

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
3:00 P.M., Thursday, September 10, 2009
Cotillion Ballroom, LSU Union
Attendance



Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (Senate President, English) | 2. Andrew Christie (Vice-President, Accounting) |
| 3. William Daly (Past-President, Chemistry) | 4. Priscilla D. Allen (Member-at-Large, Social Work) |
| 5. Renee Casbergue (Secretary, Education) | |

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

Senators present:

1. Mary Catherine Aime	2. Linda Allen	3. Sue Bardett	4. Gabriel Beavers
5. Michael Bowman	6. Kathleen Bratton	7. Josh Detre	8. Susan Dumais
9. Kristi Dykema	10. Bruce Eilts	11. Kristopher Fletcher	12. John Fletcher
13. Graham Bodie	14. Joseph Francis	15. Juhan Frank	16. Craig Freeman
17. Stephen Gaunt	18. Wanda Hargroder	19. Wes Harrison	20. Dominique Homberger
21. Andrea Houston	22. Paul Hrycaj	23. Lisa Johnson	24. Jeremy King
25. Joseph Legoria	26. Mandi Lopez	27. Kevin McCarter	28. Patrick McGee
29. Ken McMillin	30. Evelyn Orman	31. Erwin Poliakoff	32. John Protevi
33. Steve Ross	34. Lawrence Rouse	35. Kresimir Rupnik	36. Kelly Ann Rusch
37. Michael Russo	38. Cristina Sabliov	39. Edward Song	40. Phillip Tebbutt
41. Dottie Vaughn	42. Muhammad Wahab	43. Justin Walsh	44. Edward Watson
45. Susan Weinstein	46. Richard White	47. Paul Wilson	48. Yi-jun Xu

Proxies for absent Senators:

Michael Wascom for Ed Laws	Kevin Cope for Heather McKillop
Renee Casbergue for Jennifer Curry, Jennifer Jolly, Dianne Taylor, Rebecca Owens	Arend Van Gemmert for Lisa Johnson
Carol Barry for Boryung Ju	Josh Detre for P. Lynn Kennedy
Muhammad Wahab for Fred Aghazadeh	

Senators absent without proxies + (# of absences without proxies): Not available from Spring, 2009

Brittan Barker	Michael Krom	Jeff Kuehny	Richard Kurtz
Frederick Sheldon	Gail Sutherland	Jeffery Tiger	

Guests Attending Meeting:

George Stanley (Chemistry)
 Robert Doolos (University Registrar)
 Carruth McGehee
 Astrid Merget (Executive Vice-Chancellor & Provost)
 Michael Martin (Chancellor)

Consideration of the Minutes from May 2009

Motion to accept minutes - Passed unanimously.

President's Report

LSU-BR News:

- Faculty senate committees are fully staffed
- Progress is being made toward an online senate newsletter
- Football season ticket raffle was held in the summer. 42 of the first 50 names chosen elected to purchase two tickets each, with 8 alternate names chosen purchasing the remaining tickets.

- Chancellor's Forums scheduled for October 6 and November 11, 2009. Also scheduled is a Provost's Roundtable on October 29th.
- Problems related to study abroad credit are still occurring and will be addressed again.
- Graduate School interim dean David Constant is meeting to consider a range of issues including a graduate student governance body, graduate students' dwellings, GA workloads, and guidelines for appropriate use of graduate assistants.
- The faculty, though the Faculty Senate Executive committee, has been asked for input on the selection of commencement speakers.
- The Provost is creating four new university wide committees / task forces with faculty input on each to explore a variety of aspects of university life.
- The Institutional Effectiveness Committee continues its work furthering accreditation processes
- A new format for faculty orientation led to a substantial session for new faculty in the fall. Development of an online faculty handbook is progressing.
- Some issues related to the LSU Lab School have been brought to the FSEC and are being addressed.

System News:

- The system office has been relatively quiet over the summer. No news to report.

State News:

- There has been much discussion relative to decreased university contributions to the Optional Retirement Plan, with many campuses around the state preparing to take some action. This is an issue for the entire state, with determination of the amount of contribution determined by actuaries outside of the LSU system. Problems stem from issues with the state retirement system dating back to the 1970s, and will not be easy to resolve. Progress updates will be provided.
- Work is ongoing regarding a statewide transfer option, aimed at "common currency" of courses taken from years 1 and 2. LSU guidance is being accepted.
- Former Chancellor Jim Wharton is serving on the Tucker Commission as it considers reorganization of higher education in the state.
- Issues with the online travel system are ongoing. The online system was disabled, a situation that needs to be addressed immediately.

Commissioning Ceremony: PS-36-T and PS-36-NT

- Chancellor Michael Martin offered congratulations on the important achievement of revising what is and should be a "living document" that needs to continually address what we mean by scholarship and how we measure it as the university's mission and its role in the community changes. He expressed the desire that the conversation about what is recognized within PS 36 to continue.
 - Bill Daly provided a brief history of the development of the revisions of PS-36-T and PS-36-NT. This was a seven-year process with a committee first formed in 2002, and the document first voted on in 2005. Corrections were needed, particularly with regard to the absence of language regarding the constructive nature of evaluations. Annual review processes were folded into the document. Most important, the document was divided to better address the evaluation of non-tenure track faculty. The new document was approved by the faculty in 2007, then vetted by Academic Affairs, Human Resources Management, legal affairs, university upper administration, and the Board of Supervisors, and was finally approved by the Chancellor in spring of 2009. Bill offered kudos to Carruth McGehee who led much of this effort.
 - Carruth McGehee provided an overview of the documents themselves (handouts attached). (URL for Notes for Users: <http://www.math.lsu.edu/~mcgehee/PS-36-T-Notes.pdf>) He noted that from 2002-2005, most meetings of the Faculty Senate included discussion and votes on PS-36 documents. He commended the administration for following the faculty's lead on major concepts. Changes made by administrators were largely improvements. While the documents are not without flaws, he recommends "settling in" with the new guidelines before attempting further changes or corrections. PS-36-NT is viewed as a major step forward for non-tenurable faculty that is consistent with system policies and rules as well as with widely understood practices. It incorporates as appropriate aspects of PS 36-T. The document requires faculty panel procedures for some personnel decisions, while other such decisions are left to the discretion of chairs.
-

Chancellor's Remarks

- Chancellor Martin offered congratulations on PS-36-T and PS-36-NT (see comments about this above).
 - He stated that we are entering an uncertain year with uncertain budget issues. We need to be careful to sort out fact from "rampant" rumors. He lauded the impact of shared governance and the coming together of faculty and staff over budget issues in the spring and early summer.
 - He expressed the hope that we are able to continue with new construction and deferred maintenance items.
 - The FSEC will continue to be actively engaged with budget issues as they arise.
-

Election of New Member of FSEC

- Three nominees: *Craig Freeman, Kevin McCarter, Ken McMillan*. *Ken McMillan* was elected to the new member-at-large position on the FSEC.
-

Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Bargaining and Representation – Michael Russo

- Dialogue is beginning regarding a collective bargaining agreement to address three areas: empowerment, rights and responsibilities, and compensation.
 - Requested that a link to documents created by the committee be forwarded to interested constituencies (See Statement of the Faculty Senate *Ad Hoc* Committee on Bargaining and Representation.)
 - Suggested finding volunteers who have been in organized settings as faculty members elsewhere to participate on panels, in forums, etc.
 - Kevin Cope stated that these issues will be addressed in a community event in the coming months.
-

Update on Moodle – Andrew Christie

- A new interface is ready to roll out. The introductory page is much improved. There is also a direct link to all things Moodle on the PAWS opening page that should make it easier to find online resources and help.
 - Dominique Homberger lauded the help desk personnel for the quick assistance they always provide.
-

Old Business

- A. Second reading and vote, Resolution 09-06, "Inactive Course Policy" – sponsored by *Senator Andrea Houston*
-

Second Reading of FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 09-06

"Inactive Course Policy"

Sponsored by Senator Andrea Houston

Whereas the Faculty Senate has reviewed the draft inactive course policy presented by Andrea Houston and the Courses and Curriculum Committee; and

Whereas the Faculty Senate, in its stewardship of the educational mission of the University, encourages congruency between University publications concerning the curriculum and the curriculum that is available to students;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the draft inactive course policy as presented and discussed at the May 6th, 2009 Senate meeting.

- Summary of changes: Large number of courses, especially graduate, that haven't been taught in 10 years or more. It is deceptive to prospective students. Under the current policy, if a course is not taught within 10 years, it will be dropped from the catalog, and departments will be pushed to drop the course altogether.

According to University Registrar Robert Doulos, under the new policy, courses will be considered inactive and dropped from the catalogue after five years, and dropped altogether if not taught in ten years.

- *Andres Christie*: it is easier to get courses changed than to add new courses. I am opposed to dropping courses altogether since those courses numbers can be used for different offerings through the change process, but fine with having them declared inactive and removed from the catalogue.
 - *John Protevi*: The courses and curriculum prefers new course proposals and actually turns down more adaptations of existing courses than it does proposals for new courses.
 - *Andrea Houston and Lawrence Rouse* concur with this statement.
 - **Motion passed on voice vote – one nay.**
-

B. Second reading and vote, Resolution 09-07, "Conditions and Procedures for Furlough Plans"

Introduced by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at the request of the Office of Academic Affairs

- **Summary:** Attempt to develop basic guidelines to be followed in the event that the budget situation requires implementation of furloughs.

“Conditions and Procedures for Furlough Plans”

Introduced by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at the Request of the Office of Academic Affairs

Whereas it is in the mutual interest of the faculty and the administration to find solutions to budgetary problems that threaten to impair both the national standing and the basic functions of Louisiana State University; and

Whereas the legislative and executive branches of the Louisiana state government have asked the LSU community to propose an array of alternative plans for dealing with the current revenue shortfall while inflicting minimal damage on the state’s Flagship University; and

Whereas the LSU faculty deplores the failure of state government to provide, over the years, a stable economic foundation for higher education, even while applauding the desire for input from university faculty;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate, while it questions the need for furloughs, layoffs, or any other form of wage diminution and while it fundamentally opposes the violation of good-faith employment understandings with higher-education faculty, encourages the LSU administration to explore with state government officials the possibility of an elective furlough plan that meets the following conditions:

- i. That an impartial, outside expert is retained to confirm that the furlough is necessary and is the best economic option for LSU;
- ii. That, for faculty, employee permanent salaries of record will not change;
- iii. That the University provide at least three elective ways of taking the furlough (for example, [i] payroll deductions to go to the University via the LSU Foundation or [ii] one-time donations via check or other payment instrument via the LSU Foundation or [iii] multiple smaller payments or deductions);
- iv. That the elective furlough would take the form of a flat percentage of income, e.g., circa four percent or less;
- v. That employees earning less than \$30,000.00 per annum would be exempt from the furlough;
- vi. That the Board of Supervisors negotiate in earnest with faculty representatives so as to change financial exigency procedures and its furlough procedures so as to (a) separate the two emergency procedures and (b) minimize the chance of future furloughs, layoffs, or other concessions.
- vii. That the character of the furlough reflect the job description of the furloughed employee (e.g., if a furloughed faculty member is engaged in teaching as well as research, the furlough will apply to teaching time as well as to research assignments);
- viii. That an elective furlough will be requested from faculty members only if a furlough is also required of all other state employees.

Discussion Summary:

- J. Protevi: Questions consistency in # 4 and # 7 - one refers to percentage of time, while the other refers to percentage of income. We need to revisit the issue of a flat percentage for all vs. a percentage relative to income level.
- Provost Merget: Legal issues certainly need to be clarified.
- P. Wilson: I have experienced furlough - there was no *choice* of what time one could be away.
- K. Cope: You're referring to the concept of "meaningful time off."
- P. McGee: We should consider a graduated percentage for furlough - shouldn't specify a particular amount. We need to say "graduated vs. flat percentage."
- J. Protevi: (Concurs with this idea)
- : The chancellor has suggested that we can anticipate two more bad budget years; thinking about policies to govern furlough is a good idea, but may need to be tailored to the specific situation each year.
- C. Delzell: Is this really elective (for faculty) if you must choose one of three options for giving up salary?
- K. Cope: Mandatory furlough (for faculty) is legally difficult. "Elective" was an attempt at good politics.
- C. Delzell: What of the FSEC position that there should not be furlough without exigency?
- K. Cope: This resolution shows that the faculty is ready to work on budget (including consideration of furlough), without actually calling for furlough.
- P. Ajmera: We are consistent with the position of "no mandatory furlough." We should change item 3 so that it provides three possible ways *if* one elects to do furlough. Also, we should take the dollar figures out of number 5. I suggest that we not table this, so if needed, we can commit to work from here (this policy as a starting point).
- A. Houston: Clarification - this is just for tenure track.
- P. McGee: If this is individually elective, all is moot.
- K. Cope: These are guidelines for a structure *if* furlough is elected.
- P. McGee: This should be tabled; not on record.
- : Item #2 - be careful of language "will not change" which might preclude raises already in process.
- C. Delzell: Definition of faculty *does* include instructors. We need to clarify language if this is meant to apply only to tenure track faculty.
- L. Rouse: We should keep this in the quiver until FSEC thinks it is necessary. FSEC should keep working on it.
- Provost Merget: A draft budget is due in October for fiscal year 2010-2011.
- A. Christie: Refining language is hard to do out of context.
- K. Cope: We could proceed with refinements already discussed.
- A. Merget: ...and get legal advice
- S. Weinstein: Any language that includes "research cut" is just a pay cut.
- W. Harrison: The title of this should be changed to reflect "elective" or "volunteer."
(General consensus that the current title is causing confusion...)
- P. McGee: The idea of elective furlough is ridiculous. The document creates false support for furlough concept. If voluntary, why specify a percentage?
- P. Ajmera: I like the "fair share" idea inherent in guidelines, even if it is ultimately voluntary.
- P. McGee: We should focus on building muscle, fighting back, rather than meekly acquiescing.
- : We should just give donations to the foundation.
- A. Merget: That wouldn't count toward reducing any deficit.
- D. Hombarger: This is false advertising. It sounds good, but we don't mean it. It is important to make a point about cuts by making them visible.
- : We should use a different model. Perhaps take unpaid semester off with the tenure clock stopped.
- K. Cope: A number of possibilities can be considered. That idea will be proposed to legal.
- R. Casbergue: It might help to consider the timeline under which these guidelines were developed. The policy was first developed when it appeared that there might be across the board furloughs, including for faculty. The discussion of voluntary furlough arose after it became clear that faculty could not be included in mandatory furlough. Perhaps what we need are two documents - one with guidelines for voluntary furlough; another to deal with more serious exigency.
- C. Delzell: Yes. Exigency procedures and furlough discussions need to be revisited.
- K. Cope: Yes. That will be discussed.
- J. Protevi: Move to ask FSEC to prepare two documents.
- E. Laws: Continue discussion in November when we may have a better idea of the budget situation. We should table this until November.
- : Second.
- W. Hargroder: What are rules for instructors?
- A. Merget: Civil Service / HRM guidelines.

-----: Can the rules be visible - guidelines disseminated?
 C. Delzell: Board regulations are sloppy and unclear on this issue.

VOTE: unanimously tabled until November meeting.

New Business

ORP issue - will carry forward to 2040, possibly to 2049. This is a long-term problem.

- Measures taken thus far:
- Communication with other faculty senates.
- Administrators equally affected - they are on board with addressing this issue.
- Roger Laine (chair, benefits committee) is preparing a petition.
- Attempts are being made to begin mobilizing large contingent statewide with resolutions that will sway system office to act.
- Introduce Faculty Senate Resolution 09-09, "Retirement Plan Options Appropriate for Higher Education Professionals" *Introduced by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at the Request of the LSU System Council of Faculty Advisors and the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates.*

Faculty Senate Resolution 09–09
 “Retirement Plan Options Appropriate for Higher Education
 Professionals”

*Introduced by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee at the Request of the LSU System Council of Faculty Advisors and of the
 Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates*

WHEREAS the Teachers’ Retirement System of Louisiana (TRSL), the sole governing body for retirement plans for professional employees of Louisiana higher education institution, has peremptorily reduced the portion of employer contributions that reach employee retirement accounts in the “Optional Retirement Program” (ORP) by 18% ;

WHEREAS higher education is represented by only one of fifteen members on the TRSL Board of Trustees;

WHEREAS comparable higher education institutions nationwide offer optional retirement plans both designed for and within the influence of their beneficiaries (for example, by creating a plan administered by a university and its members);

WHEREAS the use of monies derived from employer contributions to service unfunded liabilities or other obligations not incurred by members of the higher education community amounts to a “surcharge on choice” and a form of taxation without representation or benefit;

WHEREAS the retirement and other benefit packages offered by Louisiana higher education institutions are already among the lowest in the nation, a situation that depresses morale and impairs both the recruitment of promising faculty members and the retention of current faculty members, thereby harming the reputation of our universities;

WHEREAS multitudinous Louisiana academic institutions (both within and without the LSU System) have expressed concern and outrage at actions by both the TRSL and the Louisiana government that have diminished retirement benefits to deep historic lows;

WHEREAS several Louisiana institutions have called upon LSU to provide leadership in the defense and the advancement of retirement packages;

WHEREAS the debate over retirement contributions and options is a uniquely bipartisan event in that administrators are affected by “ORP” cuts as frequently as are faculty members;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the LSU Faculty Senate affirms its solidarity with the professional faculty and staff of the many and various public higher education institutions in Louisiana; that it calls on its President and officers to continue working vigorously with other faculty leaders to regain a reasonable and proper measure of control over its retirement program

options; that it regards the present system and its offerings as substandard and inadequate to the needs of professionals; and that it regards the present system as unfair, subject to capricious political influence, and, in sum, unacceptable.

Discussion Summary:

J. Protevi: Move to dispense with second reading.

L. Rouse: Second.

J. Protevi: It should say, " a situation that depresses morale and impairs both the recruitment of promising faculty members and the retention of current faculty members, thereby harming the reputation of our universities;"

W. Harrison: Is there disclosure of this fact when someone is hired?

K. Cope: There is no disclosure from deans; not disclosed by HRM.

W. Harrison: Within the benefits description with a job offer and at orientation, there must be a statement that a portion of the contribution is variable.

J. Lagoria: Is this a contractual issue - should we consider the legality of a "bait and switch?"

-----: Is there discussion of mobilizing - letters, petitions, etc. - to impact legislators?

K. Cope: Individuals can lobby as private citizens.

L. Allen: What about the percentage of salary that must be contributed to retirement in lieu of participation of Social Security?

K. Cope: We're looking into that.

G. Stanley: Can we pass this on an emergency basis?

L. Rouse: Move to vote approval of resolution on emergency basis (dispense with 2nd reading).

Approved with unanimous voice vote.

Law: Move to approve resolution with Protevi amendment.

Approved with unanimous voice vote.

Meeting Adjourned.