larry Crumbley for Andrea Houston	Fahui Wang for Michael Leitner
Larry Crumbley for Edward Watson	

Represented by Proxy - Not Voting:

Jennifer Curry for Jennifer Jolly	Justin Walsh for Kristi Dykema
Kevin Cope for Joseph Francis	Kevin Cope for Ed Watson
Kevin Cope for Juhan Frank	

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

Mary Catherine Aime (1)	Linda Allen (1)	Brittan Barker (9)	Sue Bartlett (1)
Michael Bowman (2)	Lisa Johnson (1)	Michael Krom (9)	Alison McFarland (4)
Heather McKillop (5)	Evelyn Orman (4)	John Protevi (4)	Kelly Rusch
Edward Song (2)	Gail Sutherland (4)	Phillip Tebbutt (4)	Jeffrey Tiger (3)
Richard White (5)			

Guests Attending Meeting:

Will Hires,	Robert Doolos	Brian Voss
Tom Rodgers, SGA	Emily Landry, SGA	Greg Molchan
Casey Kyser	Prathyusha Aknnui	Dydia Delyser
Sheri Thompson	Robert Newman	Dane Borel
Jacob Most		

Consideration of the Minutes from April 2010

Motion to accept minutes (Stanley; Freeman second) - Passed unanimously with minor corrections.

President's Report

LSU-BR News:

- Thank you to the members of the senate (approximately 1/3) who are moving on at the end of their terms.
- We have received the faculty census from Bob Kuhn so that representation can be apportioned to units. Elections will be held immediately for the 2010-2011 senate.
- Issues have arisen regarding the process for naming a structure in front of the new Alex Box Stadium with regard to the specifications in PS 70 policies for building names. A committee will be asked to revisit PS 70 to offer more specific procedures.
- Grading issues that have arisen recently suggest a need to revisit PS 44 to address a myriad of shortcomings beyond the current controversies. The FSEC will review and suggest revisions to address ongoing and emerging issues such as policies for distance learning, etc.
- Out-of-course faculty evaluations are being introduced in some departments after the third year. This may be incongruent with PS 36. This issue will be discussed with the Provost.
- Michael Russo will present information in future meetings arising from his role as head of the ad hoc committee on bargaining and representation.
- Seating on the first two decks at the PMAC is to be replaced.
- There has been unprecedented cooperation from the Graduate School administration regarding revised guidelines and procedures for Graduate School Council representation. Implementation guidelines have been drawn up and are being reviewed by the FSEC.
- Hector Zapata reported on Lab School issues and admissions policies. Please see the Faculty Senate newsletter for information.

System News:

- Kevin Cope spoke at the University of New Orleans Forum on Higher Education, with good press coverage.

State News:

- House Bill 331 includes a revision of retirement options. It only allows some individuals to return to the TRSL defined benefit plan. Work is in progress to help address more long-term issues. LSU does support the bill (cautiously). We need to contact legislators to correct the impression among some that retirement issues are not of concern to faculty members.
- Sally Clausen has expressed support for faculty representation on the higher education governing board.
- Rusty Jabour is compiling FAQs regarding the Nevers bill (requirements for "portable" associate degree credit toward four year degrees and standardized admissions). His purpose is to make clear that LSU has separate requirements for admission to programs of study than for simple admission to the university.
- A state law has passed regarding admission requirements that apply statewide. The Regents have recognized the need to differentiate flagship requirements.

(Discussion: McGee - Is there still a question of legalities with the Optional Retirement System? Cope: Yes, there are still questions regarding social security policies, level of contribution pass through, etc. McGee - Have legal services been consulted? Cope: The AAUP and AARP are both working on our behalf and other local attorneys are willing to help. We're trying to resolve this without legal action. McGee - Time is a factor. It is in their (TRSL's) interest to prolong this as long as possible.)

Annual report from the Faculty Athletic Representative (Dydia DeLyser)

(See Powerpoint presentation attached to electronic minutes)

- Presentation included summary of the Faculty Athletic Representative's responsibilities.
- Addressed university faculties' role in the NCAA and new roles for representation in the NCAA governance structure, including an increase to 20% faculty representation on councils and cabinets, characterized as "a huge step forward" for faculty voice in athletic policy.
- Reviewed academic integrity measures [academic progress rate (APR) and graduation success rate (GSR)]. Based on 2009 report (inclusive of 2007-2008 data, the latest available), LSU fares well overall, with improvements noted for 2009 scores of lower performing teams such as baseball and women's swimming.
- Discussed student athlete well being, including an overview of policies regarding concussion diagnosis, treatment, and return to play.
- Addressed institutional control policies and procedures related to NCAA rules violations, and described response to previously reported violations in football.

Discussion:

McMillin: What prevents activities during dead week?

DeLyser: Attempts are made to avoid dead week activities. For example, a game in one sport was moved from Wednesday to Tuesday to avoid the dead period. Some weekend games are SEC games (over which the individual institutions have no control). Exam week is not the same everywhere. Every year, one or more schools have to play either during dead week or exam week. SEC games are set three years in advance. Special exemptions are sometimes given.

McMillin: How is an athletic contest more important than a field trip in my lab?

DeLyser: There is no flexibility in the athletic schedule. It was approved by the former chancellor and can't be changed.

Owens: If an athlete leaves for a pro contract, that is different than an academic drop out. Is there a way to account for this in APR scoring? Without a distance learning system, how can they finish?

DeLyser: It is an issue that FARs discuss at length. There are bonus points for those who return and graduate. We reach out to get them to return.

Legoria: Have you considered summer enrollment prior to sports? That can take some pressure off in the fall.

DeLyser: This is the summer academic success program. It's not possible for all, but that's what LSU encourages. That fits the NCAA emphasis. We aim for a 3 1/2 year plan so they can graduate as soon as their sports end.

Adams: I'm not in favor of NCAA sanctions that pull scholarships from kids (in the case of NCAA rules violations) when coaches are making millions. Salary caps should be considered.

DeLyser: The NCAA would support that, but has no power over institutions regarding hiring and compensation. Typically sanctions do disproportionately hurt students rather than coaches.

Walsh: Any word about conferences expanding, TV rights, and compensation for athletes?

DeLyser: The TV money involved is extraordinary. The NCAA has no interest in compensation for students. There is lots of tasty gossip about conference expansion, but nothing more.

Presentation by Will Hires (LSU Libraries) on institutional repositories (IR)

The university has a role in distribution and dissemination of research. This helps others see the institution as a valuable entity. A good repository allows others to benefit from data stored there. It is possible to protect intellectual property rights, copyrights, and so on. Such a repository serves a global audience, connecting LSU to interested scholars, policy makers, etc., worldwide. The value of the LSU brand would increase each time it is accessed. It can go beyond data and include scholarship (faculty and student presentations, publications, etc.). An Institutional Repository represents scholarship of the institution to donors, legislators, policy makers, and so on.

Discussion summary:

Cope: What has to happen to establish an IR?

Hires: Buy in from faculty and support from the provost. Various repositories already exist, including some parts of LOUIS, the Hill digitized newspaper collection, and electronic theses/dissertations. One central IR is better and more visible.

Cope: Would it be appropriate to create an ad hoc committee to study the issue of establishing an IR and make recommendations in support?

Hires: That would be an appropriate way to get discussion going.

Legoria: Can you direct us to a peer school with a good model?

Hires: I can send you some information. There is a website that tracks all IRs - over 1,500 nationwide.

Cope: We'll create a committee.

Old Business

Second reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-05

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

Introduced at the Request of Faculty Athletic Representative Dydia DeLyser

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

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

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

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

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

Paragraph one, reading:

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

shall read instead [new text in bold]:

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

Paragraph four, reading:

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

shall read instead [new text in bold]:

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

Discussion:

Beavers: The previous position included provisions for someone to administer exams for students on the road.

DeLyser: We won’t let any athletic or tutoring staff administers exams. FARs elsewhere can set up proctors. In the past, this has involved very complicated scheduling. There is not a lot of leeway. We do it when we have to. The reason for the resolution is that problems arise all the time. The resolution addresses some of the bigger issues that cause problems.

Staley: I have a problem with the statement "equal opportunity for success." Students are always penalized when they miss class. Grades correlate with attendance. Students will read this and have unrealistic expectations.

Casbergue: I thought that "equal opportunity for *grades*" was intended, not "equal opportunity for *success*."

Walsh: I’m also uncomfortable with the notion of opportunity for success. Students face many hardships on the road.

Fletcher: It’s one thing if you miss a test, but participation can’t be made up. That needs to be reflected on the final grade.

There can’t be equal opportunity for success if experiences are missed.

_____: Is this asking us to define what is a valid absence?

DeLyser: No. PS 22 defines excused absences.

_____: (Described situation of a student who missed classes because of a sick child.)

DeLyser: That would fall under family situations addressed in PS 22. We all know students who manipulate whatever system is in place.

_____: It is already our obligation to determine if an absence is valid. I support this. There are professors who say up front that no excused absences are allowed and think that is fine. Students need options in order to plan.

DeLyser: This is about unplanned absences.

McGee: This resolution adds nothing new. You can't simply say, "No excused absences." The only thing new here is "equal opportunity," and that could turn into a problem down the road. We have rules that are already being abused.

DeLyser: Our point was to clarify, not radically change, PS22. This helps to stop abuses.

McGee: It's one thing to insist we enforce rules already there. This invites appeals in addition (based on the equal opportunity concept).

DeLyser: PS 22 is vague in some ways. This helps to clarify it.

McGee: I'm not sure this clarifies anything. It invites more trouble.

Poliakoff: There's a simple solution. Delete "equal opportunity." I move we amend the resolution to do so. (Freeman second).

Crumbly: Will I have to give a make up (if a student misses a test or exam)?

_____: If a student has an absence, the weight of the exam missed can be added to the final. That's an equal opportunity.

That is valid under PS 22. (Describing policy in Economics)

Crumbly: This applies to small seminars too.

Walsh: I don't think the amendment changes anything.

Fletcher: What is a penalty vs. a consequence?

_____: The way students interpret this is that they should be allowed to make up an exam. They think the approach in Economics *is* a penalty. With large courses, it is not possible to offer multiple make-ups.

DeLyser: The point is not to be specific about how to do this. It's just to encourage fairness.

_____: It already is fair for everyone here.

DeLyser: Well, there are lots of problems.

Ajmera: This resolution makes it worse. PS 22 is already clear. The problem is communication.

DeLyser: We have tried and have modified PS 22. I don't see decreases in problems. We need to sustain those efforts.

Ajmera: This doesn't add anything. Better to leave it as it is. The wording of the resolution is problematic.

Cope: There is a motion to strike "equal opportunity." Vote? (Amendment failed)

Laws: I agree that PS 22 is adequate. "Assist student..." is not a penalty.

Stanley: Call the question.

VOTE: (Vote on Resolution failed)

Second Reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-07

Sunshine on the Composition of Advisory Committees at all Levels of the University

Sponsored by Senators Dominique G. Homberger and Charles Delzell

Whereas PS-36-T, PS-36-NT, PS-109, and the policies of the Graduate School provide for the appointment of various advisory committees and boards whose confidential advice to administrators can have serious consequences for faculty members, and *Whereas* some administrators have refused to disclose the names of the members of such committees and/or boards, on the ground that such bodies are purely advisory in nature, and

Whereas "Star Chambers"¹ have no place in civil society, let alone in a university, and

Whereas, although government executives, such as the U.S. President, may obtain confidential advice, the names of those advisors are nevertheless a matter of public record, and, similarly, although jury deliberations in a trial are secret, the names of the jurors are nevertheless public, and

Whereas Louisiana's Sunshine Laws include within their definition of a "public body" various committees and boards, even if their function is purely advisory²

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that every unit of the University (e.g., departments, colleges, the Graduate School, Academic Affairs, the Chancellor's Office, the offices of the various vice-chancellors, and the LSU System President's Office) post on its website the membership of all advisory bodies (e.g., all boards, councils, commissions, committees, subcommittees, and similar bodies) that report to that unit, with the exception of *ad hoc* committees mentoring or reviewing individual faculty members (e.g., committees related to PS-36-T, PS-36-NT, PS-109 or PS-169), which need be disclosed only to the respective faculty members on request; and

Therefore be it further resolved that policy statements such as PS-36-T, PS-36-NT, PS-109, and the policies of the Graduate School, be revised so as to require disclosure of the membership of the various advisory bodies mentioned in those policies, as provided above; and

Therefore be it further resolved that this resolution does not recommend any change to existing policies on the question of whether, or to whom, the advice or reports of the above advisory bodies should be disclosed.

¹ In modern usage, legal or administrative bodies with strict, arbitrary rulings and secretive membership and proceedings are

sometimes called, metaphorically or poetically, star chambers.—Wikipedia.

2 La. R.S. 42:4.2 “Definitions”: “... ‘Public body’ means village, town, and city governing authorities; parish governing authorities; school boards and boards of levee and port commissioners; boards of publicly operated utilities; planning, zoning, and airport commissions; and *any other state, parish, municipal, or special district boards, commissions, or authorities*, and those of any political subdivision thereof, where such body possesses policy making, *advisory*, or administrative functions, including any *committee or subcommittee* of any of these bodies enumerated in this paragraph.” (Emphasis added.)
La. R.S. 42:4.1: “... the provisions of R.S. 42:4.1 through 10 shall be construed liberally....”

Discussion:

Laws: Membership on "mentoring committees" is only being revealed on request? Mentoring is secret?

Delzell: This just says upon request - it doesn't have to be posted on the web, etc.

Homberger: As things stand now, that information doesn't need to be made public.

Laws: I suggest we strike "to the respective faculty members."

Delzell: "Which need not be disclosed to anyone other than the faculty member?"

Laws: Are these mentoring and evaluation committees a secret?

Beavers: We vote on membership in my department.

Legoria: Is this a problem for post tenure review, or abuse of that process? Maybe I'm paranoid.

Homberger: You're not paranoid at all. There are committees that review faculty members.

Delzell: The Graduate Council uses subcommittees with membership that is kept confidential. The faculty member who is being reviewed ought to know who reviewers are. The mentoring committee is redundant.

Adams: Can you give an example? How is this a problem?

Homberger: The Provost invoked a right not to reveal who her advisors were regarding reorganization of colleges / departments. This is one example. It's not a matter of who gave what advice, but who is doing the advising.

Cope: There is a problem with communication of committee membership. We need a reasonable means of getting that information.

Homberger: People want to know this about their own department committees. It should be on the web - just click and you'll get the information.

Ross: Do I need to revise a web page every time a committee is created?

Homberger: Department web pages are usually maintained.

Ross: We can add a sub page.

Taylor: Are there any friendly amendments?

Delzell: "Need not be disclosed to anyone other than...."

McGee Delete the final clause and add, "Committees governed by PS 36T." Are the concerns you refer to a college level secret?

Delzell: Yes, not just college, also at the provost and graduate school level.

McGee: Just refer to larger concern - faculty member knows who review committee members are.

Homberger: The point is just to make it available on the web.

_____: My concern is putting it on web rather than just making it accessible.

Homberger: The faculty senate website is an example of easily accessible information. That's not always true of department web pages. We are in an information age.

_____: There are practical concerns. What will happen is you'll have old information. That's worse than none.

Homberger: We can't enforce an ideal. It is just a recommendation. Why not? Some people will follow.

Cope: Anything we can do to encourage better web design is a service.

King: You mention colleges. Regarding tenure review processes, are those committees confidential?

Homberger: No, because they are elected.

Laws: I agree. And the wording changes are fine.

VOTE: (Resolution passes with majority vote.)

Second Reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-08

“Establishment of an IT Governance Model”

Introduced at the recommendation of Chief Information Officer Brian Voss

Whereas information technology is an essential component of LSU’s National Flagship Agenda and the Flagship IT Strategy (FITS) was created through the leadership of the LSU campus community, including faculty; and
Whereas the Flagship Information Technology Strategy (FITS) was fully supported by LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 06-11; and
Whereas the implementation of the FITS Recommendation 10, Action Item 1 calls for the establishment of a formal IT

governance model; and

Whereas the existence of a formal IT Governance model is a critical component of further strategic advance of IT at LSU and also its ongoing operational activities, which are of importance to the faculty (and students and staff) of LSU;

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

Discussion Summary:

Voss: A clear system of governance is important as universities undergo external review, but also for a systematic way of vetting proposals.

Wilson: When do you expect to get committee members named?

Voss: I'll work with the FSEC over the summer to identify chairs and then kick off after the start of the fall semester. In the fall, we will need to do midcourse review of the flagship IT strategy. Other than that, a variety of issues arise that the committees can discuss, such as Moodle implementation the past couple of years, and now choosing an e-mail system for faculty/staff. Discussion is needed to see if we continue to house the e-mail structure or move to a free or some other structure. There are issues of personal e-mail (students) vs. institutional record in faculty/staff e-mail. This is bigger than just a technology issue, and needs faculty guidance.

Cope: We have discussed the need for broad representation across disciplines on the committees.

VOTE: (Resolution passes unanimously)

Voss: (Shared information about the Eduroam network in Europe: a system that recognizes other universities' credentials.

Kuehny: Does it allow access to university systems?

Voss: No, just the wireless signal.

Kuehny - LSU requires SSN before allowing students from other states access. This is difficult for distance learning.

Voss: There an effort afoot for "In Common" - a portable credential to address this. LSU is a member. The challenge is making the interface work. We're working on a solving this. Enrollment is a separate issue.

Allen: Can we get more space (storage)?

Voss: The first gig is free; a second gig is \$38/year. Students get 7 gigs free on Google. We are evaluating how to expand this for faculty and staff.

Cope: Faculty appreciate your collaboration and openness.

Voss: We try not to put the "no" in innovation.

Second reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-09 (read by Senator Delzell)

A Faculty Member's Right to Assign Grades Sponsored by Senator Charles Delzell

Whereas the LSU Faculty Handbook declares:

It is the right and responsibility of the instructor to determine and assign the grade for each student who is enrolled in the course beyond the final date for withdrawing. The instructor's assignment of a grade is final, and the grade may not be changed or altered except through the academic appeals procedure, following appropriate investigation.

Whereas the American Association of University Professors' statement, "The Assignment of Course Grades and Student Appeals," declares:

The assessment of student academic performance ..., including the assignment of particular grades, is a faculty responsibility. Recognizing the authority of the instructor of record to evaluate the academic performance of students enrolled in a course he or she is teaching is a direct corollary of the instructor's "freedom in the classroom" that the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure assures. The faculty member offering the course, it follows, should be responsible for the evaluation of student course work and, under normal circumstances, is the sole judge of the grades received by the students in that course.

Whereas Faculty Senate Resolution 03-04, "On Grades and Standards" (introduced by then-Senate Vice-President Carruth

McGehee, and adopted in 2002) declares:

The appropriate officer of each academic unit will take special care to see that all teaching personnel are informed about pertinent policies and expectations with respect to grades, and *supported as they undertake to uphold appropriate standards* [emphasis added].

Whereas PS-44 (“Grades”) declares:

There is no “University curve” or other table of numerical equivalents of letter grades to which a faculty member must adhere.

Whereas the 2008 AAUP report, “The Use and Abuse of Faculty Suspensions,”

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/A/facsup.htm>, declares:

.. Sometimes, as we will show, administrators decline to use the term [“suspension”] and claim that in fact what they are imposing is not a suspension at all...

[I]ncreasingly the Association is dealing with cases that involve partial suspensions, in which the faculty member is blocked from some duties or locations, but not others.... Removal from even a single class can, of course, pose serious complications for the faculty member’s standing as a teacher.

Whereas the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors declare:

The faculty or Faculty Council shall establish curricula, fix standards of instruction, determine requirements for degrees, and *generally determine educational policy*, subject to the authority of the Board [emphasis added].

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate hereby (1) reaffirms the above-quoted passages from Resolution 03-04, PS-44, and the Faculty Handbook, and therefore (2) prohibits the LSU administration from suspending any instructor from teaching any course, or otherwise punishing or disciplining any instructor, on the basis of the grades the instructor gives students, as long as the instructor “assigns grades equitably and consistently in accordance with the standards established by the faculties of the various colleges and schools” (as provided in PS-44); nor may anyone change any grade so assigned (whether it be a final grade or an interim grade on any work during the course), except through the Grade Appeals procedures described in LSU’s General Catalog.

Discussion:

Delzell: This resolution was inspired by the Homberger case, but it is not intended to address that case specifically. A vote for or against this resolution should not be construed as a vote on the merits of that case. We can continue discussion of the Homberger case after the vote if necessary. We should keep the issues separate.

Russo: Let’s just deal with the resolution in our discussion. (Stanley seconds)

Delzell: What about the Homberger case?

Stanley: Later

Delzell: When later?

Cope: It appears sentiment is for consideration of the resolution.

Delzell: There is debate about the proviso regarding PS 44 - as long as the faculty member "assigns grades equitably and consistently..." This is being misconstrued to imply congruency with previous semesters. For a "standard" to be created, one needs to intentionally establish a standard. It can't be based on one faculty member's actions or grade distribution. Standards must be promulgated intentionally and shared legitimately. We may need to clarify this statement in PS 44. We should consider an amendment to deal with this.

Stanley: It's just affirming what's already there.

Delzell: It's a small shot across the bow - "prohibit" is new language.

Batista: It is an affirmation of what is already there.

Ajmera: We can't specify *now* what changes need to be made. Revision of PS 44 is already underway.

Batista: I agree. That is exactly what we need to do.

Walsh: Is it worth waiting for that revision process to conclude?

Cope: We can table this for now.

Walsh: How long?

Cope: Over the summer. PS 44 is not nearly as complicated as PS 36.

Laws: I agree that "prohibit" is new, but the problem remains if administrators interpret the provision as you related.

Delzell: When a committee is appointed, members can be directed to accomplish something specific. It is just guidance that committees can follow or not.

Allen: Can I suggest / move that we table this?

Delzell: Postpone definitely or indefinitely?

Allen: Definitely.

Daly: Until PS44 is revised.

Delzell: If the committee exists, do we need the amendment? Pratul, do you care about your amendment?

Ajmera: I care about fixing PS 44 - however it happens.

Cope: I'm hearing that we should postpone the entire resolution until the September meeting.

_____: "Definite" means next meeting?

Cope: Yes.

Delzell: (Explains difference between tabling and postponing.)

Kuehny: This would be the second postponement.

Kennedy: How much can this go toward discussion of PS 44?

Cope: I don't find any ill will on the part of the administration. They are concerned about flaws in PS 44. It was last revised in 1996. They realize that "mistakes were made."

Kennedy: A postponed resolution may not carry any weight.

Wilson: Once PS 44 is rewritten this resolution will still be the same.

Fletcher: It could change (for example by taking out quotes that may not exist any more in PS 44) to refer to 44 in whichever form.

VOTE: (Majority vote to postpone until PS 44 committee finishes its work.)

Delzell: Move for additional discussion of Homberger case. (Wilson second)

VOTE: 12 Aye, 13 Nay.

New Business

First reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-10 (read by McMillin)

Final Examinations and Grade Assignments Sponsored by Senator Ken McMillin

Whereas the LSU faculty and the university encourage student participation in public service; and
Whereas military obligations such as Louisiana National Guard member activation for the Gulf of Mexico oil spill and other valid reasons for absences from class are clearly defined by university policies (PS-22 Student Absence from Class); and
Whereas it is university policy that final examinations are required in all courses except when inappropriate for an entire course due to its nature and an exception is approved by the appropriate department chair and dean/director (2009-10 General Catalog); and
Whereas final examinations must be given during the published dates for the final examination period, as given in the LSU Registration/Schedule of Classes bulletin (Spring 2010 pages 7-8); and
Whereas it is the right and responsibility of the instructor in a course to determine and assign the grade for each student in the course beyond the final date (April 1, 2010 for Spring 2010) for withdrawing with a W (PS-44 Grades); and
Whereas special consideration can be given to individual students when justified by disability or excused absence (PS-44); and
Whereas the Board of Regents alternate guidelines for assigning grades contradict established University policies;
Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate reasserts the rights of each faculty member to make decisions on grading and grades by cooperating with students unable to complete courses due to valid absences while complying with university regulations regarding awarding of "W" grades in courses, authorization of deans for incomplete grades in courses, requests to change final examination dates, and changing the relative weight of component factors of the final grade for individual students.

Discussion summary:

McMillin: This is in response to the broadcast e-mail regarding Board of Regents guidance for accommodating students in the military.

Delzell: What BOR guidance? How is it at odds with policy?

McMillin: It implies that students can decide how grades should be given; it implies that students can choose from a menu of options. We need to reassert that the BOR has no power to do this.

Stanley: The guidelines seem reasonable. Do you think they aren't?

McMillin: BOR should not be in the business of setting policy.

Doolos: The guidelines date back to the 1991 Gulf War. They were originally approved by the various Boards of Supervisors. I sent the e-mail just to offer guidance. Faculty concurrence is required. One thing that is difficult is a request for a "W" past the deadline.

McMillin: Policy says I must give my exam on a prescribed date. But I can make exceptions.

Doolos: This is only in the case of activation.

McMillin: Then we're making a separate class of valid excuse.

Doolis: Isn't it a valid excuse?

McMillin: The point is that we can change exam dates only for activation, but not for other excused absences.

Doolos: The implication is that the exam would be given early. It does conflict with current policy.

_____: Is it important enough to pass today?

McMillin: I prefer not. We want to discuss this later after PS 44.

Cope. Thanks to Robert Doolos for offering perspective.

Stanley: Move to adjourn.

Adjournment at 5:35.