

LSU Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
3:00 P.M., Thursday, November 2, 2010
Student Senate Room, LSU Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

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

Parliamentarian: Charles N. Delzell (present)

Senators present:

1 Philip Allen	2. Mary Catherine Aime	3. John Battista	4. Gabriel Beavers
5. Melissa Beck	6. Dana Bickmore	7. Stephanie Braunstein	8. Paolo Chirumbolo
9. Aaron Clopton	10. Larry Crumbley	11. Jennifer Curry	12. Josh Detre
13. Bruce Eilts	14. John Fletcher	15. Kristopher Fletcher	16. Forrest Guy
17. Joseph Francis	18. Craig Freeman	19. Dominique Homberger	20. Jennifer Jolly
21. Joan King	22. Jeff Kuehny	23. Ed Laws	24. Joseph Legoria
25. Michael Leitner	26. David Lindenfeld	27. Michelle Livermore	28. Mandi Lopez
29. Reem Meshal	30. Kevin McCarter	31. Alison McFarland	32. Patrick McGee
33. Louay Mohammad	34. Rebecca Owens	35. Suresh Rai	36. Larry Rouse
37. Kresimir Rupnik	38. Cristina Sabliov	39. Bhaba Sarker	40. Joseph Siebenalle
41. rGeorge Stanley	42. Stauffer Suzanne	43. William Stickle	44. Padma Sundar
45. Gail Sutherland	46. Dianne Taylor	47. Phillip Tebbutt	48. Justin Walsh
49. Wanjun Wang	50. Hsiao-Chun Wu	51. Yi-jun Xu	

Replacements for absent Senators (voting):

Gina Costello for Michael Russo

Represented by Proxy - Not Voting:

1. Wanjun Wang for Kerry Dooley	2. Josh Detre for Wes Harrison
---------------------------------	--------------------------------

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

1. Linda Allen
2. Michael Bowman
3. Kathleen Bratton
4. Neila Donovan
5. Susan Dumais
6. Kristi Dykema
7. Steve Gaunt
8. John Hamilton
9. Andrea Houston
10. Benjamin Kahan
11. John Nyman
12. John Protevi
13. Frederick Sheldon
14. Ed Watson
15. Sue Weinstein

Guests Attending Meeting:

Sandrock, Johanna	Robert Doolos	Patty Exner
Ernie Ballard III	Sydni Dunn	Aurela Young
Bilal Hamideh	Ann Ostram	Hollis Carter
William Suir	Anastasia Deeter	Crawford Breedlove
Wilfred Majer	Monty Sullivan	Bradley Wood
Barbara Craig		

Consideration of the Minutes from October 2010

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

Presentation by Bradley Wood (co-founder of Proud Students)

Bradley presented the “Don’t Sink LSU” Banner with hundreds of student, faculty, and staff signatures. Students are not as apathetic as you might think. The number of signatures reflects the level of student awareness and engagement, with hundreds of signatures in response to the budget situation. Bradley also announced plans for a rally at the state capital. There was more information on the back table about the rally.

President's Report***LSU-BR News:***

- We have at long last managed to explain commencement procedures. No new procedures were implemented, just established procedures now enforced. Procedures concerning regalia, medals, and tassels are also being clarified.
- The new and more limited use of broadcast e-mails for announcements is now implemented. The senate still has access, but others must show ability to attract 500 people to an event in order for it to be advertised via the Broadcast system. Thus the FSEC has met with Herb Vincent and Brian Voss to discuss other ways to distribute general information across campus.
- Robert Doolos is shaking things up by enforcing the storing of social security numbers either on computers or hard-records by faculty. The threat of fines caught a lot of attention. The FSEC is pursuing ways of getting this information cleaned up efficiently.
- The SGA appeared before the FSEC to address use of laptops in class. They noted split opinions among students regarding appropriate use. They want the faculty senate to reaffirm the right of individual faculty members to decide on laptop use in individual courses.
- Robert Doolos is also developing class schedule options for various emergencies that might occur. More on that as it develops.
- Good news in that the university’s quality enhancement plan (QEP) has been accepted by SACS with minimal comment. The next round of accreditation reviews is scheduled for 2014.
- The senate newsletter is available with one more due in December.

System News:

- No move by the supervisors towards considering an exigency declaration. They have also shot down any consideration of closing some campuses to provide more money to others in case of serious budget cuts. The “just say no” concept of fighting on-going budget cut scenario preparations has caught on with some of the other system campuses, most recently

State News:

- Amendment # 2 could negatively affect higher education by directing funds to local governments. Amendment # 6 concerns retirement and could also have some negative impact on higher education.
- The LSU Business School has developed a plan for accepting transfer students.
- The website for the Louisiana Transfer Degree guidelines has been established.
- The LSU Student Government efforts to draw attention to our budget issues have garnered both state and national attention.

Q&A Summary:

King: Should we be trying to get rid of Social Security numbers from our computers?

Cope: Yes. The release of student SS #'s can be a serious issue.

Doolos: We are finding residual SS #'s on departmental and faculty computers. These need to be removed or protected. We now use LSU ID #'s to generally replace SS #'s. So please be careful.

Rouse: Does that include Excel files from 10 years ago?

Doolos: Yes, you should remove the SS #'s. All old students have been assigned LSU ID's in case you need them for some reason. We're happy to convert these files for you, even for students who are long gone.

Report and Summary by Senate Vice-President Pratul Ajmera concerning Revision of PS-44 (Grades and Grading Authority)

The PS-44 draft was electronically distributed to the senate a while back. I received comments, including detailed feedback from three senators, some of which were implemented. We then met with the Provost who also had comments, some of which were also included. The revised draft was then re-distributed to the senate and more comments (some very negative) were received. The main conflict point with some faculty concerns the removal of a faculty member by the administration during the semester. This might be due to illegal actions by the teacher, a traumatic event that negatively impacts the ability of the faculty members' ability to teach, or extremely poor teaching. Removing a faculty member from an active course is a serious event and some faculty felt that it should not be mentioned or addressed in PS-44. It could be covered in some other existing PS's or we could generate a new one to address this issue. We have the current draft of the PS-44 and will post it for viewing.

Q&A Summary:

Homberger: Assignment of grades in a course is a process that is intricate to the faculty member in charge of that course. Changing those grades is serious and this draft of PS-44 should be voted on by the Faculty Senate.

Ajmera: I agree. And the way I view the current draft of PS-44 is that the Faculty Senate has ultimate authority and should vote on it. If we do not agree to this, I think it would be extremely difficult for the university administration to put this on the website since this kind of policy is the responsibility of the faculty.

Cope: We need to get general agreement from the administration on the current draft. Voting on something that the administration won't accept would not be productive since they have the final say.

Ajmera: For example, PS 36 T/NT was voted on, but there were changes made for three years. The spirit and gist can be voted on, but revisions can follow. It is okay to say that we should make these changes in other PSs, but that can be difficult. It is okay to say that we should change other PS's or PM's to address this. But to put language about short-term problems in the midst of a PS like 104 that deals with dismissal from the university is dangerous. To come up with a new policy for a short term problem will take a long time. I'm open to better language, but please don't read this with an eye toward perfection. I'm open to changes to make this better, please don't read this expecting perfection.

Cope: Until recently, the administration did not see the need for this PS. Pratul's negotiating skill has led to acceptance of this policy in principle.

Presentation by Dr. Monty Sullivan, Executive Vice-President, Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS) – Statewide Transfer Programs.

Cope: We have been working on a 60 credit hour transfer program for students to move from the Community and Technical College system to the 4-year university system. Monty will brief us on this.

Sullivan: Thank you Kevin for that introduction. We are facing similar serious cuts to the LCTCS. There could be almost a 50% cut in our system budget from its highest funded point. We have had nearly 600 positions lost. So this is a very serious situation for all of us. This is the single largest percentage reduction in funding in the history of higher education. We need to consider the long-term implications for our state. During difficult times businesses need to focus on the core mission. I believe that colleges and universities also need to have a similar focus. How do we deploy our higher educational system to best effect?

I also want to hear your thoughts on an effective transfer environment. We do not now have an effective transfer environment. We are trying to set up a system for this in Louisiana that will function similar to that in place in other states. There are 16 total institutions in the LCTCS: 7 community colleges, 7 technical colleges, and 2 technical community colleges. These have functioned as a system since the Foster administration. 75,555 students are

enrolled as of Fall 2010. Missions vary across type of institution. 220,381 students in all of higher education including LCTCS for Fall 2010. Overall, the state has some significant challenges. Our higher education assets including all institutions have a responsibility to address those state needs, including high poverty levels, low high school graduation rates, and so on. In large part, the answer to these problems lies in higher education.

How does this relate to a discussion of transfer credit? We want to build a clear pathway for students to earn a baccalaureate degree. That needs to include community and technical colleges to prepare students who may not be ready for 4-year universities or who may not have thought of higher education. Setting up a state-wide transfer credit system so students can move from community colleges to 4-year universities is important and mandated by the state via LA Act 356 (aka, Nevers' Bill). Where appropriate, we need to combine our efforts to do what is best for the state of Louisiana. Transfer issues address how we work together to build a seamless route toward four-year degrees. Transfer council is charged with overseeing the development and implementation of the transfer credit system. (Described work to date, including development of two transfer degrees.)

Looking ahead - we need more data to have a better understanding of the transfer problem. We haven't studied the current situation to know what transfers look like in the state of Louisiana today. We have to describe today's circumstances and then move forward from there. This process will not work without engagement of four-year institutions in the process. Faculties determine admissions and transfers. Give our students a chance, and I promise they will succeed in your classrooms.

Q&A Summary:

Owens: Have you considered allowing students to transfer before they complete the two year degree?

Sullivan: Absolutely. We have pushed for them to complete the associates degree for the same reason you push for graduation.

Owens: Is there a way they can count as completers for you if they finish their two year degree work at a four year institution?

Sullivan: We need to consider at what point students are more ready to transfer and be successful. Let's collect the data to determine that and set policy accordingly. It is important for them to complete the degree no matter where they end up. What matters is keeping the student at the center of discussion.

-----: What is the tuition rate? How does it compare in other states?

Sullivan: \$2,500 per year. In Virginia, there is not much difference. Efficiency factors effect rate of funding per FTE from state general funds in places like Northern Virginia.

_____: California has a very strong community system. If you plan to transfer, you sign a contract that says if you complete the 60-hour degree, you will be accepted to the campus of your choice. It works really well. This type of system helps those who are not traditional students due to multiple circumstances.

Sullivan: The vast majority of students fall into that category. They have academic ability, but life circumstances have kept them from pursuing their education.

-----: There are 2 plus 2 programs already in existence. Have you looked at those?

Sullivan: We are collecting information about those programs, some of which have been in place for decades. We don't have the data yet that tells us how well the students do when they make the transition. We need to gather it.

-----: Problems with funding are documented at the state level, but how are our community colleges funded as compared to other states' programs?

Sullivan: We're not funded at the level we'd like. Tuition rate varies among institutions. Surcharge is being considered as a short term solution, but that won't work at all for us in the long term. 70% of our students have tuition paid for by a third party, as with Pell grants. We will push to raise tuition.

Old Business

Resolution 10-09 is deferred.

Second and Final Reading of Resolution 10-14.1, “Reclaiming Faculty Authority over the Curriculum and Rescinding Announced Layoffs” Sponsored and read by Dominique Homberger.

Whereas the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors delegate the Board’s authority to “establish curricula” on the LSU A&M Campus exclusively to the LSU Faculty Senate, and not to any campus administrator or to any committee appointed by campus administrators,¹ and

Whereas the Faculty Senate’s authority over “establishing curricula” includes at least a shared authority to decide which academic programs should be created, reorganized, or closed, and

Whereas in August 2010, 14 instructors in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures (the “Foreign Language 14”) were notified that their employment, and theirs alone among all LSU faculty, would not be extended beyond January 2011, and hence the LSU curriculum would no longer include instruction in several foreign languages, and

Whereas the National Office of the AAUP, in its letter to LSU’s Chancellor of October 29, 2010, pointed out that the Foreign Language 14 were not afforded due process in their mid-year termination and urged that Chancellor Martin “rescind the notices of termination issued to the fourteen language instructors”, and

Whereas this action has serious impact on students already admitted in allied programs, such as International Studies and Business Administration, as well as on LSU’s national and international reputation, and

Whereas such allied programs received no warning or notice of the termination of programs,² even though the elimination of the language programs in question has significant impact on the allied programs’ curricula, and

Whereas the Provost and the Chancellor have declined to say how these 14 faculty members were chosen from the entire LSU faculty for termination,² contrary to the AAUP’s Recommended Institutional Regulations,³ which require that administrators give a faculty member, upon request, the reasons for a decision not to reappoint, and

Whereas programs and curricula, once terminated, cannot easily be re-established when the budget stabilizes in the future, and

Whereas a budget crisis should not be an opportunity for the administration to make major structural changes to the university, especially in the absence of a declaration of financial exigency, and without adequate faculty involvement in shared governance on programs and curricula,

1. *Therefore be it resolved* that the Faculty Senate inform the LSU Board of Supervisors, through channels, that the campus administration has been violating the Board’s Regulations as described above, and
2. *Therefore be it further resolved* that the Faculty Senate recommends that the layoff notices to the 14 Instructors be rescinded and that no faculty member at LSU be terminated due to budget cuts:
 - (a) until the Faculty Senate has voted to accept the repercussions on the curriculum that the terminations will cause, and
 - (b) until other options to absorb cuts, and thereby avoid faculty and program terminations, have been examined by committees with substantial faculty representation.
 - 1) At the level of each campus of the LSU System, the Board Regulations declare: “The faculty or Faculty Council [of the campus] shall *establish curricula* [emphasis added], fix standards of instruction, determine requirements for degrees, and generally determine educational policy, subject to the authority of the Board. It ... may delegate its own authority to an elected Faculty Senate and/or to standing committees, whose authority shall be limited to matters which are proper to the faculty and which have been specifically delegated by the faculty.” In 1973, the LSU Faculty Council (i.e., the entire body of all faculty members at the LSU A&M campus) delegated its authority over the above matters to the LSU Faculty Senate. At the college level, the Board Regulations further declare: “The faculty of each college or school not within a college shall define and recommend degree programs for units under its jurisdiction.” And at the department level, the Board Regulations declare: “The departmental faculty shall have jurisdiction over matters concerning its educational policies insofar as these do not conflict with the policies of other departments, [or] the rules and regulations of its own college or school, the campus, or the University System.”
 - 2) See “Classics instructors fired, questions remain unanswered,” by Andrew Robertson, *The Daily Reveille*, LSU, Sept. 22, 2010: <http://www.lsureveille.com/opinion/cancel-the-apocalypse-classics-instructors-fired-questions-remain-unanswered-1.2337948> and “Administration at odds with faculty, war of the protocols begins,” *The Daily Reveille*, October 6, 2010: <http://www.lsureveille.com/opinion/cancel-the-apocalypse-administration-at-odds-with-faculty-war-of-the-protocols-begins-1.2355525>
 - 3) <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/RIR.htm>

Q&A Summary:

Stanley: Shouldn't you also read the next resolution, 10-14.2, so we can have a general discussion due to their similarity?

Homberger: OK with me.

No disagreements from the Senate for this.

LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 10-14.2 "Reclaiming Faculty Authority over the Curriculum and Recommending Considerations of Alternatives over Layoffs"

Sponsored and read by Senator Dominique Homberger

Whereas the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors delegate the Board's authority to "establish curricula" on the LSU A&M Campus exclusively to the LSU Faculty Senate, and not to any campus administrator or to any committee appointed by campus administrators,¹ and

Whereas the Faculty Senate's authority over "establishing curricula" includes at least a shared authority to decide which academic programs should be created, reorganized, or closed, and

Whereas in August 2010, 14 instructors in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures were notified that their employment, and theirs alone among all LSU faculty, would not be extended beyond January 2011, and hence the LSU curriculum would no longer include instruction in several foreign languages, and

Whereas this action has serious impact on students already admitted in allied programs, such as International Studies and Business Administration, as well as on LSU's national and international reputation, and

Whereas such allied programs received no warning or notice of the termination of programs,² even though the elimination of the language programs in question has significant impact on the allied programs' curricula, and

Whereas the FY12 Budget Crisis Committee has proposed cut to degree programs, course offerings, faculty, and staff,³ all of which, in combination with the recent and projected tuition increases, will hurt current and future students, and

Whereas programs and curricula, once terminated or "defunded", cannot easily be re-established when the budget stabilizes in the future, and

Whereas a budget crisis should not be an opportunity for the administration to make major structural changes to the university, especially in the absence of a declaration of financial exigency and without adequate faculty involvement in shared governance on programs and curricula, and

Whereas LSU Chancellor Michael Martin declared⁴ that he would take twice the amount of furlough administrators and faculty would if furloughs were to be instituted, and

Whereas other options for handling the budget cuts should first be explored, such as salary reductions or furloughs of administrators and faculty members at LSU (analogous to the furloughs imposed by the University of California System⁵ or the University of Illinois System⁶, or the voluntary temporary salary reduction schedule encouraged by former LSU Chancellor Bud Davis in 1992, which would protect more of the curriculum than the Budget Crisis Committee's plan would, and

Whereas distributing the pain and burden of budget cuts more equitably instead of concentrating it on the least powerful programs and faculty will strengthen the faculty and student body, which have been demoralized by recent budget cuts and the continuing uncertainty of the nature of future budget cuts,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate inform the LSU Board of Supervisors, through channels, that the campus administration has been violating the Board's Regulations as described above, and

Therefore be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that no faculty member at LSU be terminated due to budget cuts:

(a) until the Faculty Senate has voted to accept the repercussions that the terminations will cause on the curriculum, and

(b) until other options, such as furloughs of all administrators and faculty, to absorb cuts and thereby avoid faculty terminations, have been examined by a committee with substantial faculty representation, such as the steering committee prescribed in the campus exigency policy.

¹ At the level of each campus of the LSU System, the Board Regulations declare: “The faculty or Faculty Council [of the campus] shall *establish curricula* [emphasis added], fix standards of instruction, determine requirements for degrees, and generally determine educational policy, subject to the authority of the Board. It ... may delegate its own authority to an elected Faculty Senate and/or to standing committees, whose authority shall be limited to matters which are proper to the faculty and which have been specifically delegated by the faculty.” In 1973, the LSU Faculty Council (i.e., the entire body of all faculty members at the LSU A&M campus) delegated its authority over the above matters to the LSU Faculty Senate.

At the college level, the Board Regulations further declare: “The faculty of each college or school not within a college shall define and recommend degree programs for units under its jurisdiction.”

And at the department level, the Board Regulations declare: “The departmental faculty shall have jurisdiction over matters concerning its educational policies insofar as these do not conflict with the policies of other departments, [or] the rules and regulations of its own college or school, the campus, or the University System.”

² See Andrew Robertson “Classics instructors fired, questions remain unanswered” (*The Daily Reveille*, LSU, Sept. 22, 2010 <http://www.lsuredreveille.com/opinion/cancel-the-apocalypse-classics-instructors-fired-questions-remain-unanswered1.2337948>

³ Under the 23% cut scenario (Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Jack M. Hamilton at the Faculty Senate meeting of October 4, 2010) and “Administration at odds with faculty, war of the protocols begins” (*The Daily Reveille*, October 6, 2010 <http://www.lsuredreveille.com/opinion/cancel-the-apocalypse-administration-at-odds-with-faculty-war-of-the-protocols-begins-1.2355525>) (<http://www.lsu.edu/senate/meeting%20videos.html>), LSU would be reduced to the status it had in 1974. Under a 32% cut scenario (FY12 Proposed Cuts, Sept. 15, 2010, <http://www.lsu.edu/FY12BudgetCrisis/listings.shtml1>), 389 faculty members would be terminated, no faculty members would be furloughed, 50 degree programs would be eliminated, the student population would be reduced by 8000, which in turn would “substantially” reduce income generated from tuition and lead to another “layoff of hundreds more faculty and staff”.

⁴ Video, Faculty Senate-Chancellor Forum, 28 September 2010, “The Budget: Paying for a Great University”,

⁵ <http://tigerbytes2.lsu.edu/users/wwwfacsen/web/Chancellor-Budget-Forum-Sept-28-2010.wmv>

⁶ <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/21511>

Q&A Summary:

K. Fletcher: What is the technical definition of curriculum? For some of the languages that were cut there were no related majors, for some others there was. Where is the line drawn?

Homberger: Doesn’t that include all the courses we are offering for degrees? everything?

Cope: Board of Regents defines this technically - there is a difference between degree granting authority, and then curricula, then programs, then concentrations within programs. This is a fairly technical and legal distinction. In the resolution, we are using it more generally, but we need to be careful regarding statewide interpretation.

Walsh: With regards to the second resolution, I don’t think we should be suggesting a furlough. Spreading the pain across the faculty won’t necessarily improve things. I don’t think it is our job to suggest solutions. The administration needs to make decisions and then prove to us that it will be effective.

Homberger: I agree with you. I am not the only author. This has also been voted on by the LSU AAUP. This is listed under “other options”.

Walsh: There seems to be a remarkable emphasis on furloughs in this document.

Homberger: That is not the main part of the resolution. The main part is the importance of faculty in curriculum decisions. This is why we need faculty representation. This is about reclaiming faculty authority and reassertion of faculty participation and shared government.

Walsh: Part 1 of the resolution appears to do that adequately without suggesting furloughs.

Homberger: This is why we decided to separate the resolution into two parts, both of which begin with asserting faculty governance.

Owens: I question the transparency in this entire instructor “termination” process. First it was 500+ instructors being fired, then 250-some, then finally 14 were laid off. The question is how were these people selected? I would like to see a resolution that just emphasizes transparency of the process without giving any preordained solutions.

Cope: I think the resolution has been improved over the last month. The trend in these comments is in favor of the first, but not the second. I do not believe that the LSU system is going to allow furloughs, so I don't think we should be commenting on the furlough possibility in this resolution. I'm OK with point one in the resolution concerning the effect of laying off instructors and the impact of those layoffs on the education of our students.

Stautter: By bringing in the idea of furloughs we are diluting the impact on the educational part of the resolution.

Stickle: I think realistically we have to look at the fact that weak programs have been perpetuated. We aren't doing our part if we try to view everyone the same. We need to recognize that this isn't about curriculum - it's about students we are moving out into the state to represent us.

Cope: We are trying to bring some Supervisors onto campus to meet some real faculty and you [Bill Stickle] will be one of them.

____: Can we simplify this and just discuss the first resolution and drop the idea of the second?

Homberger: They are not the same. I think we need to vote on each separately. I didn't think the furlough idea would be so incendiary. If you don't like one of the resolutions you can vote it down. (Suggests language that can be cut in the second resolution.)

Walsh: I'm not sure how they aren't alternatives. Both resolutions appear very similar to me aside from the furlough issue.

Homberger: There are some other differences concerning the reinstatement of the Foreign Language 14. Some of the Whereas's are different as well. So although there is overlap, they are not the same.

Beavers: In resolution 14.2, I don't know that it is a foregone conclusion that tuition and fee increases will hurt students. I couldn't vote for it with that language.

Homberger: I spoke to students who feel that way.

Beavers: I'd like to see more clarity in this. I don't think the Whereas fits what you just said. This doesn't say how they will be hurt.

Walsh & Homberger: How about phrasing it as "will result in current and future students paying more and getting less."

Homberger: I'm willing to accept friendly amendments.

Walsh: I'd like to see the Whereas's (3, 4, and 5) from the one starting with Dr. Martin and going forward stricken from this. They are not relevant.

Homberger: The elephant in the room.... Why not be philanthropic? I accept the friendly amendment to delete these.

Cope: Vote on amendments: (Passes unanimously)

----: Now that we've accepted the changes suggested by Justin, the second resolution looks even more similar to one. Let's vote on the first one, and then the second.

***** Vote on 14.1 passes unanimously. *****

***** Vote on 14.2 fails *****

New Business

First Reading of LSU Faculty Senate Resolution 10-15: “Challenging the Membership of Unelected Faculty Senators” Sponsored and read by Senator Larry Crumbley

Whereas both the constitution and the bylaws of the Faculty Senate repeatedly mandate elections of faculty senators; in fact, the very first sentence of the constitution declares:

“The Faculty Senate shall consist of members of the Faculty Council [= all faculty on the LSU A&M campus] duly *elected* in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution” (emphasis added),
and a later sentence in the constitution declares:

“The Senate shall determine and publish the method of nomination and election of its members, provided, however, that each member of the Faculty Council shall at all times be entitled to nominate candidates *and to vote* for each Senate seat allocated to that member’s college or school not within a college” (emphasis added), and

Whereas even the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors (from which the LSU Faculty Senate derives its very right to exist) require that faculty senators be elected:

“The Faculty Council [of a campus] ... may delegate its own authority to an *elected* Faculty Senate ...” (emphasis added), and

Whereas on September 4, 2009, an email (Appendix 1 below)¹ was broadcast to the faculty of the College of Science (then called the College of Basic Sciences, “BASC”) stating, in part: “In order to proceed with the election [of faculty senators], we must first nominate five candidates who will participate in the election later this month...,” but, while the nomination process occurred, the promised election did not, according to several faculty members in that college, and

Whereas on August 10, 2010, an email (Appendix 2 below)² was broadcast to the faculty of the College of Science stating, in part: “In order to proceed with the election, we must first nominate six candidates who will participate in the election later next month...,” but, while the nomination process occurred, the promised election did not, according to several faculty members in that college, and

Whereas there is no need to assign blame for any possible shortcoming in the electoral process; rather, all that is needed is that the requirement of elections be enforced, and

Whereas it would be easy to administer an election, and voting is quick,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall appoint a committee of three LSU faculty members outside the College of Science, to inquire into the above reports, to seek any possible evidence of an election (such as a copy of a ballot, or a vote tally, or an announcement of the winners), and to report their findings to the Senate at its next meeting. If the Senate finds that any of the senators sent by the College of Science in 2009 or 2010 were merely nominated, but not elected, then the Senate will declare those Senate seats to be vacant until a special election has been held.

¹Appendix 1 (the 2009 broadcast)

Date: Fri, 4 Sep 2009 14:39 -0500 From: BASC Dean's Office <bascdean@lsu.edu> To: Broadcast_BASC_Faculty@gateway.lsu.edu Subj: Nomination of Faculty for Faculty Senate Election Parts/Attachments: 42 KB Application

Dear BASC Faculty:

This memo targets the selection of candidates for the upcoming election of Faculty Senators for a two-year term, for we have three individuals who will end their terms this month, and due to the recent outcomes of a faculty census, we now have an additional seat in the Senate.

In order to proceed with the election, we must first nominate five candidates who will participate in the election later this month.

This nomination process will occur through the use of PAWS as a portal for data collection.

The link for you to go to for selecting the five (5) nominees can be found at:

[<http://appl027.lsu.edu/comp/surveyapp.nsf/survey?OpenAgent&id=facultysen2>](http://appl027.lsu.edu/comp/surveyapp.nsf/survey?OpenAgent&id=facultysen2)

You will need to enter your PAWS information and then you will have access to the data collection form for the nominees. You can only enter data once. Please refer to the pdf document attached to this email for a list of eligible faculty in BASC.

Please complete the nomination process by September 11, 2009.

Motion advanced to debate.

Q&A Summary:

-----: Since I was one of the people elected in 2009, I'm curious about how this happened since I was informed that I was elected.

Stanley: Offers explanation of 2009 election - nomination procedure via PAWS. From that list, slate of candidates for election is prepared. Problem is no one wants to serve. So we start making calls to rustle up volunteers. I agreed to help with this and twisted some arms. I eventually managed to get three people to run for four slots. So I think we didn't technically have an election. I ended up being an emergency appointment beginning in January to fill the fourth slot. I believe something similar happened in 2010, although I wasn't involved.

Delzell: The opinion is that there was not an election. The rules state that all faculty nominated should be on the first ballot. Then have the election. That was not done. Instead, they started at the top of the list until enough people agreed to serve. I've spoken to several people who were nominated but were never contacted and given a chance to be on the first ballot.

Stanley: What's the point of having the election if people who are nominated and then elected don't want to serve?
(General consensus emerges that there was not an actual election.)

Delzell: We can address this quickly by simply holding the election. Notify nominees by e-mail, then proceed with election.

Walsh: It is clear that the process for nominations within the college is flawed. Using self-nomination only might be the way to do this. Then have the dean twist arms if no one wants to serve.

Cope: In the time that I've been senate president, I've had to intervene in elections twice - both times in the college of sciences. The FSEC has tried many times to get the college policy committees engaged. Perhaps there should be a reformation within the college policy committee in basic sciences, especially given that the math faculty has now joined that college.

Delzell: The FSEC could delegate election process to college planning committees or some like body, but in the case of an emergency, could be handled more expediently.

Cope: I will point out that the College of Sciences took four months to get this far. There is a call to delegate Chip to run the election. Do you accept it?

Delzell: I don't think that is in the bylaws. If this resolution passes, it will put pressure on the college committee to get this done.

Rebecca Owens: Can't this be covered by the by-laws and not via a resolution?

-----: We have illegal senators, they are voting. That may mean that everything they've voted on might be illegal.

Cope: You have a good point Rebecca. This has been presented in the form of a resolution.

Walsh: Has there been a complaint by faculty members who have not been represented in this process?

Delzell: It's a question of what is required in the bylaws. Ultimately, this is the business of the senate.

_____ : This can be handled easily within the next month.

Ajmera: Basic Science should just go back and fix the problem for this year. It can be corrected in a reasonable way. Last year does not matter since people were acting in good faith.

_____ : I am concerned that I have no business here since I wasn't elected properly last year. I shouldn't be voting.

Ajmera: There is no clause that allows us to go back and examine older elections.

_____ : Have you addressed this with the College?

_____ : The College response is that we have other things to worry about. They view the election as over and do not want to revisit it.

_____ : Close votes could be in doubt, as could any votes on the FSEC that came within one vote of passing. This is a scandal.

Cope: Who should lead that election effort?

_____: The College Policy Committee. If they won't do it, then get someone else in there. Or leave the slots empty.

Cope: We'll ask the College again to hold new elections.

First Reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-16. "Stoppage of Budget Scenarios that Degrade Morale and Appeal for Increased Leadership by Boards of Higher Education"

Sponsored by Ken McMillin and the FSEC; read by Ken McMillin

(Reading waived and moved into discussion for the following month - unanimously)

Whereas the Louisiana Legislative and Executive branches have failed in the performance of their constitutionally assigned duty to demonstrate fiscal responsibilities and have instead produced a deficit budget this last fiscal year; and

Whereas revenues continue to decrease this year, even after expected sources of budgetary income were stifled by repeal of revenue-generating legislation over the course of the last two years; and

Whereas state support for higher education was cut \$280 million and support for the Louisiana State University A&M campus was cut \$42 million during the past two years; and

Whereas the Louisiana Legislature has repeatedly and irresponsibly failed to provide sufficient financial support to the four-year colleges and universities and these institutions are now threatened with an estimated additional \$34.7 million mid-year budget cuts to these institutions this year, cuts that will greatly decrease the abilities of these institutions to fulfill their mission statements and to fulfill the mandated goals of the newly passed GRAD Act; and

Whereas Louisiana State University is the largest employer and has a great economic multiplier effect in the Baton Rouge and surrounding areas, and the state; and

Whereas 4-year degrees lead to employees that are more highly trained and intellectually qualified to have higher earning power and greater economic contributions if graduates remain in the state; and

Whereas a highly educated and motivated workforce and transfer of technology from the university helps to maintain competitiveness of Louisiana and national companies; and

Whereas having educated potential employees and university intellectual property available to entrepreneurial startup companies are major attractors for new businesses and economic growth in Louisiana; and

Whereas the Louisiana Board of Regents and the Louisiana Board of Supervisors have not convinced either the academic community or the community at large that they have served as advocates for higher education and have merely passed on the budget crisis handed to them by the Louisiana Legislature, not even questioning the wisdom of an across-the-board, percentage-based cut to the otherwise unequal four- year institutions of higher learning in this states; and

Whereas the numerous budget cut "scenarios" that have been required of college and university administrators over the past two years have not resulted in any meaningful direction or guidance to the institutions, have wasted valuable time and human resources, and will likely need to be repeated again since the Governor's Office has not identified the next level of specific budget cuts; and

Whereas each of the budget cut "scenarios" and administrative announcements of program reductions and layoffs of instructors and staff have continued to erode the morale of our administrators and faculty; and

Whereas these budget cut "scenarios" are causing students to question whether they will be able to complete their degree programs while fostering a general sense of futility about the health of higher education in this state; and

Whereas such a loss of confidence may translate into our students resuming their migration for education and employment into states that are perceived to be more friendly to higher education;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU A&M Faculty Senate strongly recommends that our administrators stop engaging in these destructive exercises that, if fulfilled, will lead to the demise of LSU; and

Therefore be it further resolved that the Louisiana System Board of Regents and Board of Supervisors accelerate their efforts as advocates of higher education by interacting with individual legislators and collectively with the Louisiana Legislature to forestall such drastic budget reductions that the Louisiana flagship institution would be so devastated that it could not return to the top tier of research universities until the celebration of its Tercentennial or beyond; and

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU A&M Faculty Senate urges the Governor and the Legislators to provide leadership in securing adequate funding for the State's higher education system including its Flagship university for its citizens' well-being and for the State's economic prosperity.

First Reading of Faculty Senate Resolution 10-17. "Appeal for Increased Leadership by the Governor" Sponsored and read by Ken McMillin.

Whereas the Governor has constitutional responsibility for submitting an operating budget and capital budget to the legislature each year; and

Whereas the Governor is required by the Louisiana constitution to use means so the total appropriations for the year shall not exceed anticipated revenues for that year; and

Whereas this specific provision of the constitution was violated this past fiscal year by incurrence of a \$108 million deficit; and

Whereas the Governor's Office has indicated that higher education authorities are not meeting his expected educational goals of graduation rates; and

Whereas Governor Jindal believes that universities are delivering less value than student deserve and has asked feedback on how the state can save money and improve the educational experience; and

Whereas the Governor appoints members to the Board of Regents and to the various Boards of Supervisors; and

Whereas the Boards of Regents and various Boards of Supervisors determine educational policies and their implementation and hire and fire higher education administrators; and

Whereas the Governor's office has indicated that time cannot be found in the next two years to schedule a meeting with LSU student leaders or with the Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates leaders while the Governor continues to travel outside the state; and

Whereas the Governor has avoided directly answering the LSU Student Government President's request that he return to Louisiana and address the serious problems of the state and its universities; and

Whereas other components than graduate rates determine a quality education and graduation rates can be easily obtained by reducing the rigor of higher education requirements;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate affirms the request by the Student Government to the Governor for his leadership for higher education in Louisiana; and

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate demands that the Governor and his staff provide each management board with specific guidance by the end of this calendar year on the desired programs and activities to be eliminated at each institution to meet the budgetary restrictions anticipated in the next fiscal year.

Owens: Move to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:40