

Faculty Senate Meeting

November 3, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm by President Jarzabek in the DeSoto Room of the University Center.

Members Present: Julie Bergeron, LaWanda Blakeney, Emre Celebi, Amy Erickson, Chris Hale, Mary Hawkins, Mary Jarzabek, Kevin Krug, Robert Leitz, Lonnie McCray, Harvey Rubin, Carl Smolinski, Raymond Taylor, and Marjan Trutschl.

Members Absent: Matyas Buzgo

President Jarzabek began with her **President's report** by stating :

- A. That most items that she wished to discuss were on the agenda for the day's meeting. She issued the document, Faculty Senate Resolution 11-19 Call of an Audit of the Budget and Procedures of Southern University with the Prospect of Censure (See Appendix A).
 1. She received it from the Louisiana Association of Faculty Senates.
 2. She asked that all senators review the document and be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting.
 3. All senates were asked to support this resolution or to develop one similar.
 - a. She said that such a move could not occur until the item was placed on the agenda and she would bring it before the executive committee for the next meeting.
 - b. She mentioned the state of financial exigency at Southern University and the feeling from Faculty Senates across the state that the attached document may be some sort of template for treatment of faculty at other universities in Louisiana.
 - c. She requested that all review the document and determine if the LSUS Faculty Senate wants to put together a document that supports the faculty of Southern University.

B. She then offered praise for the many activities on campus: Fall Fest, Open House, and the LSUS Debate Tournament.

Dr. Raymond Taylor called for a point of order and asked that the minutes from Oct. 5, 2011, be approved. These were unanimously approved.

Administrator's Reports

Chancellor Vince Marsala: The Shreveport-Bossier (SB) Initiative was formed primarily by Dr. Philip Rozeman to alleviate situations caused by the budget cuts. Discussions in this group have continued about the need for a comprehensive, fully developed university in the Shreveport Bossier area. A study was begun to see what could be done to increase the number of graduates in undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral programs. The Community Foundation of SB and the Committee of 100 funded a consultant's report. Dr. Marsala stated that he was part of some of these meetings and is in no way opposed to having more undergraduate and graduate programs at LSUS. There are 25 undergraduate programs in the I20 corridor for SB at LSUS. We have 11 graduate programs. Further down the highway there are 69 master's programs, 16 doctoral programs, and a total 210 degree programs among three universities approximately 20 miles apart. Dr. Marsala stated that there has long been talk of a merger between LSUS and nearby universities. He has never been in favor of this. LSUS has its own distinct needs. It is important that LSUS not become a satellite campus for another institution.

Eva Klein and Associates was hired by the Community Foundation and Committee of 100 to conduct a study. She is highly respected and has done numerous studies throughout the state. The contract for the study was titled Due Diligence Review of Proposed Merger Between Louisiana Tech and Louisiana State University Shreveport. This was a surprise to Dr. Marsala as a direct merger had never been discussed at any of the meetings that he attended. He argued that before any merger could take place, the programs needed in SB would need to be determined. He felt like any programs needed could be offered by LSUS with the resources, excellent faculty, and property available. Dr. Lombardi, system president, was not happy with the study and wrote a letter of response to Eva Klein. Dr. Lombardi questioned why a merger between the three universities located so near to each other would not be considered for a merger (La Tech, Grambling, UL Monroe). Dr. Marsala provided a copy of this to President Jarzabek. The LSU system was not ready to have this type of discussion at this point. Following the expressed concern it was decided that the scope of work needed to be expanded. This would focus on what programs need to be developed for the SB area, the options to meet those needs, and the type of university that would best serve this area.

Eva Klein contacted Dr. Marsala stating that she would like to meet with representatives of LSUS on Wednesday, Nov. 9th. Dr. Marsala read the proposed schedule with Ms. Klein and her associate, Dr. Joe Carter. This included meetings with the vice chancellors and deans, LSUS Foundation and alumni representatives, Dr. Barrish of the Health Sciences Center, and faculty and staff. Each group will be limited to 14 participants for each two hour session. Ms. Klein will then meet with LSUS system representatives and members of the Board of Regents (BoR). Dr. Marsala stated that he has heard that the BoR is funding part of the study and may adopt whatever recommendations are made, but he has not seen this in writing.

Dr. Marsala expressed the desire for all to have a positive attitude. Although this study began with negative connotations, he believes that it has gotten back on track. He is open to an honest discussion on how to create a comprehensive university for SB. In our 43-44 years of existence, LSUS has always had restrictions placed on it. There were three other universities created at the same time we were. Politics have always entered into the picture. In 1973 when LSUS was approved to become a four year institution, an amendment was tacked on which stated that LSUS could never build dormitories. That branded LSUS as a commuter institution.

Dr. Marsala suggested that most of us know which programs are needed on our campus. The growth of UT in Tyler and Texas A & M in Texarkana show us that this is a rich area for higher education. Buildings for science and technology, dormitories, etc. are helping these universities to grow programs. Both are in a much smaller service area than SB.

Ms. Klein will be meeting with other representatives from around the area (perhaps BPCC, Southern, etc.). Dr. Marsala requested that the deans compose a succinct paragraph outlining the centers of excellence of their programs (strengths of the university) that he can present to the consultant. The Board of Supervisors has provided some information to the Shreveport Times on our competitive grants and on our education program. Dr. Marsala was pleased to see this happen.

Dr. Hawkins questioned whether or not Ms. Klein's visit to the campus was part of a new study. Dr. Marsala replied that it was an enlargement of the scope of the original study commissioned by the Community Foundation of SB and the Committee of 100. He stated that a merger is not the function of such a committee or of chancellors, but of the BoR and other legislatively-mandated committees.

Provost Paul Sisson: The Board of Regents has lifted the moratorium on new programs. The MS in Environmental Biology has been re-sent to the LSU Board of Supervisors and has passed by ¾ vote. It is now before the BoR. In 2009 it was reviewed by the BoR before the moratorium was in effect. This program had excellent reviews from external consultants. We are hoping that it does not have to be reviewed again. We are waiting to hear on this. We also know that there is tremendous need for an Ed.D. in education in this region. In fact, there are many on our campus who have expressed an interest. Dr. Sisson met today with a committee from the School of Education to revisit a proposal that was submitted three years ago. The process has begun to develop this program and to seek approval to implement it. He thanked Dr. Bergeron and her colleagues for the work that they have done and will need to continue to do for this program. He also thanked Associate Vice Chancellor in Academic Services, Julie Lessiter for the work she will do to keep this proposal in line with SACS regulations/processes.

Dr. Sisson stated that our 1st and 2nd year retention rate of last fall's cohort was 65%. Our goal is 66% with a cushion of 2%. Next year we will have a 67% retention rate of this year's cohort. Dr. Sisson mentioned data from the four week grade reporting on 100 and 200 level courses being used by advisors. He stressed the importance of this for retention.

The deans will have a working meeting to revise the FPR. The goal is to have a common set of principles to construct the FPR templates in all departments. Dr. Sisson would like for the template to recognize all of the work that has been going into advising. Dr. Bergeron asked if a common timeline would be implemented and Dr. Sisson responded affirmatively.

Interim Vice Chancellor of Development Dr. Johnette McCrery Magner: For the first time in LSU Shreveport's history, the University will be guaranteeing scholarships to first-time, full-time freshmen students at LSUS. Students meeting specific criteria will be guaranteed a scholarship in the fall of 2012. A formal announcement will be on TV tomorrow and at Pilot Day on Saturday. Dr. Marsala sent out an email to all faculty and staff today. This is a bold step. Dr. Magner thanked all faculty and staff for their support of the Foundation in unrestricted dollars.

Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs, Mr. Mike Ferrell discussed the following:

Friday is the last day for open enrollment for the health insurance

Basketball season has started with women's games. The men will begin at home in December. He encouraged all to come out and support the Pilots. The next game for the women is Nov. 21st.

Our billing shows that our consumption of electricity is down, but fuel costs are up. Parking lot lights will change to LED. There have been changes in light fixtures to result in reducing energy consumption. As changes are made on campus, we always move to more efficient products. In fact, our electric contractor originally installed the incorrect bulbs and had to return to make replacements at their expense.

Travel cards will expire in December. LSUS will do in-house travel.

In response to a question concerning the budget from Dr. Taylor, Mr. Ferrell stated that at this point LSUS still does not know its status. The state budget will probably not be finalized until after November elections. Health insurance is up 5 – 6% for next year.

Old Business

a) Consideration of Student Representatives of Board of Student Conduct Committee

Dr. Smolinski stated that student representation on the Board of Student Conduct Committee has been a problem due to attendance and confidentiality issues. Student Affairs has voted to eliminate student participation on Board of Student Conduct. Rogers Martin, chair of the committee, was present and stated the committee has recommended that students no longer serve on this committee. Dr. Smolinski stated that since this is a Faculty Senate Committee, the Faculty Senate would need to act on this.

Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Gloria Raines discussed student participation on the Student Conduct Board and the Scholarship and Financial Aid Committee. She serves as the person to grant appeals when that process is used for both committees. In the event of an unfavorable decision by either committee, if the student representatives were not present, an appeal argument will be presented that the student did not have the designated voice of his/her peers at this meeting. If the student representatives were present, then the appeal often states that it is unfair that a student is sitting in judgment.

Dr. Raines emphasized that LSUS wants students involved. However, due to the litigious nature of society she is in agreement that student representation on the Student Conduct Board is problematic. Often there are no students at the meetings. However, in their defense, she stated that there are often 60–80 meetings per year. It is a heavy burden to put on students, especially at the time of finals when most of the meetings occur. The Student Conduct Board cannot meet without a quorum. The quorum is 5 – two students and three faculty. It is often difficult to meet the quorum. This will change the quorum to 3 which is a good number to make these decisions.

Dr. Raines stated that in earlier talk with SGA representatives, students expressed a that loss of positions on these committees would not be to their advantage. However, once SGA understood that students could be sued over what might be seen as an unfavorable outcome by a peer, it seems as if the SGA also supports the change of removing students from the Student Conduct Board. The Faculty Senate has nothing to do the Scholarship and Finance Committee.

President Jarzabek commented that the constitutional revision approved in May had two numerical mistakes. The wording for the makeup of the Courses and Curriculum Committee reflects the former structure of the university. Dr. Sadow recommended two per school rather than one member. President Jarzabek issued a document which outlined changes in composition on the Student Conduct Board and the Courses and Curriculum Committee (See Appendix B) with rationale and proposed changes.

Dr. Smolinski stated that a student has not been present at the Admission and Standards Committee meetings for more than three years. He stated that this committee makes decisions about whether or not a suspended student can reenter school. He said that committee members who were polled agreed it was time to eliminate student membership due to confidentiality issues and attendance. He stated that there was an error in the constitution regarding Admissions and Standards. There only needs to be 6 members present for a vote, not 6 senators. He issued a statement with proposed changes (See Appendix C).

There was no further discussion on the changes concerning the Student Conduct Board, Admission and Standards, and Courses and Curriculum motion. Senator Harvey moved to adopt the motions concerning the constitutional changes to these three committees. Senator Hawkins seconded. President Jarzabek stated that these proposals must be presented 10 days prior to changing to the Faculty Council. Then a set period of time must pass before a

discussion and putting the proposed changes to a vote. This can be accomplished before the Spring Faculty Council by putting this out in an email and letting everyone know.

b) Update on Advising: Dr. Elizabeth Leibert presented a detailed account of the evolution of the Advising Committee for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the work that this committee has done to improve advising throughout the university. This committee began two years ago as an ad hoc committee of concerned volunteers at the request of Dr. Anderson. After it provided recommendations, it disbanded. It became an appointed committee. The committee developed an Arts and Sciences Advising Webpage aimed at assisting both advisors and advisees. A faculty handbook was developed for advisors. The committee was invited to participate in the process of developing the webpages on myLSUS concerned with advising. The committee worked closely with Shelby Keith and Julie Lessiter in an effort to make those pages specific to LSUS. Dr. Leibert emphasized that this is a faculty committee not an administrative committee.

Regarding the 4 week and 8 week grading, Dr. Leibert stated that the submitting of 4 week grading had nothing to do with the Advising Committee; however, she stated her support of this process. Her committee then developed a paper form called At-Risk Intervention and Advising. It was requested that advisors complete the form with their advisees. However, the process was tedious and the process was completed in its entirety on only 8 students. Over the summer, though, the committee was able to develop a smoother process. An automatic email went out to all at-risk students directing them to the Steps to Success webpage which identifies the key skills sets that students need to possess for academic success. By default, the Arts and Science Advising Committee, though not intended to be a campus-wide committee, became the place where other faculty began to turn to for guidance. At the time, there were only 2 people on the committee, Dr. Leibert and Dr. Linda Webster. By answering numerous phone calls, the two committee members realized that many people wanted to improve advising and help make students successful. However, these calls also pointed out weaknesses in established procedures. Addressing some of the issues brought to attention allowed the committee to make positive changes in the 8 week advising process.

Dr. Leibert discussed other initiatives begun by her committee:

(1) A chairs' meeting in Liberal Arts and Science led to the offer to hold workshops in any interested departments to help navigate the advising pages. Dr. Leibert extended an offer to work with any faculty. She suggests that Steps to Success be used with first time, full time freshmen or at-risk students – not with all students.

(2) Student workshops were developed to educate students so that they may go to their advising appointments prepared. The goal is not to make more work for the advisor. The response to this has been limited.

(3) The committee will be reviewing the Advising Survey. They may be calling for faculty involvement as they review that survey. There are currently committee members outside of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Thirty-two advisors completed 92 records on the 4 week Intervention Process. There were approximately 200 grades that classified students as at-risk. Dr. Hawkins thanked Dr. Leibert for her committee's work. Dr. Hawkins stated that in Freshman Seminar students were asked to go through the advising pages and that it made the advising process smoother with the students who had done this.

c) Request for FPR Review: This was discussed in the Provost's report.

New Business

a) Consideration of Constitutional Change: This item was also discussed . President Jarzabek again requested that all Senators read through the constitution so that all changes could be made at one time.

b) Change of December Meeting: Dr. Bergeron stated in the Executive Meeting that she would not be able to attend the December meeting due to participation in a state meeting on the same date. President Jarzabek suggested having the date changed rather than asking someone else to take minutes. After suggestions of several dates which did not work for the senators, Dr. Hawkins agreed to take minutes at the next meeting.

c) Observations and Concerns:

Dr. Bergeron commented on an email sent to senators in the College of Business, Education, and Human Development from Dr. Gary Jones. Dr. Jones expressed displeasure over the dates of the student survey on course evaluation. He feels that the survey is being sent too early in the semester. Dr. Bergeron stated that these were the dates that the Faculty Senate agreed on and asked ITS to implement. The Faculty Senate stands by its decision for the survey to be sent at this time.

Dr. Bergeron stated that Dr. Buzgo asked for discussion concerning the dates of future Faculty Senate meetings. Dr. Erikson stated that Dr. Buzgo is interested in Friday meetings during common hour. President Jarzabek stated that the constitution directs that meetings may not be held on the same day of the week each month. President Jarzabek stated that this could be discussed under Old Business next month when Dr. Buzgo is in attendance.

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted, Julie Bergeron, Secretary.

See Appendices A, B, C below

Appendix A

Faculty Senate Resolution 11–19

Call for an Audit of the Budget and Procedures of Southern University with the Prospect of Censure

Introduced at the request of the Southern University Faculty Senate President

1. Whereas good governance of universities requires careful financial and other planning that involves all stakeholders: faculty, staff, students, and administrators;
2. Whereas preparation for financial emergencies requires systematic and extended consultation along with the open exchange of information;
3. Whereas national educational and professional organizations as well as local and state universities offer widely-recognized template procedures for the management of financial crises;
4. Whereas both the Southern University System administration and the Southern University administration, which have less than four months of current experience in Louisiana universities, have followed no published procedures, have engaged in only superficial consultation with campus stakeholders, and have set out no plan of consultation prior to the recent declaration of financial exigency at Southern University;
5. Whereas the published budget of Southern University lacks adequate detail and resolution to develop a plan or to allow for public scrutiny;
6. Whereas the Southern University has increased its subsidy to its athletic program by one million dollars and whereas the total athletic subsidy exceeds the alleged deficit to be recovered from faculty furloughs;
7. Whereas universities in Louisiana share many common interests insofar as they are regulated by a common Board of Regents and insofar as policies imposed on one higher education system often migrate to others;
8. Whereas Chancellor James Llorens as well as Commissioner of Higher Education Jim Purcell demonstrated astounding callousness in referring to the declaration of exigency and with that the dismissal of faculty as a “bold” and admirable move that will begin the process of realigning all of higher education;
9. Whereas neither Southern University nor the Southern University System have any plan, either just or unjust, with regard to the implementation of an exigency procedure;
10. Whereas dismissals of faculty at three University of Louisiana schools have demonstrated that firing of faculty for purported financial reasons bring opprobrium to all of Louisiana higher education;
11. Whereas the unjustified declaration of financial exigency needlessly stigmatizes all colleges and universities in Louisiana;

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate affirms its commitment to the welfare of the Southern University faculty and urges those concerned in the management of Southern University to retract their rash decision;

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate calls for an audit of the budget of Southern University and of the Southern University System as well as for a review of the governance procedures of these institutions, audits and reviews to be conducted by appropriately qualified persons who are not members of either the Southern University or Southern University System administrations;

Therefore be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate joins with Faculty Senates around Louisiana in urging Southern University and the Southern University System to create a panel with substantial faculty representation as well as with two or more qualified academic professionals who are not Southern University employees to develop solutions for budget problems and for improving governance procedures;

Therefore be it further resolved that, if the foregoing measures are not accomplished within one month of the passage of this resolution, the LSU Faculty Senate censures the Southern University administration, Southern University Chancellor James Llorens, the Southern University System Board of Supervisors, and Southern University System President Ronald Mason;

And therefore be it further resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate places a moratorium on the development or conduct of any cooperative programs involving LSU and Southern University until such a time as Southern University and its parent System conducts itself in a way worthy of membership in the community of higher educational institutions.

Appendix B

Proposed Constitutional Changes

Changes dealing with the Faculty Senate Standing Committees' "Composition"

1. Courses and Curriculum:

- a. Current: Seven voting members to serve three year terms: one from each School, one from the Library, and the Faculty Senate President, ex officio. The Dean of Enrollment/Registrar will be asked to serve as a nonvoting advisor to this committee.
- b. Proposed Change: Twelve voting members to serve three year terms: two from each School, one from the Library, and the Faculty Senate President, ex officio. The Dean of Enrollment/Registrar will be asked to serve as a nonvoting advisor to this committee.
- c. Rationale: the composition statement for this committee was never intended to be changed. A numerical error occurred during the last Constitutional Revision process that changed "School" representation from two members to one member. After checking with past chairs of this committee, it is recommended that the numerical composition reflect the "two representatives from each School" concept in order to provide the maximum input from the various Schools when decisions about courses and curricula are being made.

2. Student Conduct Board:

- a. Current: Nine voting members to serve five year terms: One from each School, one from the Library, two students, and the Faculty Senate President, ex officio.
- b. Proposed: Seven voting members to serve five year terms: One from each School, one from the Library, and the Faculty Senate President, ex officio.
- c. Rationale: Student Affairs administrators and faculty members on the board and the committee are recommending that students no longer serve as members because of increased liability concerns related to the confidential issues discussed during board hearings and committee meetings. A related concern was the continuing problem of making quorum for student conduct hearings because of poor student attendance and the number required to conduct a hearing.

Appendix C

Admissions and Standards Committee

Current: Ten voting members to serve three year terms: one senator from each school, one from the Library, two students, and the Faculty Senate President, ex officio. The Dean of Enrollment/Registrar will be asked to serve as a nonvoting advisor to this committee.

Proposed: Six voting members to serve three year terms: one from each school, one from the Library, and the Faculty Senate President, ex officio. The Dean of Enrollment/Registrar will be asked to serve as a nonvoting advisor to this committee.

Rationale: Committee members are recommending that students no longer serve as members on the committee primarily because of increased liability concerns related to the confidential issues discussed during committee meetings. In addition, there are quorum concerns; no student has attended a meeting in at least three years. Also, the composition needs to be corrected; there are six members, not ten, and the members do not have to be senators.