

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, February 23, 2022
Atchafalaya Room 339, LSU Union



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

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

I	Arend Van Gemmert	I	Trey Jones
I	Charles Delzell	I	Judith Sylvester

Alternates:

Fabio Del Piero for Adriano Vatta	Hsiao-Chun Wu for Gerry Knapp
Fereydoun Aghazadeh for Marwa Hassan	Juan Martinez for Samithamby J Jeyaseelan
Alan Baumeister for Matt Freeman	Lilly Allen for James Canfield
Edward Shihadeh for Helen Regis	Nathan Lord for Jeff Davis
Guoqiang Li for Muhammad Wahab	Timothy Chandler for Joseph Legoria

- Attendance was taken via email for both senators attending in person and via zoom. All senators and guests were asked to send an email to faculty senate@lsu.edu with Subject: Faculty senate

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – February 23rd, 2022

meeting attendance; Body: full name and guest or senator indicating whether they are alternate and for whom.

- President Lopez called for a motion to approve the agenda for the February 23rd meeting. A motion was made by Professor Mohammad and seconded by Fereydoun Aghazadeh. The motion was passed to approve the agenda.
- Dr. Lopez announced the alternative representatives.

Public Comments on Agenda Items

No registered public comments.

Consideration of the Minutes from January 25th, 2022

A motion was made by Fereydoun Aghazadeh and seconded by Louay Muhammad. The motion passed with Professor Jeffrey Roland abstaining.

President's Report

- a. President Lopez covered Robert's rules of order on calling the question, postponing the resolution, tabling topics, and referring to the committee.
- b. More than 100 faculty, students, alumni, donors, administrators, and Board of Supervisors members met at the Pennington Biomedical Research Center to identify values and vision for a consistent and meaningful message for LSU. A survey went out, and there were about 10,000 responses. The attendees worked in groups of about ten in brainstorming sessions to articulate a set of values and translate that information into a mission statement. The meeting included a presentation by Coach Kim Mulkey, where he spoke about leadership success, leading teams, and clever commentary. A representative from the EAB company also helped identify goals for the University.
- c. President Tate stated he would steadfastly and markedly defend tenure. Board of Supervisors Chairman Starns also stated the same.
- d. President Lopez mentioned about the transition of all video assets from Kaltura to Panopto (faculty should now see a folder containing these converted videos called "Kaltura Content" or "Kaltura Migrations" in their folder on the Panopto Cloud site). She reminded the faculty to ensure that the instructional materials were in place.
- e. President Lopez met with Kappie Mumphrey, the Interim VP of Online Education, and pointed out the challenges of transferring Moodle ownership or access to Moodle. Only the instructor of record has access, and if that instructor is no longer available, it takes quite an effort to transfer. As such, President Lopez asked for a protocol to follow to save time and avoid security or confidentiality of concerns of any kind.
- f. Kimberly Lewis is the new Executive Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer, serving as the chief advisor to the President and the LSU Board of Supervisors on all fiscal and administrative matters.
- g. Donna Torres will serve as the Vice President for Finance. In the meeting with Ms. Torres, information about faculty salaries was requested by some FSEC members. The salary equity study is in the data collection phase. The concerns about campus safety were also expressed, where Ms. Torres reminded the FSEC about the LSU Shield app. Faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to install the Shield app on their phones. The executive committee also requested that an appropriate faculty consultation be secured when the fire hydrant currently positioned in the Indian mountains is removed.
- h. If some stealthy actions have been observed around the Louisiana Emergency Technology Center, it may be because of a new hub for cyber security and military science.
- i. A pulmonary report is due next week on the graduate student stipend.

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes – February 23rd, 2022

- j. President Lopez mentioned the \$225 million donation to LSU.
- k. A concern has been raised in regard to the library collection. Through the years, underfunding continues to be at the forefront of the FSEC agenda. With limited resources the number of turn-aways is unfathomable. Faculty and students have too many turn-aways and they cannot get the required manuscript since LSU does not have a subscription.
- l. From the FSEC meeting on February 9th, the dual enrollment participants have surged from two to seven thousand and are on track to reach 10,000 in the near future. Retention falls precipitously after the second year.
- m. Jose Aviles, Vice President for Enrollment Management, might visit Faculty Senate to discuss his view on the current state of student enrollment, plans, and precipitous decline in college-age populations
- n. There was a significant discussion about the December 2021 minutes. To allow the FSEC to focus on the business of the Faculty Senate, the FSEC has procured an outside transcription of the meeting by a professional vendor. Professor Veldman provided highly detailed corrections that were sent out before the February 23rd meeting. Now, it is anticipated that the transcript will be available for a March meeting, and both the transcript and Professor Veldman's corrections will be sent before the next meeting.
- o. Many faculty have raised concerns about the value of some of the proposed resolutions to the LSU faculty. Faculty Senate has the option to decide whether or not to consider a resolution. The FSEC has never served as a gatekeeper to prevent faculty expression; in fact, the FSEC have acted as facilitators to those who came with ideas. After some candid and thoughtful discussion, the FSEC settled on the following for resolution submissions: A resolution must have a corresponding author and that individual will be responsible for arranging the introduction, reading in the resolution, responding to questions and comments during the discussion, and making any necessary amendments or other revisions. Further, the FSEC believes that resolutions must pertain to that which is defined as the purview of the faculty as delegated by the Board of Supervisors.
- p. Professor Jeffrey Roland is preparing a document with the executive committee's input to guide submission and faculty center resolutions. The FSEC hopes to have it in place before the March Faculty Senate meeting.
- q. The last valid ratification of the Faculty Senate constitution was from 1973. The FSEC is going to find out and make things right. The process is further complicated because the Faculty Senate has not always functioned as a public body. It was noted that it is via FSEC's role in deciding educational policy delegated by the Board of Supervisors.
- r. President Lopez is meeting with Jason Droddy regularly to align Faculty Senate constitutional bylaws with the those of the Board of Supervisors. BOS governing documents have migrated in different directions, causing some misunderstandings
- s. The nominating committee has been formed and will meet with President Lopez to set the mission. The committee members are Peter Doran, John Miles, Wei-Hsung Wang, and Rosemary Peters-Hills. They will be reaching out to secure nominations. Those who wish to be considered should send names to Dr. Knoll.
- t. A member of the Louisiana Attorney General's office will be attending the Faculty Senate March meeting to provide training on open meeting laws.

Q & A Summary:

Daniel Tirone: From 100 participants at the strategic planning forum, how many were faculty, and how were they selected?

Dean Spencer: Six to eight were invited for the LSU system, and they were selected based on a distribution of rank and a distribution of college. Some attention was paid to different first viewpoints, and I think most of them attended.

Jeffrey Roland: How will they know who to identify as a speaker for transcription?

Susannah Knoll: I have been working with them directly to make sure.

Theda Daniels-Race suggested identifying the speakers themselves by name.

Dean of Students Update, Brandon Common, Associate Vice President, Dean of Students, Division of Student Affairs

Brandon Common joined LSU as Associate Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students on Dec 20, 2020. He is originally from St. Louis, Missouri, and has lived in Ohio and Illinois. He mentioned that he had an opportunity to learn about LSU culture and southern Louisiana and civic culture in general. He stated that everyone in the LSU community, faculty, and staff are committed to excellence and promoting student success. He stated that the students have roughly 153 hours per week that they do not spend in the classroom. As such, the goal of the Division of Student Affairs is to help them create the best experiences possible. He further added that the Division of Student Affairs could help students be successful in the classroom. He added that it could be accomplished by promoting three priorities, i.e., quality, creating spaces where students feel as they matter and belong, and inclusion and access control to make sure policies and procedures are inclusive and accessible. Brandon primarily works with five functional areas to make the priorities mentioned above happen. His work area includes campus life, student advocacy and accountability, Greek life, student government, and military and veteran student center. He continues to create more clarity in the division's work and looks at the policies and practices to ensure that it addresses the community and the needs of students. He stated that he wants to attend more events in the student community to be a resource for student life admission as all the operations and campuses are trying to get back to normal.

Q&A Summary

Joan King: How will the Code of Conduct be revised regarding infraction consequences?

Brandon Common: Every two years, we undergo a code of conduct revision process. When I came in December 2020, this process was wrapping up. So, I'm anticipating that we'll undergo that conversation and think about starting that process up again at the end of this calendar year or the beginning of the following calendar year. Regarding who's represented, we have faculty, undergraduate students, graduate students, and administrators, so we try to get a good representation from the community because we understand that this document impacts the entire community.

Meredith Veldman: From my students and talking to faculty and then reading about mental health, there's quite a crisis in student mental health, so what measures are being taken in this area?

Brandon Common: Students' mental health falls under the health center, not in our office area; yet, we are here for students, which impacts us differently. Our group is having conversations around this issue because it plays out in their academic experience, social experience, retention, and behavior. I work across the Division of Student Affairs and also with colleagues in the health center, where a lot of the preventive work is centered around programs and training for students regarding mental health, how to identify if their classmates or themselves are suffering from mental health, how they can access LSU CARES, student advocacy, and accountability. The R.A.s are trained about issues involving mental health as they are the first line when working with freshman students on campus. Our student government students are taking the lead, and they're challenging us and charging us to pay even more attention to mental health.

Mandi Lopez: What's your biggest challenge, and how did you overcome it?

Brandon Common: This goes back to the mental health-related question that was just posed. Isolation has been tough. So, it's been challenging to help students navigate to build a sense of community. We've thought about how we can continue to build a sense of belonging for our students in a virtual space. Students are largely back, but there are still students who don't feel as comfortable and would rather have meetings remotely. We try to accommodate, but I think we're going to continue to think about how we can find those spaces to continue building a sense of community and belonging to our students. There's been much conversation with student affairs around this year, especially having two freshman classes because our students who came in last year didn't really get that experience.

Old Business

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

Sponsored by Faculty Senator Daniel Tirone

Dr. Tirone mentioned that the graduate student association initially approached the Faculty Senate seeking the endorsement of a Bill of Rights that they had passed through student government. The FSEC reached out to Dr. Tirone as he knew the graduate student association president. So, he was appointed to bring the resolution to the Senate. He added that they received some constructive but critical feedback after the first reading. He worked with graduate students and some faculty members on campus both in and out of the Senate. The direction was to revise this document and particularly incorporate more of the existing policy infrastructure into it. In the second reading of the resolution, i.e., last December, Senator Tirone made a motion to postpone, as the graduate students were not quite ready. After that meeting, some Senators reached out to him seeking to assist, and they had a meeting. After the meeting, the graduate students got another direction for revision. As such, they are reintroducing a substitute resolution, which will consequently be very different from the current one. He further added that it seemed easier to introduce a substitute resolution than try and revise the current resolution 21-02. Consequently, Daniel Tirone made a motion to withdraw the resolution. The motion was seconded by John Miles. The motion passed to withdraw the resolution with no opposition.

b. 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

Professor Mann mentioned that the resolution has been on the Faculty Senate's agenda for months. The sponsors had hoped that they would have debated and voted on this resolution long ago. Professor Mann mentioned that there is now another resolution on the agenda, which proposes some sensible policy reforms to improve and streamline the Senate's functions, and that resolution would resolve many of their concerns over how the Senate conducts business. The current resolution, 21-08, outlined the serious leadership problems which have not been resolved. Professor Mann mentioned that he and his co-sponsors are conscious that the Senate elections are coming in April, and they believe those elections are now the more appropriate forum. As such, from the above-mentioned concerns, on behalf of his co-sponsors, Professor Mann made a motion to withdraw resolution 21-08. The motion to withdraw the resolution was seconded. The motion passes with no opposition.

c. Second Reading, Resolution 22-01, "Call for Enforcement of LSU's PS 118 100% Tobacco-Free Policy and an Education Campaign for Students"

Sponsored by Dr. Judith Sylvester, Manship School of Mass Communication/LSU SmokingWords

Judith Sylvester read the revised resolution.

Whereas state law [RS 40:1291.23](#) required LSU to adopt a smoke-free policy (including traditional smoking and vaping) and also authorized LSU to adopt a 100% tobacco-free policy (PS 118) which was enacted Aug. 1, 2014, all forms of tobacco, cigarettes, e-cigarettes (including all vaping devices) and smokeless tobacco are prohibited on all areas of the campus, including classrooms, residence halls and Greek housing;

Whereas the American Medical Association (AMA) cites more than 20 studies, which have looked at smoking status and COVID-19 complications, finding in more than 80% of those studies, smoking resulted in a statistically significant increase in adverse outcomes;

Whereas research shows that, compared to nonsmokers, smokers with COVID-19 are twice as likely to be admitted to the intensive care unit, to need mechanical ventilation, or to die;

Whereas the AMA further cites the 2020 U.S. Surgeon General's Smoking Cessation Report indicating the impacts of smoking—which includes an increased risk of upper and lower respiratory tract infections—a substantial risk for COVID-19 infections and complications;

Whereas tobacco use is now concentrated in subpopulations of society, such as those with mental health and substance abuse issues, especially individuals who are dealing with other major challenges in their lives that makes quitting even more difficult;

Whereas a study that tested more than 4,300 young people for the coronavirus found that those who vaped regularly were five to seven times more likely to test positive, because vaping harms the lungs, increasing the risk of coronavirus infection or a more serious case of COVID-19;

Whereas vaping is a social activity that can include sharing tobacco devices with others, increasing the chance of infection.

Whereas when people are smoking or vaping, they are also exhaling particulates from deep within their lungs into the environment around them, exposing anyone sharing a living space or classroom to exhaled secondhand smoke or aerosol. Such exposure also impairs immune function in both children and adult nonsmokers, which increases susceptibility to infection;

Whereas 31% of LSU students are regular or social tobacco users and, 39% live with or near a person who uses tobacco products;

Whereas only 10% of all LSU students receive information about the health effects of vaping from freshmen orientation and less than 5% receive information from faculty members, while 51% had received information from social media that often promotes use;

Whereas LSU has had personnel changes across the administration, deanships and faculty and staff since 2014 that increases the lack of awareness of the 100% tobacco-free policy and the public health concerns that led to the law that requires the policy;

Therefore the LSU Faculty Senate requests that the administration immediately publicly support LSU's 100% tobacco-free policy and reiterate the public health issues, including COVID, that underpin the policy;

Therefore inform students of the added risks of contracting and spreading COVID among those who smoke and vape by adding a public health message to all University announcements regarding COVID;

Therefore re-enforce the policy in the same manner as other policies enacted to promote healthy behaviors among members of the campus community, such as mandatory masking requirements, responsible bicycling and responsible alcohol consumption, are broadcast and communicated to all members of the campus community;

Therefore special 100% tobacco-free campus messages should be distributed to faculty and students, reminding them that tobacco use is prohibited in classrooms, residence halls and Greek housing – with special attention given to the regular vaping spots in the Quad and other hot spots where members of the campus community ignore the 100% tobacco-free policy and the public health issues, now including COVID-19, the policy was developed to address;

Therefore be it further resolved that LSU reconstitute the LSU Smoking/Tobacco/Inhalants/Vaping (STIV) committee for the sole purpose of developing the afore mentioned educational materials, increasing signage and suggesting re-occurring messages from top administrators to support our 100% tobacco free campus.

O&A Summary

Kerry Dooley: Why do we need a committee? Why do we need to continue reminding the students about an issue they already know is dangerous? They already know it's harmful to them. If they make a conscious decision that they want to smoke, it's none of our business, and it's not the university's business either, as long as they don't do it on the university grounds.

Judith Sylvester: We already have the committee. It was formulated in 2019, and it just has not been active or populated since the shutdown.

Jim Madden: In a statement, "Therefore inform students of the added risks of contracting and spreading," should the therefore name the agent or offices that you want to do these things?

Judith Sylvester: We have strategic communication and OAA. My original goal for this committee was to develop educational material that involves the health center, which involves the PR function at LSU. I mean, anybody responsible for campus-wide communication would be involved with this, and yes, particularly the student life area, I think should be involved.

Mandi Lopez: Would it be just simple to amend to say the office of academic affairs (OAA) could handle it?

Scott Baldrige: I have a question: what do you mean by re-enforce in "therefore re-enforce the Policy"? Aren't we already enforcing it? Suggests saying communicate policy rather than reinforcing.

Judith Sylvester: I feel like the message needs to be reinforced. We've never had a statement supporting this from any administration, any college, or President since 2014. Consequently, it was never viewed as really an important policy. We never reinforced the public health issue part of this, and we have never treated it like other policies. In

2014, it was covered at orientation. At that time, we did have the student affairs that were promoting it or talking about it. They also ensured it was in student orientation, although I'm unsure if it's still in student orientation. So, all I am trying to do is get us back into the messaging point. In addition, the laws changed, and students now have to be 21 years of age to purchase it, which was not the case in 2014, so there are legal implications for this as well.

President Lopez reiterated the suggested changes, i.e., OAA as a responsible party for the three Therefore : (1) "Therefore the OAA will inform students of the added risk of contracting and spreading....."; (2) "Therefore the OAA will see to the communication of the policy," (3) "Therefore special 100 tobacco-free campus messages should be distributed by the OAA Faculty and students...", and (4) "Therefore been further resolved that the OAA reconstituted the LSU smoking tobacco inhalant vaping committee."

Jeffrey Roland: Can you change re-enforce to reinforce?

Mandi Lopez: Currently, reinforce has been removed in the friendly amendment and has been changed to "therefore the OAA will see to the communication of the policy."

Judith Sylvester accepted the friendly amendments.

Lilly Allen: CBD is not noted here, and I do not want it noted here, but many people smoke CBD, which is not tobacco nor nicotine. Where do we stand on that? A lot of students are using CBD for anxiety for depression, so I do not know if it is a really hard thing to navigate? I do not want to infuse CBD as smoking.

Judith Sylvester: The IRB let me ask students this fall about CBD use. So, I actually have some statistics about that, but the difference is that CBD can be legal if they have a medicinal reason to use it. It's different if they use it for medicinal purposes. For tobacco, where there's no medicinal reason. I honestly think that will be our next issue so we will leave it alone now.

Jim Madden: Does FS have a way to directly communicate to the LSU community? Can the Senate communicate directly to the community rather than the admin?

Mandi Lopez: FS communicates through meetings and the website. We can place this on the website. We'll certainly include this resolution and any of the materials developed on our website. I see no limitation to that.

The motion was made to favor the resolution. The motion was passed with two opposing (Kerry Dooley and Estanislado Barrera) and 8 abstaining (Kirk Ballard, Wei-Hsung Wang, Daniel Tirone, Lilly Allen, John Miles, Robert Newman, James Madden, Fred Aghazadeh, Wei-Ling Song, Sarah Rosser).

d. Second Reading, Resolution 22-03, "Formation of a Planning Committee to Hold an Annual Faculty Council Meeting"

Sponsored by The Faculty Senate Executive Committee

The revised resolution was read by President Mandi Lopez

Whereas Faculty Council voted in favor of forming a faculty senate and to adopt the Constitution of the Faculty Senate which was adopted March 1, 1973. (*Faculty Council Records, Box 9/Faculty Senate Records, Box 9, Faculty Handbook 1973*).

Whereas on May 14, 1973, the Board of Supervisors approved the formation of a Faculty Senate (*Faculty Council Records, Box 9/LSU Board of Supervisors, Reel 16*) (*Faculty Council Records, Box 9/Faculty Senate Records, Box 9, Faculty Handbook 1973*).

Whereas the 2005 Faculty Senate Constitution, Article I, Nature and Function Section 2 states: "The Faculty Senate shall possess all of the powers conferred upon the Faculty Council by regulations of the Board of Supervisors or otherwise and shall exercise such powers in a manner consistent with the duties of the Faculty Council.... to establish curricula, fix standards of instruction, determine requirements for degrees, and generally determine educational policy for the University, subject to the authority of the LSU Board of Supervisors.Such power

shall be exercised by the Senate at any and all times when the Council is not in session. The Senate shall represent the Council in all matters and shall be deemed to voice the policies, opinions, and sentiments of the Council on any matter within its jurisdiction."

Whereas the 2005 Faculty Senate Constitution Article I Nature and Function section 6 states that "The Senate shall present a report of its activities and actions to the Council at each regular meeting of the Council and at such other time or times as the Council shall by resolution provide". Whereas the faculty must have input into setting the agenda and for determining the timing of the Faculty Council meetings.

Whereas the 2005 Faculty Senate Constitution Article I Nature and Functions section 7 states that "at any meeting of the Faculty Council for which the item is on the agenda distributed prior to the meeting, the Council may, by vote of a majority of those present and voting, review, modify, overrule, or otherwise deal with any action taken by the Faculty Senate. Upon the written request of 50 members or 10 percent of the Faculty Council, whichever is the smaller number, final action of the Senate shall be submitted to the Council for review. Upon written request of a majority of the Senate, any pending matter may be referred to the Faculty Council for final action".

Whereas the Board of Supervisors Regulations Article 1 Section 2 states "Each faculty or Faculty Council shall meet at least once each academic year. It can be convened on the written request of 50 members or 20 percent of the membership, whichever is the smaller number. A council quorum may not be less than 25 percent of the membership".

Whereas 2005 Faculty Senate Constitution Article VII Amendments states that "Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed by the Faculty Senate or by any member of the Faculty Council' and 'Amendments to this constitution shall become effective upon adoption by the Faculty Council by two thirds vote of the members of the Faculty Council present and comprising a quorum. Amendments may also become effective upon adoption by mail ballot in which twenty-five percent of the Faculty Council responds and two thirds of those responding approve".

Whereas Faculty Senate voted on October 29, 2020, to adopt changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution which have yet to be approved by the faculty as a whole.

Whereas the last known vote on changes in the Faculty Senate constitution by the Faculty Council was in February 2004, with the resulting vote being 619 yes and 23 no as reported by email by Carruth McGehee on March 1, 2004.

Therefore Be It Resolved that a mail ballot be sent as soon as feasible to all faculty members requesting their vote on the October 29, 2020, changes to the Faculty Senate Constitution.

Therefore Be It Further Resolved that the Faculty Senate form the Faculty Council Planning Committee whose mission and duties would be the following as discussed and proposed by all FSEC members

"The mission of the Faculty Senate Faculty Council Planning Committee is to ensure that there is an annual Faculty Council meeting."

"The Committee will be responsible for preparing an agenda, in cooperation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and input from any Faculty Council member who chooses to contribute, and for developing plans for when the meeting will be held and coordinating logistics for the location of the meeting and how it will be conducted, in cooperation with the President's or their designee's office and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee."

Q&A Summary:

Thomas Douthat: How do we know how many people are in and how many faculty councils on our campus?

Joan King: We have a directory.

Thomas Douthat: Going back to the 1973 changes, is the Faculty Council inclusive of the entire LSU system or just ourselves?

Joan King: Each campus has their own faculty senate.

Daniel Tirone: The Office of Management and Budget keeps a census of all faculty at the University, which is also how the Senate knows how big the senate needs to be. So, the Senate is based on 25 faculty get one representative and that's communicated to the FSEC and then that number is used to determine allocations of Senate seats. OMB has that data, and they issue an update every spring and that's how its maintained.

Daniel Tirone: It would seem that the proposed mail ballot is permissible under the Senate constitution but is impermissible under open meetings laws and I was wondering if the general counsel representative could weigh in on that.

Trey Jones: To comply with open meetings law, votes need to be held in-person.

Mandi Lopez: This is the problem because the last two revisions have been approved via mail ballot. If depending on these discussions, we may have to go back to circa 1973.

Joan King: We can do it either way, we will do whatever we need to do.

Jeffrey Roland: The resolution reports to be about the formation of a planning committee to hold an annual faculty council meeting but these two whereas, the last two areas of the first therefore are not about that. They're rather about ratifying the constitution. That's a completely separate issue, so I don't really understand why these are part of this resolution at all.

Joan King: What we were thinking originally was when we had the annual meeting, we could vote on the constitution but then we were thinking we should try to do that sooner than wait until the annual meeting and that's why how it is present there.

Jeffrey Roland: If we're going to vote today on asking the faculty council to ratify a constitution that I've not seen, and I think a lot of other people in this room have not seen. This resolution is saying we're going to submit a constitution that was adopted by this body in 2020 to the faculty council. You're asking us to vote on that today and I'm not prepared at all.

Joan King: We are not asking all Senates to vote today.

Mandi Lopez: We do not know which of the last faculty Senate constitutions was legally approved. We do not know yet, but it appears to be 1973. We have to confirm which is the actual constitution, so I would suggest a friendly amendment and recommend them to strike.

Professor King reiterated the suggested changes: remove the last two whereas and the first therefore that relate to voting on faculty Senate constitution

Kerry Dooley: Why do we need an entire committee to just plan a meeting?

Joan King: The Executive committee handles tons of issues. So, we thought the committee that's just focused on making sure that the faculty council meets annually would be helpful.

Mandi Lopez: We need to make sure that everyone is able to participate and that we are able to get a quorum, which is critical to our faculty Governance. It really is a tremendous amount of work, and it has to be done correctly to not be in violation of Louisiana public laws.

The motion was made to favor the resolution. The motion was passed with one opposing (Kerry Dooley) and 2 abstaining (Paulo Waltrich and Theda Daniels-Race).

e. Second Reading, Resolution 22-04, "Amendment to Article III of the Louisiana State University Faculty Senate Bylaws"

Sponsored by Inessa Bazayev, Pamela Blanchard, Peter Doran, James Madden, Robert Mann, Rosemary Peters-Hill, Jeffrey Roland, Parampreet Singh, Daniel Tirone, and Meredith Veldman

The revised resolution was read by Meredith Veldman.

Whereas, many of the Faculty Senate 's most important purposes are fulfilled in consideration of old and new business; and

Whereas, the current Order of Business for Faculty Senate meetings places consideration of business as the last two items on the agenda; and

Whereas, a pattern has developed of Faculty Senate meetings concluding without due consideration, and in many cases with no consideration at all, of business;

Therefore, be it resolved that Article III of the LSU Faculty Senate Bylaws, which currently reads:

1. Registration and recognition of attendance for each member or alternate and guests for recording in the meeting minutes.
2. Recognition of individuals having public comments on agenda item(s).
3. Approval or revision of minutes.
4. President's report.
5. Committee report(s) and invited speaker(s).
6. Agenda business item(s).
7. Introduction of new business

be amended to read:

1. Registration and recognition of attendance for each member or alternate and guests for recording in the meeting minutes.
2. Recognition of individuals having public comments on agenda item(s).
3. Approval or revision of minutes.
4. President's report.
5. **Upper administrator's report and question time (if applicable)**
6. Old business
7. New business
8. Committee report(s) and invited speaker(s).

Jeffrey Roland requested a friendly amendment to change old business to unfinished business.

Robert Newman: If we have invited speaker, we ask them to sit through this type of meeting before they talk?

Meredith Veldman: We can invite them to come at 4:40 or 4:45 pm. Number 5 added for upper admin to speaker, other speakers can wait to speak.

The motion was made to favor the resolution. The motion was passed with two abstaining (John Miles and Louay Mohammad).

New Business

a. First Reading, Resolution 21-12, "An Expression of No Confidence in Faculty Senate Practices, with Recommendations for Reform"

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

Dr. Tirone mentioned that the Senate has a critical role to play as they are the first line of representation for the faculty and shared governance. However, the Senate is not fulfilling that obligation and the dysfunction is causing many important issues to go unaddressed. It is imperative that the Senate should improve their practices in order to get back to the business of effectively representing the faculty. Dr. Tirone stated that the situation is urgent to shared governance and academic freedom are increasingly at risk. It is important to identify fundamental problems with the practices that are holding this body back and offer solutions that will allow to move forward through cooperation rather than competition. It's normal and appropriate to have different perspectives on policies and for those differences to lead to sometimes seeded discussion. However, it is not acceptable to disagree on rules and procedures that govern those debates. Dr. Tirone mentioned that it is those rules that allow for the productive and civil discourse that should enable the Senate to reach outcomes to support the majority of its members and for those who are not in the majority, to feel that they were heard and to accept the final decision in short, good practices yield good policies. Unfortunately, the practices are all too often irregular and lead to destruction and delay rather than moving forward. As such, Dr. Tirone and his co-sponsors have the resolution 21-12 to identify some of the Senate's

most pressing procedural problems and propose a series of reforms. He said that "As a group, I hope we can temporarily set aside any policy differences we may have in order to do the necessary work of improving this body's practices, so that as we turn our attention to pressing questions of policy and principle in the future we do stand upon a much stronger foundation". Dr. Tirone then read the resolution.

Whereas attempts underway across the United States to abolish tenure, limit faculty's right to freedom of speech, and eradicate the principles and practices of shared university governance highlight the importance of the LSU Faculty Senate serving as a strong and effective advocate for faculty interests and concerns; and

Whereas a series of formal and informal changes made over the last several years to the policies and practices of the Faculty Senate have centralized decision-making and diminished faculty representation, allowing for the exercise of authority without accountability; and

Whereas certain members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) itself were excluded from communications regarding proposed changes to the LSU Board of Supervisors Regulations that would have fundamentally altered shared governance at the University, and this information additionally was kept from members of the Faculty Senate and Council, even though it was clear that the actions of the Board of Supervisors were likely undertaken as retaliation against the faculty for its activism in assuring COVID planning during the summer of 2021; and

Whereas the erosion of Faculty Senate practices has been obvious in the disorganization of the last several meetings and led to general dissatisfaction with the manner in which recent meetings have been conducted; and

Whereas these instances include the inappropriate use of Executive Session at the FSEC meeting on November 10, 2021, and at the meeting of the full Senate on November 15, 2021, actions that subjected the Senate to criticism on legal and principled grounds¹ and exposed members to potential fines;² and

Whereas an anonymous Resolution (21-11) was added to the agenda for the Senate meeting on November 15, 2021 in violation of the requirements described in the Senate's Constitution and Bylaws;

Therefore, be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate calls for the creation of an ad hoc committee composed of five Senators to be elected by their peers to review current Senate Constitution & Bylaws, policies and practices and to present a series of recommendations for revisions and improvements to the Senate no later than its March meeting; and

Therefore, be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate is to immediately implement or observe the following best practices, many of which are already part of its guidelines, while awaiting the recommendations of the ad hoc committee:

1. The FSEC is to operate according to established Senate rules and general parliamentary procedure and is to set and approve the agenda for Faculty Senate meetings via deliberation and a vote by all eligible FSEC members, in accordance with the requirements laid out in the Constitution and Bylaws, during their normal meetings.
2. Time limits are to be strictly enforced as follows: a three-minute limit for public comments; ten minutes for presentations by outside speakers followed by a five-minute question and answer period; ten minutes for committee reports; and for the President's Report to be circulated in written format to the Senate in advance of the minutes with a ten-minute in meeting presentation of the most pressing issues followed by a five-minute question-and answer period.
3. All FSEC members and Senators must be immediately notified of any potential changes to any LSU Regulation, Policy Statement, Permanent Memorandum, or other standing practice or policy originating from inside or outside of the Senate.
4. The Senate is to be advised of all actions taken on its behalf by the FSEC at the earliest opportunity, in accordance with the requirements laid out in the Constitution and Bylaws.

Therefore, be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate also directs the FSEC to undertake the following actions:

1. Investigate the possibility of retaining outside counsel to assist in the conduct of meetings, determining permissible meeting formats including the use of remote participation technologies, and for consultation on legal matters which may arise as part of Senate business, and to present their findings to the Senate at its February meeting.
2. Identify and adopt an easily accessible method of conducting votes that is compliant with ADA requirements and all other applicable laws.

Therefore, be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate does not allow for resolutions to be sponsored anonymously; and

Therefore, be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate rejects any efforts to constrain faculty voices or academic freedom in any way, and supports the right of faculty to participate in shared governance and advocate for their interests via all legal channels.

A motion was made and seconded to move the resolution into discussion.

Robert Newman: I am sympathetic to some changes that you requested here. It could have done in a non-confrontational way by just proposing these changes; and not calling it an expression of no confidence. Make proposed changes that we will enact without making normative judgment of no confidence. Propose them in a non-confrontational, non-normative way. I'm opposed to the title of this resolution.

Thomas Douthat: I was not member of body when alleged actions came forth. I tried to understand them retrospectively and why it caused so much tension and mistrust. It is very hard for me to do that. I would like to recommend that the title be changed to recommendations to reform, and the 2nd through 6th whereas be removed, as I think there are more constructive recommendations.

Hana Beloglavec: I would recommend adjusting the timelines.

Daniel Tirone: We would be certainly open to any and all feedback including the friendly amendments on the title but also with regards to the timing.

Scott Baldrige: I also recommend deleting 2 through 5 whereas and the title change.

Matt Hiatt: I support the last two other amendments.

Kerry Dooley: Your proposed changes call for another ad hoc committee to make changes. Just propose changes without a committee.

Daniel Tirone: These were what we thought at a minimum would be best practices for implementation moving forward. But we by no means wanted to suggest that this was an exhaustive list. In fact, we removed in the interest of brevity, a lot of recommendations that we had put forward with the idea that those then could be suggestions to the committee for their presentation and their committee report to the full setting.

Joan King: The last two Therefore's in resolution do not relate.

Daniel Tirone: We can remove the next to last therefore with a new procedure for having a reader for the resolution.

Robert Newman: Why have last therefore and the innuendos? You could just ask the Senate president to start enforcing those without making any windows about no confidence.

Daniel Tirone: There are members of the Senate that have faced retaliation or the threat of retaliation for speech and that is to us troubling now the question of the necessity of including that type of concern in the document. I would propose that is a question for the Senate. If the Senate relates to us as clearly a number of members are that this is a document which would be strengthened by removing those types of concerns and focusing exclusively on procedural changes, we will be receptive to that and we will give that for full consideration.

Scott Baldrige: The third from the bottom therefore about the method of voting. We did that already. Do we actually need counsel?

Daniel Tirone: We have interest beyond the University General counsel's office for open meetings laws. We may have different interpretations of the law so we should not rely on one.

Roger Laine: The point of retaliation is not true, the BOS chair told us it was frustration about the two groups.

Daniel Tirone: I would respectfully suggest that we do have evidence of the contrary. I give Chairperson Starnes full credit for coming and speaking in front of the Senate and I give them all the respect to this position and his statements, but I think this is an area where you know perhaps reasonable individuals may disagree and we have reasons to believe that there was at least in part some retaliatory actions.

John Miles: Along lines of reconsidering whereas 2 through 5, then also remove the attached letter.

Daniel Tirone: It would seem to make sense to adopt that approach.

5. First Reading, Resolution 22-02, "A Resolution for Fair and Equitable Cost of Living Salary Adjustments for LSU Faculty Based on Annual Inflation Rates"

Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Benefits Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

Professor Laine read the resolution.

Whereas faculty raises are classified as merit raises;

And whereas these "merit" raises have not been awarded every year (since 2010, seven years have had no faculty raise at all);

And whereas since 1975 the Social Security Administration has included Cost of Living Adjustments (SSA-COLA) annually for all recipients;

And whereas "merit" raises given to LSU Faculty since 2005 and yearly SSA-COLA are:

Year	Merit Raise	SSA COLA*
2005	0.00	2.70
2006	5.40	4.10
2007	6.00	3.30
2008	4.00	2.30
2009	0.00	5.80
2010	0.00	0.00
2011	0.00	0.00
2012	0.00	3.60
2013	4.00	1.70
2014	3.00	1.50
2015	0.00	1.70
2016	0.00	0.00
2017	3.00	0.30
2018	3.00	2.00
2019	0.00	2.80
2020	0.00	1.60
2021	3.00	1.30
2022	0.00	5.90

*<https://www.ssa.gov/oact/cola/colaseries.html>. SSA-COLA adjustments go into effect in January but are reported in December of the previous year. For the sake of comparison, we have aligned them with the academic year and the university fiscal year, which begins in July.

And whereas, for example, a faculty member earning \$60,000 in 2005 who received all scheduled merit raises in full would be earning \$81,604 in 2021, while the SSA-COLA adjusted \$60,000 salary would be \$82,211, indicating that "merit" raises lag cost of living adjustments;

And whereas providing an annual cost of living adjustment would maintain a baseline of adequate compensation for faculty that would make true merit-based raises possible;

And whereas due to the erratic scheduling of "merit" raises, the real value of a faculty member's salary is determined by their hire date, producing an inequitable compensation structure;

And whereas categorizing cost-of-living adjustments as "merit" raises can have numerous negative effects on faculty morale;

And whereas lack of true merit raises has cost the University valued faculty who get higher salaries befitting their expertise at other institutions;

And whereas for LSU to recruit and maintain excellent faculty, and thus excellent students, salaries must be competitive both with our regional peers and with our Carnegie peer institutions;

And whereas to provide a student experience and state service befitting a flagship university we must have faculty with national and international reputations, reputations that require compensation adequate to keep and maintain said faculty;

And whereas the Social Security Administration has applied a 5.9% COLA for 2022, meaning that without a raise in 2022, faculty "merit" raises would be further devalued in real terms; Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the University include a 5.9% COLA for faculty in the FY 2023 university budget recommended by the President of LSU and the Board of Supervisors TO THE STATE LEGISLATURE,

And **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that for the 2022-23 academic year and beyond, the President recommend an annual cost of living adjustment for all LSU faculty, based on the SSA-COLA, to the Board of Supervisors, to be forwarded and recommended by the BOS to the STATE LEGISLATURE.

A motion was made by Del Piero and second by Muhammed to move the resolution into discussion.

Thomas Douthat: Should this extend to other employees not on faculty tracks, like support staff?

Roger Laine: The staff has had more egregious changes than faculty, so writing another for staff is recommended.

Robert Newman: Is getting an intent to ask University for 5.9% raise going to be a merit raise or you are asking for a across board raise. Their department treated it as merit. Will it be distributed based on merit? This needs to be clear.

Roger Laine: It will be a cost of living raise and merit would be on top of that. It says 5.9% COLA to clarify that it is cost of living. It can be clearer that COLA is not merit raise which makes merit raise possible.

Edward Shihadeh: When announced as merit raise, it is distributed as COLA, but indexing it is important. It's just about the priority here. You know a little expression; show me your budget and I will show you your priorities. We have never been a priority here. I have been here for 30 years and so I would favor anything. Especially something like this would increase pressure and that would make us a line item in the budget rather than an occasional afterthought.

James Madden: Salary of \$60,000 in 2005 would become salary of \$81,000 with merit raises. The total merit raises over the period is 36% and COLA increases are 49%. The difference is much different than what is stated here. We should check it.

Roger Laine: Raises multiply over time, but they did not include time of raise.

Robert Newman: If you want a verification of the growth, you can go to the Bureau of Labor Statistics home page, and they have an inflation.

Daniel Tirone: You may want to just add that the current inflationary environment is increasing at a rate that we haven't seen in a few decades. So, this is more to remain now than it has been particularly given that an error period is sort of below inflation over the period that you've analyzed. Adding in the most recent estimate of year over year inflation was about 7.1 and that is not going to be changing probably noticeably in any one significantly soon. As such, that might be an additional piece of information to motivate this moving forward to the administration.

Kerry Dooley: Going forward Shihadeh's point is important. We need to be part of the line item of the budget. In order to do that, we need to think about cuts in other parts of the University to get appropriate adjustments. The

legislature won't help us.

President Lopez said that the committee is willing to consider the suggestions. She asked to forward all suggestions to Dr. Knoll via email.

Adjournment before 5:15.

* A member of the Senate, with written notice to the President before the meeting, may choose another faculty member who is eligible for election to the Senate from the same college or division as a voting Alternate representative at that Senate meeting.

**It is intended that public comments may be made (1) when they relate to a matter on the agenda and (2) when individuals desiring to make public comments have registered at least one hour prior to the meeting by emailing facultySenate@lsu.edu or by calling 225-578-5248. When registering, individuals should identify themselves; the group they are representing, if appropriate; and the topic on which they would like to comment. To ensure that the meeting is conducted in an efficient manner, each individual will be limited to 3 minutes for their public comments and the President reserves the right to limit the total number of public comments if necessary.