

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Monday, November 15th, 2021
Howe Russell 130



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

1. Mandi Lopez (President, VCS)
2. Ken McMillin (Past- President, AG)
3. Joan King (Vice-President, Food Science)
4. Marwa Hassan (Secretary, Engineering)
5. Inessa Bazayev (Member-at-Large, Music)
6. Roger Laine (Member-at-Large, SCI)
7. Jeffrey Roland (Member-at-Large, HSS)

Parliamentarian: Joan King

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

1	A	Scott Baldrige (SCI)	25	A	Edward Gibbons (HSE)	49	A	Kevin Ringelman (AG)
2	X	Heather Kirk-Ballard (AG)	26	X	Jason Harman (HSS)	50	X	Jeffrey Roland (HSS)
3	X	Estanislado Barrera (HSE)	27	X	Marwa Hassan (ENG)	51	X	Julie Wright Rollins (HSE)
4	X	Inessa Bazayev (MDA)	28	X	Roy Heidelberg (BUS)	52	X	Sarah Peppin Rosser (HSS)
5	X	Hannah Beloglavec (MDA)	29	X	Matthew Hiatt (Coast)	53		Kirk Ryan (VCS)
6	X	Pam Blanchard (HSE)	30	X	Rosemary Peters-Hill (HSS)	54	A	Alan Sikes (MDA)
7	A	Margo Brault (HSS)	31		Robert Holton (AD)	55	X	Parampreet Singh (SCI)
8	X	Kellie Brisini (HSS)	32	X	Samithamby Jeyaseelan (VCS)	56	X	Wei-Ling Song (BUS)
9	X	James Canfield (HSE)	33	X	Joan King (AG)	57	X	Shane Stadler (SCI)
10		Elizabeth Carter (Law)	34		Gerry Knapp (ENG)	58		Brenton Stewart (HSE)
11	X	Chantel Chauvin (HSS)	35	X	Lauren Lazaro (AG)	59	X	Daniel Tirone (HSS)
12	X	Senlin Chen (HSE)	36	X	Carlos Lee (HSE)	60	X	Adriano Vatta (VCS)
13	X	Jin-Woo Choi (ENG)	37	A	Joseph Legoria (BUS)	61	X	Meredith Veldman (HSS)
14	X	John Church (Law)	38	X	James Madden (SCI)	62	X	Mark Wagner (HSS)
15	X	Robert Cook (SCI)	39	X	Bob Mann (MC)	63	A	Muhammad A Wahab (ENG)
16		Jeff Davis (AG)	40	X	J. Michael Martinez (HSE)	64	X	Paulo Waltrich (ENG)
17	X	William Doerrler (SCI)	41	X	John Miles (LIB)	65	X	Wei-Hsung Wang (Energy)
18	X	Kerry Dooley (ENG)	42	X	Louay Mohammad (ENG)	66	X	Jinan Wu (BUS)
19	X	Peter Doran (SCI)	43	X	Ioan Negulescu (AG)	67		
20	X	Thomas Douthat (Coast)	44		Robert Newman (BUS)	68		
21	X	Jake Esselstyn (SCI)	45		Derick Ostrenko (AD)	69		
22	X	Lori Favela (HSS)	46	X	Arthur Penn (VCS)			
23	X	Matthew Freeman (HSS)	47	X	Theda Daniels-Race (ENG)			
24	A	Lisa Fultz (AG)	48	X	Helen Regis (HSS)			

Guests: (I= In-person, V=Virtual)

<i>I</i>	Lindsay Madatic	<i>I</i>	Arend Van Gemmert	<i>I</i>	Amanda Talbot
<i>I</i>	Carol Friedland	<i>I</i>	John Thorton	<i>I</i>	Philip Calais
<i>I</i>	Julia Ledet	<i>I</i>	Vicky Roy	<i>I</i>	Devens Show
<i>I</i>	Ryan Landry	<i>I</i>	Cecilia Shanks	<i>I</i>	Kate Shanks
<i>I</i>	Jason Hicks	<i>I</i>	Sharon Thorton	<i>I</i>	Valerie Gibson
<i>I</i>	Emily Hatfield	<i>I</i>	Russell Fontenot	<i>V</i>	Charles Berryman
<i>I</i>	Craig Woolley	<i>I</i>	Tracy Fontenot	<i>I</i>	Taylor McNair
<i>I</i>	James Spencer	<i>I</i>	Robert Rohli	<i>I</i>	Ravi Rau
<i>I</i>	Robert Turner	<i>I</i>	Michelle Odinet		

Alternates:

James Murphy for Alan Sikes	Charles Delzell for Scott Baldrige
Lauren Lazaro for Lisa Fultz	Edward Shihadeh for Margo Brault
John Nyman for Kevin Ringelman	Robert Newman for Joseph Legoria
Fereydoun Aghazadeh for Muhammad Wahab	Oliver Crocco for Edward Gibbons

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – November 15, 2021

- Dr. Lopez asked senators and guests to follow instructions on the screen to register their attendance.
- Voting will take place via Qualtrics, and votes will be vetted.
- Dr. Lopez announced the alternative representatives.
- Ms. Knoll announced person names and the agenda items on which they made a public comment.

Public Comments on Agenda Items

a. Julia Ledet: Public Comment on Resolution 21-08

Julia has been an LSU faculty member since 1998 and previously was a Faculty Senator from 2018 to 2021. She served on the faculty Senate executive committee as a member-at-large from May 2019 to August 2020. She mentioned that she has worked directly with the officers named in resolution 21.08 and shared that the amount of work, knowledge, and leadership these experienced officers provided is substantial. She added that she has seen that many hours of work each week that these officers put in. She stated that she had seen the mentorship, leadership, and patients from these experienced officers as they taught the newer members how to perform their jobs. She expressed that it is lucky to have officers with such experience in the Faculty Senate at the positions of President, Vice President, secretary, and past President. She mentioned that the resolution is insane, as it processes the resignation of three of the most experienced officers on the board, with the elections being held at the earliest opportunity to fill a vacated post to almost totally starting from scratch. This resolution is flawed and makes no sense. She added that the new officers could run in the next elections.

b. Professor Robert Rohli: Public Comment on Resolution 21-08

Professor Rohli mentioned that he sees no incriminating evidence that the elected members intended to misinform or deceive the rest of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or the rest of the faculty in general. On the contrary, he stated that the selected members had done a lot for the LSU community for no compensation beyond which they need to serve that function. Professor Rohli further added that the Faculty Senate leadership shields the faculty from the information that they do not need to worry about and focus on their jobs uninterrupted while providing needed information. He stated that it is a fine line to walk, especially considering that every faculty member has a different definition of what they need to know, and each person's definition of how much they need to know varies from one issue to the next. He stated that the selected members are a stabilizing influence in an uncertain time. He emphasized that finding new leadership would be dangerous, especially when we don't know if the next leadership may be eager to seize control to pursue their own agenda. Professor Rohli recommended opposing resolution 21-08.

c. Taylor McNair – Public Comment on Resolution 21-06.

Taylor McNair is a biology graduate who has read through every clinical trial of CDC and FDA data pages and numerous CDC site of the research reported. She stated that Pfizer BioNTech and COMIRNATY are two different vaccines, while one is approved and another is still underway (which comes with vastly different liabilities). She further clarified that both vaccines have identical amino acid sequences of the encoded antigens, but COMIRNATY includes the presence of optimized codons to improve antigen expression. She explained that, as per CDC, vaccinated people can still become infected and have the potential to spread COVID to others. She added that the scientific community does not yet know if the COMIRNATY will reduce and simplify transmission. In addition, she also stated that the long-term health hazards had not been qualified. As such, Ms. McNair emphasized ensuring that the risk-benefit analysis is purely traced.

d. Professor A. Ravi P. Rau – Public Comment on Resolution 21-11

Ravi P. Rau is a faculty member of Physics and Astronomy. Professor Rau mentioned that Faculty Senate exists to serve the Faculty. He stated that the University exists for the good of society through free exploration and expression of ideas, open discussion, and debate even on topics that the majority of society may disapprove. He mentioned that an anonymous resolution like 21-11, with unsupported claims and accusations against other senators and faculty members, has no place, even apart from broader norms, that everyone has the right in this nation to confront their accusers. He questioned if we want to bring internet

trolls, fake news, and disinformation into our academic discourse. He explained that the resolution, while accusing others of threatening a style and intimidating environment, calls for the LSU president to investigate and the faculty Senate to punish senators and faculty members. He mentioned that the worst part of resolution 21-11 is calling for a realistic president to initiate actions against faculty. It violates the most fundamental principles of a US university. We have policy statements and procedures for president decisions, whether granting promotion or tenure or revoking tenure.

e. Philip Calais – Public Comment on Resolution 21-06

Mr. Calais mentioned that he was in the meeting for his son and anyone else in the same position. He briefly explained the story of his wife's family (four generations) being Jewish. He questioned the senate members what makes it suddenly safe when a person is on the podium or at a microphone that they do not have to wear a Mask, why it is advertised as well as the vaccine being promoted, why are jobs and education in jeopardy if, for some reason, someone chooses not to get vaccinated?

f. Valerie Gibson – Public Comment on Resolution 21-06

Ms. Gibson mentioned that last month she covered the scientific and legal reasons why resolution 21-06 had no business to be passed. She further added that this resolution is directly contrary to science and law. Ms. Gibson gave a brief background on her family. She mentioned that she graduated in three and a half years on a full academic scholarship. She also mentioned the exceptional achievements of one of her daughters. However, her daughter had to change her major and lost her income due to the COVID. She mentioned that LSU had implemented ridiculous and scientifically baseless policies this year that ignore natural immunity, not to mention civil rights laws. She added that LSU has been changing policies, with no consideration to the students or their rights law means nothing to LSU anymore. She urged senators to defeat this resolution.

g. Vicky Roy: Public Comment on Resolution 21-10

Ms. Roy stated that she has three children attending the University Laboratory School. Ms. Roy spoke on behalf of concerned parents and children attending the University Laboratory School, who would like to be heard when decisions are being made that affects their minor children. She mentioned that LSU decisions govern the Lab school regarding all COVID matters, which directly impacts the requirements for their children to continue to wear the mask. Ms. Roy mentioned that the Lab School students are required to wear a mask all day, and hours a day, five days a week; this is not the case for college students, teachers, professors, or the administration of the Lab school or LSU. She stated that their children had not received any training on how to keep their masks clean and sanitary during extended use. She also added that they are not allowed to take a break from the mask, where they all fail expecting to learn from adults who are wearing masks blocking important auditory and visual information. She said that LSU recently ended the mask mandate at the PMAC, insinuating that somehow sports goers are safe without a mask while enjoying an athletic event, but children are somehow unsafe to learn. She mentioned that the decision still requires minor children to wear a mask for seven hours, but it is not the same for college students or the administration. She stated that children in the lab school should not be expected to learn while wearing the mask and the risk no longer outweigh the benefits.

h. Sharon Thornton: Public Comment on Resolution 21-06

Ms. Thornton mentioned that the Louisiana law allows for contingencies for citizens to refuse COVID-19 vaccinations. She added that the COVID-19 is not a vaccine-preventable disease, and the CDC has made that abundantly clear, stating that COVID-19 vaccines are not 100% effective at preventing infection. Ms. Thornton further clarified that some fully vaccinated people will still get COVID-19 with breakthrough cases, and people who get right through cases can make it contagious. She said that CDC had acknowledged the strength of natural immunity (i.e., natural immunity is robust). She asked why LSU is ignoring natural immunity? She explained that students should not spend time writing documents with the rationale behind why they should be exempt or take periodic COVID testing. She added that increasing PCR tests weekly would only expose more employees outside that is a known carcinogen. She mentioned that it is discrimination against unvaccinated students if a vaccinated student can still spread this virus, but they are not required for periodical testing. Ms. Thornton suggested that it would be a wise choice to exercise students' rights rather than going into coercion.

i. Professor Turner: Public Comment on Resolution 21-08

Professor Turner mentioned the exceptional skills of the officers named in the resolution. Professor Turner thinks that is not an intentional act of looking away or opposing valued action; instead, it is a time constraint misunderstanding. He added that there is no intention of looking away from the FSEC. He mentioned that there are human errors, the imperfection of humanities is in all of us, and we all make mistakes. He stated that the elections are in five months, and asking about this resolution is probably an impractical suggestion. He specified that the resolution is to remove three of the seven-member and give it to the person who does not want to do it, which seems imperfect. Professor Turner asked for a decisive rejection of the resolution and for the people who have the objection to working with the administration to sustain and improve the workings of the faculty Senate.

j. Michelle Odinet: Public Comment on Resolution 21-06

Ms. Odinet is the mother of four, who is an undergraduate student at LSU. She mentioned that resolution 21-06 is flawed as it distinguishes between the vaccinated and unvaccinated students. She added that the resolution puts the unvaccinated students in a specific group and requires them to test. She asked Senate to strike the resolution and questioned Senate members if the unvaccinated will be forced to bear the burden of the testing cost after January 1st (i.e., after PCR has been recalled by the FDA). She further requested to reconsider this resolution and require testing for both the vaccinated and unvaccinated students, and eliminate discrimination.

Consideration of the Minutes from October 28, 2021

A motion was made by Pamela Blanchard and seconded by Ioan Negulescu to accept the minutes with two friendly amendments. The minutes were accepted with two friendly amendments.

LSU Board of Supervisors Chair, Mr. Rémy Starns

Dr. Lopez introduced Mr. Rémy Starns

Rémy Starnes is the State Public Defender overseeing the entire 64 parishes public defense system, and Louisiana represents almost 88% of all persons accused of a crime statewide. Prior to his appointment as State Public Defender, Mr. Starns was an assistant district attorney in Avoyelles Parish and practiced simple and criminal law wide range of matters of the state Federal court. Mr. Starns was born in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. A 1993 graduate of LSU, he received a Bachelor of Arts in political science with minors in Latin and classical civilization while also playing for the football team. Mr. Starns was appointed to the Board of Supervisors by Governor John Bel Edwards in June 2018.

Mr. Rémy Starns spoke at the Faculty Senate Meeting

Mr. Starns thanked Dr. Lopez for inviting him to the meeting. Mr. Starns mentioned that LSU Faculty had worked diligently during the pandemic following the safety measures, and Dr. Lopez has been a steady presence in all of the Board of Supervisors meetings. He added that the LSU Faculty Senate has a well-established reputation, and he has a deep respect for LSU faculty and their professionalism. He defined his role to support this community of scholars. He stated that recently there had been some confusion regarding shared governance. He stated that he had proposed a resolution on the agenda that was pulled by President Tate. He added that the primary impetus of the proposal was to clarify which entity carries the voice of the faculty. Looking through 1936 records about Faculty Council meetings, the regulations define the Faculty Council as full-time members of the academic staff having the right to instruct and that shall constitute the faculty, the campus to which they are appointed. Mr. Starns stated that the faculty might organize itself into a Faculty Council, which shall include all full-time members of the faculty and members of the administrative council. In 1958, the Faculty Council created the policy committee that function much like an executive committee. He mentioned that by 1970, the Faculty Council decided to adopt a Faculty Senate. Finally, in 1973, a faculty Senate was created and approved by the Board of Supervisors. He explained that the resolution that was pulled sought to clarify which of these bodies or other is the group to deal with at the administration level and the Board of Supervisors. He assured that the Board of Supervisors and the LSU administration will work collaboratively to find solutions to and address problems in a good faith manner with

whomever the faculty designates as their representative. He emphasized that the faculty has full authority to determine their own form of governance, i.e., whose voice shall speak for the faculty. He emphasized an established procedure to call Faculty Council together for purposes of determining this representation was needed. He mentioned that that is a role of faculty, not the Board of Supervisors, and not the administration to make these determinations.

Q & A Summary:

Bob Mann – If the Faculty Senate and the Council says we want a vaccine mandate, you're saying you don't know whom to listen to, but we're all saying the same thing. So, where is the confusion?

Remy Starns – We need to know from the faculty which it is we should address. We are not silencing anyone; we're simply asking for the faculty to determine among yourselves, the way that you choose to govern yourself, and the way you organize, to bring issues to the administration level. From a supervisor's standpoint, we do not think the proper way to go is to pick and choose which voice to listen to. The faculty determines how they want to go and what voices speak for them and bring in that vessel to the administration.

Robert Newman: If the faculty decided to keep both Faculty Council and Senate, will you listen to both?

Remy Starns – Yes, we have no issues. We will follow the will of the faculty. What we cannot do is deal with multiple groups with conflicting opinions. Whatever, however, the one voice comes to us.

Daniel Tirone – I understand that this is expedient for the administration to have one person to deal with, but this is also empathetic to the interests of the faculty and our governance because admittedly, as has been stated earlier by some of our speakers, sometimes their institutions aren't perfect that they don't get the message right and so why should faculty give up our ability to lobby the Board of Supervisors if we think that our representatives are not at that point of time representing the interests of the faculty as a whole?

Remy Starn – A representative government should represent its body. You get 3000 opinions, and the reasons that that mass number of interests are seen as inefficient are the reasons that representative government came. So I would encourage you not to give up your business, but I do encourage you to not choose your own way. Rather, if it is a representative government or representative governing scheme of a plan, I would encourage you to use your politics there and get the policies you want through the representative government and bring to the administration; that is, political differences should be handled within the election processes.

Edward Shihadeh– The FSEC only had 16 hours to comment on changes to the BOS bylaws that could have resulted in eliminating the Faculty Council. The Faculty Senate and Council did not know about it.

Remy Starns- The reason I came here today was to clarify this issue and that it's not the intention of the Board of Supervisors. It's not any part of what we're trying to do with that resolution, as it is not any part of our deliberation to silence the voice of the faculty to interfere in any way with the faculty's determination of how they should govern themselves. We were simply asking for one voice, and you choose, you choose your structure, you choose who that is. I realize there is confusion regarding that, and that's why I decided to come here and speak.

Hannah Beloglavec—I realize currently the issue is tabled, but is the Board of Supervisors planning on bringing the issue back?

Remy Starns – It is not on our agenda. We have no plans to put it on the agenda. What I think should happen is that this body decides how you wish to be governed, and this dovetails into that long tradition of shared governance that I'm committed to. At that point, we'll decide how to go forward, but we're not going to bring it back until the faculty determine how they want to govern themselves and will communicate with that to us.

Meredith Veldman made a motion to rearrange the agenda to bring forward items 9 (LSU Graduate School Strategic Plan Update), 11 (Old Business), and 12 (New Business), and then go back to item 8 (President's report), and 10 (Faculty Senate Appeals Board Elections). The motion was seconded.

Professor Delzell requested the justification for the change in the order of the agenda. The justification was provided, mentioning that idea was simply to get the deliberative stuff from the center and have the guests (the grad school) speak first.

A vote from Senators was taken by Qualtrics. The senators voted to rearrange the agenda.

Old Business

a. Postponed: Second Reading, Resolution 21-02, "Faculty Endorsement of the Graduate Student Bill of Rights"

Sponsored by Faculty Senator Daniel Tirone

b. Postponed: Second Reading, Resolution 21-06, "A Call to Bring LSU's Vaccination Mandate into Conformity with State Law and National Guidelines"

Sponsored by Faculty Senators Inessa Bazayev, Robert Mann, Jeffrey Roland, Daniel Tirone, Meredith Veldman

A motion was made by Rosemary Peters-Hill and seconded by Meredith Veldman to postpone the second reading to the December meeting.

c. Postponed: Second Reading, Resolution 21-07, "A Resolution Commending Faculty Grassroots Collective Action"

Sponsored by Rosemary Peters-Hill and Kevin Ringelman

A motion was made by Rosemary Peters-Hill and seconded by Meredith Veldman to postpone the second reading to the December meeting.

d. Postponed: Second Reading, Resolution 21-08, "An Expression of No Confidence in Selected Members of the Faculty Senate Leadership"

Sponsored by Margo Brault, Jin-Woo Choi, Robert Mann, Daniel Tirone, Helen Regis and Meredith Veldman

A motion was made by Professor Denzell and seconded by Dr. Hassan to go to an executive session to discuss resolution 21-08. Dr. Lopez mentioned that as per Louisiana public open meetings laws when there's a discussion about personnel matters, it is recommended to go into executive discussion.

An issue was raised that discussing the character of the members of the society body is not appropriate in an open meeting.

Professor Newman questioned why this was not raised in the first meeting? Dr. Lopez answered that she did not anticipate what would occur in the first meeting and that the discussion would go beyond individual concerns.

The motion passed by a raise of hands of those against entering into an executive session to discuss the resolution. Senators named during the meeting as opposed: Robert Mann, Daniel Tirone, Meredith Veldman, Edward Shihadeh, Inessa Bazayev.

A motion was made by Dr. Lopez and seconded by Professor Peters-Hill to move out of the executive session.

e. Postponed: Second Reading, Resolution 21-08, Resolution 21-09, "Correcting LSU's Misquotation of the FDA's Vaccine Letters"

Sponsored by Charles Delzell, Charles Berryman, Carol Friedland, Robert Rohli, and Boris Rubin

A motion was made by Professor Tirone and seconded to postpone the second reading of the resolution to the December meeting. The motion passed.

New Business

A motion was made by Professor Tirone and seconded to postpone the new business to the December meeting. The motion passed.

a. Postponed: First Reading, Resolution 21-10, "Bringing LSU's COVID-19 Mandates into Compliance with State Law"

Sponsored by Carol Friedland, Kerry Dooley, Boris Rubin, Charles Delzell, and Charles Berryman

b. Postponed: First Reading, Resolution 21-11, "Censure of Faculty Senators for Behavior Unbecoming of LSU Faculty Members"

Sponsored by Concerned Faculty Senators and Faculty Council Members

President's Report

A motion was made by Professor Tirone and seconded to postpone the President's report to the December meeting. The motion passed.

Update on LSU Graduate School Strategic Plan, James Spencer, Vice Provost & Dean, LSU Graduate School

Dean Spencer gave an overview of the status of the LSU Graduate School Strategic Plan. Dean Spencer mentioned that the visitation was started last December with the strategic planning process specifically for the graduate school. He mentioned that there were five different constituency groups that were initiated to go through the next hurdle via the graduate school. Approximately six months later, those five groups gave a report from their working groups, which was independent of one another. Those independent reports were combined into a single 40-page document. He mentioned that there are five major areas that the graduate school wants to promote through all of their activities, policies, and programming over the next five years: 1) academics and scholarships, 2) future faculty and educators training, 3) workforce development and applied scholarships, 4) using Louisiana State University and the location as a kind of learning lab about their unique culture, environment, and history, 5) integrate all that in projects that are supported by data. He explained that the first part of the report describes the LSU graduate faculty staff, resources, and environment and identifies major challenges. He stated that there are 6000 graduate students (about 5000 full-time equivalent graduate students), about 1500 graduate faculty and full-time positions, and about 1800 graduate assistants which 50 million dollars are annually invested. He added that there are significant challenges in terms of the level of stipends and tuition waivers. While some progress was made on the levels of stipends and waivers, Dean Spencer mentioned that still a lot has to be done, and that is one of the main things that strategic planning is focusing on. He mentioned that there will always be a need for higher stipends as there's always going to be a need for increasing our graduate students. He further emphasized that the graduate school wants to bring the stabilized funding model for graduate education, making it more predictable and will partly generate resources for graduate students. The second part identifies a peer group that LSU can compare itself with. He stated that an ambitious but realistic set of peers had been established. Actions include data sets to track the alumni and make the data available to departments. He added that this would help to build a graduate community.

Q & A Summary:

Kerry Dooley: We are not treating our graduate students as resources. There is no max on the stipends. Departments that pay more to attract better students pay more overhead. Can we put a maximum allocation on the overhead charged?

James Spencer: So this is a very important question, and there are two things. The first is, there has been no standard policy on stipends across the University. So every college is setting the minimum, and then departments can pop that up as their financial resources. One of the first things that we have is to standardize and rationalize the universal stipend level as the baseline. Right now, the markets can bump that up as they see fit, based on whatever discretionary funds available. We haven't talked specifically about capping the department contribution, but that may come in as we're running a graduate assistant management workshop. We're trying to figure out what should be the most beneficial policy on external funding that will incentivize faculty to get graduate students on board in ways that actually increase our overall research.

Rosemary Peters-Hill: We have a small pool of resources that doesn't help us attract better students. When we

have good applicants, we cannot bring them here.

James Spencer: So, what I am getting from you is that the resources don't exist in HSS. This is the opposite side of some other departments which is why we need representation from HSS and the sciences. Engineering recruit students that have a standard package. So, this kind of finding that that standard package is going to require two things; one is ascertaining what's going to be reasonable to get great students, and then how do we allocate those beginning of the year across colleges. I think once we start moving in that direction, it'll be much more predictable for the college to know whom they're going to get like what they have to work with this year. And so one of the other things that our working group is going to have to ascertain that level, and really assert basically how many days you would need to maintain our status as a comprehensive diversity as well.

Robert Cook: A while ago, we didn't get charged tuition with some grants. It really does have that level where I don't know. I guess it's only when you get a postdoc, research, and the student. And I don't know how much money LSU makes off of those tuition fees.

James Spencer: One of the things that we've started doing is actually survey, and this is really from the strategic planning process. This was important to have some benchmark your groups. Everybody says stipends are too low or too high, but we don't give them to find what that market is, and now that we have nine-year institutions, and we've already done this, we've surveyed them, how do they treat their, their tuition waivers. Right, so we can see these are our competitors, and we benchmark. Now, we have surveyed nine peer institutions, and how they are handling their tuition waivers. We will use their data to establish LSU's baselines.

Pamela Blanchard: These policies that you're discussing, they're going to go across the main campus and the Ag Center. So, they're going to affect both main campus grad students in the agricultural center.

James Spencer: It will affect the Ag center in the fact that it has the grad students are from the College of Agriculture, and the College of Agriculture is part of the A&M campus as far as the faculty approval systems and review and all this kind of stuff, so it's just like any other college. It just happens to have a whole bunch of faculty that are graduate faculty, but they're not graduate faculty as part of the standard tenure promotion process through the College of Agriculture, so we have a separate process for bringing them in. So it will affect them because they have the College of Agriculture.

Pamela Blanchard: Would the grad students that work with that faculty still be included in the tuition and salary and all of that?

James Spencer: Yes

Matthew Hiatt: Who are our competitors?

James Spencer: We found a 2014 list that included SEC schools. We looked at metrics including research expenditures, federal funds to total funds, and a number of graduates, doctoral students. When you look at the ranking of US institutions from the selected metrics, LSU ranked fourth in 2010. We now rank 10th. It is optimistic but realistic.

Faculty Senate Appeals Board Elections

Vote for the new member of Appeals Committee; Vote was taken by Qualtrics. Professor Rosemary Peters-Hill was elected.

Dr. Aghazadeh said he hadn't seen such a mess in his 37 years of service. He added that not all the statements were showing on screen prior to the election.

Dr. Lopez mentioned the meeting for December 7th to make up for the meeting that was canceled due to Hurricane Ida.

Votes were taken by Qualtrics. The next meeting will be on December 7th instead of in January.

Adjournment before 05:30 pm