

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 14, 2012
Student Senate Room, LSU Student Union



Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Kevin L. Cope (President, English) | 2. Ken McMillin (Vice-President, Animal Science) |
| 3. Joan King (Member-at-large, Food Science) | 4. George Stanley (Secretary, Chemistry) |
| 5. Bill Daly (Past-President, Chemistry) | 6. Kenneth Fasching-Varner (New Member-at-large) |
| 7. Larry Rouse (Member-at-Large, Oceanography) | |

Parliamentarian: Louay Mohammed

Senators present (A = alternate; P = Proxy):

1	✓	Sibel Ates (Oceanography/C&E)	24	✓	Kristopher Fletcher (Foreign Lang/HSS)	47	✓	John Nyman (Renew Nat Res/Ag)
2	✓	Linda Allen (Chemistry/Sci)	25	✓	Joseph Francis (Compar BioMed/Vet)	48	✓	Evelyn Orman (Music/Music & DA)
3	✓	Gabriel Beavers (Music/M&FA)	26	✓	Juhan Frank (Physics/Sci)	49	✓	Rebecca Owens (Curricul & Instruct/Ed)
4	✓	Melissa Beck (Psychology/HSS)	27	A	Craig Freeman (Mass Comm/MassCom)	50		Rosemary Peters (French/HSS)
5	A	Dana Bickmore (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)	28	A	Stephen Gaunt (Pathobiological Sci/Vet)	51	✓	Suresh Rai (Elect & Comp/Eng)
6	✓	Graham Bodie (Comm Studies/HSS)	29		Wes Harrison (Ag Econ/Ag)	52	✓	Margaret Reams (Environ Studies/C&E)
7	P	William Boelhower (English/HSS)	30		Richard Holben (Drama/Music & DA)	53	✓	Lawrence Rouse (Oceanography/C&E)
8	✓	Dorin Boldor (Biol Eng/Ag-Eng)	31	✓	Dorothy Jacobsen (Kinesiology/Ed)	54	✓	Gary Sanger (Finance/BA)
9	✓	Stephanie Braunstein (LSU Libraries/Lib)	32	✓	Jennifer Jolly (Ed Theory Pol Pract/Ed)	55	✓	Bhaba Sarker (Const Manage & Ind/Eng)
10	✓	Robb Brumbfield (Bio/Sci)	33		Rajgopal Kannan (Comp Sci/Sci)	56	✓	George Stanley (Chemistry/Sci)
11	✓	Alvin Burns (Marketing/BA)	34	✓	Joan King (Food Sci/Ag)	57	✓	Suzanne Stauffer (Lib & Info Sci/SLIS)
12	✓	Russell Carson (Kinesiology/Ed)	35	✓	Jeff Kuehny (Horticulture/Ag)	58	✓	William Stickle (Biological Sci/Sci)
13	✓	Paolo Chirumbolo (Foreign Lang/HSS)	36		Michael Leitner (Geog & Anthro/HSS)	59	✓	Padmanabhan Sundar (Math/Sci)
14		Aaron Clopton (Kinesiology/Ed)	37	P	Vince LiCata (Biological Sci/Sci)	60		Gail Sutherland (Phil & Relig/HSS)
15	✓	Kevin Cope (English/HSS)	38	✓	David Lindenfeld (History/HSS)	61	✓	Carol Taylor (Chem/Sci)
16	✓	Larry Crumbley (Accounting/BA)	39	P	Michelle Livermore (Social Work/SW)	62		Dianne Taylor (ELRC/Ed)
17	✓	William Daly (Chemistry/Sci)	40	✓	Mandi Lopez (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet)	63		Jeffrey Taylor (Geology/Sci)
18	✓	Jeffrey Davis (Entomology/Ag)	41	✓	Kevin McCarter (Exp Stat/Ag)	64		Phillip Tebbutt (Interior Design/A&D)
19		Neila Donovan (Comm Sci Disord/HSS)	42	P	Patrick McGee (English/HSS)	65		Wanjun Wang (Mech Eng/Eng)
20	✓	Kerry Dooley (ChemE/Eng)	43	✓	Ken McMillin (Animal Sci/Ag)	66	✓	Christopher Weber (Polysci/HSS)
21	✓	Bruce Eilts (Vet Clinical Sci/Vet)	44		Reem Meshal (Phil & Relig/HSS)	67		Hsiao-Chun Wu (Elect & Comp/Eng)
22	✓	Kenneth Fasching-Varner (Ed T Pol Pract/Ed)	45	✓	Louay Mohammed (C & Environ/Eng)	68	✓	David Young (Physics/Sci)
23	P	Guillermo Ferrey a (Math/Sci)	46	✓	Jeff Nunn (Geology/Sci)			

Guests:

Darrell Henry	Carol O'Neil	Bobby Matthews	James Murphy	Ravi Rau
John Protevi	James Stoner	Gil Reeve	Rachel Waren	Claire Advokat

Consideration of the Minutes

Moved and accepted conditionally

President's Report

- Recent articles in the papers about the athletic department monitoring the “tweets” of athletes. I have checked into this and the Athletic Department is not censoring student athlete communications.
- The +/- grading system task force has started meeting. The SACS accreditation group is also going and working towards our 2014 accreditation. Finally, the huge group that will be reviewing the Athletic program met recently and has started their work.
- There is now a state-wide compensation group working on retirement and other issues.
- Some of you may have seen James Carville on TV recently talking about the system. I have relayed to the media that LSU faculty might be better informed about issues concerning LSU.
- The most startling new at the state level are the various plans the Governor has advanced regarding the state retirement system. We are engaged in continuing discussions with various state-wide groups and the retirement

system officials downtown. We have a working group that meets each week to discuss retirement issues and plans for the future.

- The BOR has commissioned a study to study the reorganization of higher education in LA. The report calls for a redefinition of university missions and some major reorganizations. Although it is unlikely that their recommendations will be accepted we are keeping a close eye on this.
- Last month we passed a resolution that LSU not base tenure and promotion on LA GRAD act standards. Their appears to be a small group at Southeastern that disagrees with this and I will be meeting with them in the near future to hear more.

Q&A Summary:

No questions or discussions

Presentation from James Murphy, Gill Reeve, and Bobby Matthews Regarding General Education Status

(this is a brief summary of James' presentation, see video for full details)

- 39 course credit hours distributed over 6 general education areas
- 6 student learning competencies (not all need to be in each General Education course)
- Focused assessment of student learning and competency
- Provide students with experience in how thought and learning are conducted
- Add substantively to student learning
- Process: initial course approval; annual course assessment based on reports from each course; 5-year renewal.
- Major assessment of students in their senior year via random interviews. Will be done again this year with rubrics defined to better probe general education competency.
- The annual assessment report is due on June 15 each year for each department's general education courses.
- We have around 320 general education courses.
- Non-compliance: please encourage your departments to submit their reports or renewals on time. This is very important for our SACS accreditation. In some cases we may need to remove courses from the general education system if the reports and assessment is not done.

Q&A Summary:

Senator: Do you cover all colleges with your senior survey?

James & Bobby: Yes we do. But we don't interview that many from each college.

Gil: Remember that programs also do their own assessment of student learning from General Education courses.

David Lindenfeld: I sense a lot of hostility in my department concerning the assessment required by the General Education committee. Faculty often feel that there is a high level of bureaucracy and duplication required for these reports and assessment.

Larry Crumbley: You mentioned grade inflation – what do you mean by that?

Bobby: We don't have a standardized grading system on this campus so grade inflation can occur if we aren't careful.

Larry: If you are using student evaluations as part of the assessment how can you avoid grade inflation since students like getting high grades.

Gil: It isn't that simple. We also want to test students and the materials and assignments in a course to determine whether real learning is occurring. This is part of the course assessment process for General Education certification.

Senator: Can we reduce the General Education credits to zero?

Gil: No – the state mandates 39 hours.

Senator: Do courses need to address all six competencies?

James: No.

Presentation by Darrell Henry and Carol O'Neil Regarding Preparations for SACSCOC (COC = Commission on Colleges) Reaffirmation of Accreditation

(this is a brief summary of Darrell & Carol's presentation, see video for full details)

- We are one of 804 members of SACSCOC (Southern region runs from VA to TX)
- 10 year reaffirmation/accreditation cycle – we are up again in 2014.

- Accreditation is important for LSU to get federal grants and contracts and permits students to be eligible for federal financial aid.
- Compliance Certification: 98 principles of accreditation
- Quality Enhancement Plan: forward looking document on how to improve education
- Some key areas: credentials (faculty); general education courses; distance education (new area of importance); institutional effectiveness.
- Key dates: Sept 2013 – compliance document due at SACS; Dec 2013 – response to SACS review of document, QEP due.
- Reaffirmation Steering Committee: 30 faculty, staff, and students.
- The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) needs to be developed and assessed. This is an important part of the SACS accreditation process.
- Current QEP included: CxC, Residential Colleges, Summer Reading Program. The summer reading program has been dropped due to ineffectiveness.
- A group of 23 faculty and staff are on the QEP committee. The QEP needs to be submitted 6 weeks before Dec 15, 2013.
- The QEP group will be soliciting ideas for improved student learning ideas over the next few weeks.

Q&A Summary:

George Stanley: can you provide more information about this call for proposals for the QEP?

Carol: Yes, we are looking for innovative ideas to improve student learning.

Joan King: Is there a website where we can go to get more info?

Carol: Yes, we will have more information up later this week.

Old Business

Second and Final reading:

Faculty Senate Resolution 11–22 Civil Disobedience on Campus: Rights and Responses *Sponsored by John Protevi*

John Protevi: I communicated with the Chancellor about the issues in this resolution and the correspondence will be included in the minutes (below). The Chancellor responded with information concerning LSU policies on the use of excessive force in dealing with protests, which reassured me that proper procedures are in place at LSU to minimize the improper use of pepper spray and other responses. Based on this I am withdrawing this resolution.

Dear Chancellor Martin,

In November of last year, two incidents of police action on the Berkeley and Davis campuses of the University of California grabbed national media attention and sparked extensive discussion in the national higher education community. In response to those incidents, President Mark Yudof of the UC system proposed a system-wide review of police protocols in the event of nonviolent civil disobedience protests. Quoting from the Daily Californian of November 20: <http://www.dailycal.org/2011/11/20/yudof-student-regents-address-police-response-to-protests/>

Two days after controversy erupted over police action at UC Davis, UC President Mark Yudof issued a statement saying he will implement “a system wide response” to address police responses to peaceful protests on UC campuses.

As part of this response, Yudof will convene all 10 campus chancellors for “full and unfettered discussion about how to ensure proportional law enforcement response to non-violent protest,” according to the statement.

In addition, Yudof expects the chancellors to forward to him all relevant campus police protocols — including mutual aid policies — which will be reviewed by a team of “experts and stakeholders” he assembles, according to the statement.

As a result of the incidents and in light of President Yudof’s commendable response, I sponsored FS Resolution 11-22 <http://www.lsu.edu/senate/resolution%2011-22%20civil%20disobedience.pdf>, asking you forbid the use of pepper spray and similar tactics at LSU in the event of non-violent protest. Discussion of the resolution at the January 19 meeting led to the resolution being deferred until the February 14 meeting, and to me being asked by FS President Cope and the FS Executive Committee to contact you to see if police protocols here at LSU are in line with President Yudof’s phrase, “proportional law enforcement response to non-violent protest.”

The idea of deferring the resolution, with which I am fully in agreement, is that a resolution that merely duplicates already existing policy would be superfluous. In retrospect, I am surprised that I did not think of this myself prior to presenting the resolution; I can only say that the strength of my feeling here pushed me a step further along than what was necessary.

In any case, we hope you will be able to provide us with a statement on LSU’s policies in this area. We have no reason to doubt the professionalism of the LSU Police force, but we feel this is an excellent opportunity for you and the LSU administration to proactively lead discussion among all the stakeholders of the LSU community on this important issue. Following the signature are the full texts of President Yudof’s statements of Nov 20 and Nov 22, 2011, as taken from official UC web postings.

Respectfully yours,
John Protevi
Phyllis M Taylor Professor of French Studies
Professor of Philosophy

For purposes of the minutes we produce here excerpts from President Yudof's statements. Full versions were provided to Chancellor Martin and are on the web:

November 20, 2011: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/26702>

I am appalled by images of University of California students being doused with pepper spray and jabbed with police batons on our campuses.

I intend to do everything in my power as President of this university to protect the rights of our students, faculty and staff to engage in non-violent protest.

Chancellors at the UC Davis and UC Berkeley campuses already have initiated reviews of incidents that occurred on their campuses. I applaud this rapid response and eagerly await the results. . . . [T]he recent incidents make clear the time has come to take strong action to recommit to the ideal of peaceful protest.

As I have said before, free speech is part of the DNA of this university, and non-violent protest has long been central to our history. It is a value we must protect with vigilance. I implore students who wish to demonstrate to do so in a peaceful and lawful fashion. I expect campus authorities to honor that right.

November 22, 2011. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/26712>

"With these actions," Yudof said, "we are moving forward to identify what needs to be done to ensure the safety of students and others who engage in non-violent protests on UC campuses. The right to peaceful protest on all of our campuses must be protected."

Chancellor Martin's response

On Jan 31, 2012, at 1:12 PM, Office of the Chancellor wrote:

John, I (we) certainly endorse the spirit of Mark Yudof's statement. We want always to protect free speech and the right to peacefully assemble, while also ensuring the safety of all involved and protecting public property.

The LSU Police Department follows the mandates of General Order (GO) #303 (Use of Force) as well as General Order (GO) #319 (Civil Disorder Operations) as dictated during events such as a non-violent protests. Within GO #303 there is specific notation as to when ASRD (Pepper Spray) is used, which falls between "soft empty hand control" and "hard empty hand control" indicating that ASRD cannot be used in a non-violent protest. Since the Berkeley and Davis incidents, we have reviewed the policies and have concluded that the present standing is both well-developed and sound in terms of Force Continuum. I am confident that the application of both GO's has and will continue to outline the criteria necessary to affect the assurance of a proportional law enforcement response. Additionally, LSU Police Department personnel participate in frequent training opportunities including simulations of this type of incident.

Another aspect of coordinating a successful mission is to recognize disconnects in terms of communication and take the necessary steps to correct them. Specifically, in the Virginia Tech Shootings and the Berkeley and Davis incidents it was found that a disconnect existed between the law enforcement agencies (Campus Police) and the functional areas of Student Affairs. Through the practice of engaging in regular meetings with Student Affairs, the LSU Police Department has taken and will continue to take a proactive role to insure that an informative and responsive approach will be taken.

Mike Martin

Second and Final Reading:

Faculty Senate Resolution 12-1
Graduate Faculty Status: Confidence in Colleagues and their Credentials
Introduced at the request of A. R. P. Rau

Whereas participation in graduate education is integral to being a tenure-track or tenured faculty member at a Flagship University, and

Whereas policy for many years as stated in the LSU General Catalog (2010-11, p.335) is that new full professors are accorded a 7-yr Full Member status in the Graduate School and all full professors extended to permanent status after another 7-yr review, and

Whereas the Graduate Dean and academic deans seem now to be drafting a policy that requires annual certification of continuing Graduate Faculty status for all tenured faculty by the chair of the unit, and

Whereas this amounts in effect to an annual review for tenured faculty of just the most significant component of their duties and thus incompatible with "indefinite tenure" as usually understood, and

Whereas this new policy has not been presented at any Graduate Faculty meeting or to the Faculty Senate, and is being promulgated by deans without deliberation by faculty groups, and

Whereas the search for a new, permanent Graduate Dean has only just concluded while one is under way for Executive Vice-Chancellor and Provost, and

Whereas a drastic change in tenure policy at LSU is likely to have major impact on the health of this institution, especially in the caliber of students and faculty we attract, and

Whereas such changes, therefore, require careful thought, deliberation and discussion involving also the faculty under shared governance,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate rejects this modified policy being proposed and calls for its withdrawal, and

Be it further resolved that no changes in current practice occur till the new Graduate Dean and Executive Vice-Chancellor and Provost have examined all the implications while consulting with the Graduate Council and have presented any proposed changes to the Graduate Faculty for its vote.

Read by Ravi Rau

Q&A Summary:

Rebecca Braunstein: Can I suggest that you change the “till” to “until”

Ravi: I accept that.

Resolution passes unanimously

New Business

First Reading:

**Faculty Senate Resolution 12-4
“Provost Search and Replacement”**

Sponsored by the Tenured Members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Whereas the current Provost was selected without faculty consultation and for a limited term; and

Whereas many decisions in the Provost’s Office would have been improved if faculty input had been requested or if the suggestions of faculty not been ignored when advice was given; and

Whereas Faculty Senate resolutions to fulfill faculty responsibilities of insuring the adequate educational policy of the University, particularly notable the election of Graduate Council members and minimal changes in graduate faculty membership criteria by Colleges, have been disregarded; and

Whereas relationships between the Louisiana higher education systems and campuses and the LSU A&M campus have degraded during the past year, and

Whereas faculty have had minimal input on most of the upper administration position appointments and many of the searches overseen by the Provost have been delayed, postponed, or cancelled, and

Whereas upper administration should comply with all University and System policies and have full and transparent disclosure of outside employment, which has not been accomplished in recent years,

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate thanks Dr. John Maxwell Hamilton for his two year service as Provost, and

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate requests that the Provost search committee complete their assignment so that a new permanent Provost is identified by July 1, 2012, and

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate demands that all administrative searches and appointments comply with PS-1, PS-2, PS-20, and PS-36T.

Read by Ken McMillin

Accepted into debate

Q&A Summary:

Rebecca Owens: There are several things that I question. Where is the evidence that “relationships that have degraded”? Is there any evidence for this?

Ken: Yes. One only have to go to the ALFS and Alexandria Summit minutes and look over those.

Rebecca: And hasn’t Jack Hamilton agreed to step down this summer and there is a new provost committee in progress?

Ken: Yes.

Louis Day: What evidence do you have for your claim that decisions would have been improved with faculty input?

Ken: We would have to go into executive session to discuss some of these things.

Louis: That isn’t necessary.

Bill Daly: I’m also concerned about some of these statements in the proposal and would like to see them tightened up.

Kerry Dooley: Should PM-11 be included in your last therefore? This would allow you to get rid of the sixth Whereas from the resolution?

Ken: I’ll accept that as a friendly amendment.

Friendly amendment passes unanimously

Rebecca: I think that this resolution is tacky and too negative.

George Stanley: I’ve been involved with the FSEC on and off for a number of years and I’ve never seen a Provost that is so bad at communicating with the FSEC and President Cope. The Provost has ignored several of our resolutions, most

notably the Graduate Council Election. This is one indication of the level of disrespect that the Provost has for the Faculty Senate.

Kevin: The graduate faculty status is yet another issue where the administration has changed course and essentially broke an agreement with the FSEC.

Ken: Please send any other comments or changes that you have before the next meeting.

First Reading of:

Faculty Senate Resolution 12-3

“Including Class Attendance Among Course Grading Criteria”

Introduced by Professors Louis Day, James Stoner and Claire Advokat

WHEREAS, class attendance is fundamental to a quality education at Louisiana State University, the state’s Flagship University; and
WHEREAS, excessive class absences may result in students’ failure in courses, thereby delaying their graduation and possibly leading to withdrawal from the university; and

WHEREAS, the State of Louisiana subsidizes the educational costs of all LSU students and has a right to expect respect for its investment in this education, respect which includes but is not limited to, regular class attendance; and

WHEREAS, the most effective means of fostering student responsibility for class attendance is a university policy permitting instructors to include attendance among their grading criteria; and

WHEREAS, Academic Affairs has interpreted the statement in the current university policy on grading (PS-44) that judgments concerning grading “should be based solely on academic considerations” as prohibiting taking into account class attendance in the awarding of grades

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that PS-44 be amended to insert these two sentences following the word “considerations” as noted above:

Because class absences are likely to affect a student’s mastery of course content, they may be considered among these “academic considerations” in determining the final course grade. Therefore, instructors, at their discretion, may also include “unexcused” absences as a component in the assignment of course grades, as long as attendance policies are spelled out clearly in the course syllabus at the beginning of the semester.

Background

After considerable discussion with colleagues over the years, representing most of the major colleges, we are convinced that the problem of class absences is wide-spread and pervasive and is inimical to the quality of education expected of a flagship university.

Since the inauguration of PS-44, Academic Affairs has generally interpreted this policy as precluding any grade considerations based upon class attendance. Admittedly, the language is rather ambiguous, but a fair reading of PS-44 is that the policy does indeed prohibit the use of class attendance in the determination of a student’s grade. We believe the time has come to change this policy to permit instructors to take class attendance into consideration in their grading. This amendment would send a strong message that the university considers class attendance essential to the intellectual development of LSU students.

Some of the rationales for this policy change are incorporated into the Resolution, but we offer the following additional justifications for this policy change:

1. Because some faculty are frustrated with what they perceive as a “culture of permissiveness” at LSU towards class attendance and a policy that frustrates their attempts to alter this culture, they resort to other means to circumvent the policy by including in their syllabi class participation points or grades. While class participation grades have frequently been used as a legitimate component of the grading scale, too often they are employed as a means of encouraging (if not ensuring) class attendance. A policy change like the one proposed above would at least make the process of including class attendance in the grading scale more intellectually honest.
2. Like most communities, a university is animated by certain core values that are imparted to its students through a continuous process of acculturation. Among these are professional responsibility and respect. Students who are persistently absent display a wanton disregard for the academic responsibilities that flow from the privilege of attending an institution of higher learning with selective admission standards such as LSU.
3. Within the university setting, students form a *learning community* among themselves. The absence of some class members from this intellectual environment demeans the quality of this shared experience and displays a lack of respect for their classmates. In addition, regular class absences signal a lack of respect for the instructor on the part of the student. This proposal will send an unmistakable signal to our students that they have a moral obligation to attend class, except when they are impeded by circumstances beyond their control.
4. Insofar as we can tell, the current university policy is inconsistent with most other major universities. A survey of the policies of 19 universities, representing geographical diversity, revealed that 18 of these permitted grading, at least to some extent, on class attendance (the 19th university’s policy was somewhat ambiguous) as long as this expectation is included in the syllabus.

Read by Louis Day (along with Clair Advokat & James Stoner)

Accepted into debate.

Q&A Summary:

Kris Fletcher: I’m generally in favor of this, but the third whereas bothers me a bit. I’m not comfortable with “return on investment”.

Louis: I understand your concern, but I think that it should remain to remind students that students on TOPS are receiving a highly subsidized education and owe us their best effort.

James Stoner: Would you be happier with “respect for its investment”.

Kris: Yes, that sounds good.

Evelyn Orman: This has been debated a lot in the education community. Was there any discussion about participation being part of the course syllabi which covers an attendance policy.

Louis: Yes, we did discuss that. But we think something stronger was needed to encourage students to attend class.

Larry: I give a short exam before every class, is that illegal?

Louis: No.

David Lindenfeld: One of the things that bother me with this is that some students will think that they get a grade for just showing up.

James Stoner: Well, that is true, but they might learn more if they do attend. You don’t have to put in an attendance grade by the way.

Ken Fasching-Varner: What stops a professor from putting 85% of the grade simply on attendance?

Louis: Nothing, but I think few faculty will do that.

Jeff Nunn: Of the schools that you surveyed was there any correlation between allowing a grade based on attendance and retention of students?

Louis: No, I didn’t research it that carefully.

Kris Fletcher: Sandra McGuire spoke on this a few meetings ago and presented evidence that attendance and retention are correlated.

First Reading:

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 12-5
Explaining Responsibility for the Lab School

Sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Whereas the University Lab School honorably presents itself as a distinguished contributor to the educational program that Louisiana State University offers to its clientele and communities;

Whereas the honorable standing and distinguished reputation that the Lab School enjoys depends in part on its affiliation with LSU and its faculty;

Whereas the Lab School presents itself advantageously as an LSU “unit” and deploys the LSU trademark, the value of which is derived from the achievements of LSU faculty;

Whereas the organizational charts of the University indicate that the Lab School reports to the Dean of the former College of Education, now the College Human Sciences and Education;

Whereas faculty who have inquired into the administration of and “command line” behind the Lab School have encountered conflicting signals regarding responsibility for this “unit”;

Whereas the Lab School includes in its admission criteria special consideration for LSU faculty members;

Whereas those admissions criteria also contain measures of student preparedness that allow for impressionistic judgments;

Whereas the extreme difficulty in evaluating the Lab School admission process has given rise to damaging suspicions, in the LSU community, that acceptance to the Lab School occurs at a higher rate among the children of politicians, coaches, and new hires than among the children of long-serving faculty members;

Whereas questions have arisen as to whether the charges assessed for services and goods provided by LSU approximate either their market value or the cost to LSU;

Whereas the designation “Lab” in “Lab School” suggests a level of research activity that has not been demonstrated by reliable review procedures;

Whereas research a record of high accomplishment with regard to national merit and other prominent scholarships and achievement measures has yet to be demonstrated;

Whereas calls to expand the Lab School so as to allow for ready access for the children of faculty members have gone unheeded;

Whereas the faculty have an interest in the proper administration and management of a “unit” that operates under the imprimatur of LSU;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate calls on the LSU administration and the Dean of the College of Education (until June 30; beginning July 1, the Dean of the College of Human Sciences and Education) to explain and to clarify to the LSU community the administrative relations between LSU and its Lab School and to promulgate and enforce a clear line of responsibility for the Lab School;

Therefore be it further resolved that the level of control by the LSU A&M campus over the Lab School should be increased; And therefore be it further resolved that the University line officer responsible for the Lab School should undertake a thorough review and revision of admissions criteria and procedures.

Statement by Prof. Joseph Kronik: My child, who had a sibling in the Lab School, was turned down for admission to kindergarten not because of any academic deficiencies but because my 5 year old son was not mature enough. They offered to reconsider him the following year, but only for admittance to kindergarten, which would set him back a grade. The chance for admission to first grade is considerably more difficult. The current admission policies give the impression that favoritism is given to politicians, coaches, wealthy donors, and other connected people. I would like to see more clarity and transparency in the admission process.

Accepted into debate.

Q&A Summary:

Ken Fasching-Varner: I have a number of problems with this resolution. In the second therefore section the statement that control should be increased – increased over what? The entire resolution is filled with vague language. In the first therefore there is already clarity of many of these points which are available on the web. Have you spoken with the Dean of Education about this (Laura Lindsey).

Laura Lindsey: I'd be happy to meet and discuss any of these issues further. The lab school can only admit less than 50% of those that apply. So there are many students that are qualified that can't be admitted.

Jim Wharton: [*see video for full version*] I strongly encourage you to talk to Dean Lindsey about the lab school. This resolution has a number of problems with it. First off "laboratory" does not necessary mean a research setting. It is a laboratory for student teachers. In 2004 Chancellor Emmert asked me to help fix up the physical plant of the Lab School and expand it. I've spent over 8,000 hours working on improving the Laboratory School. We worked to improve the economy of scale and increase the size and number of students that could attend. So the school has expanded. Tuition at the lab school is set to cover all the direct costs and not drain the budget of the Education College. It is a public school that follows all the public school rules. No university utilities run to the lab school, so they pay all their utility and other costs. There is nothing more important to me than the children of faculty members. 272 children applied to kindergarten and only 104 could be accepted. So there were 104 very disappointed sets of parents.

Jeffrey Davis: If it is a public school, why don't more students come from the local area?

Jim: It is a public school, but not a community school. The lab school gets about \$4K from the minimum education foundation for each student and charges about \$4.2K in tuition (including the \$800 building fund, \$200 activity fee, etc). No tax payments come from East Baton Rouge Parish.

Dorin Boldor: Why is there a private firm that deals with admission?

Jim: The lab school accepts most of their students at the kindergarten level and keeps most of them through 12th grade. So the selection process is very important.

Kevin Cope: We will defer this resolution until we can meet with Dean Lindsey and discuss and research this further.

Adjournment at 5:45 PM