

Faculty Senate Minutes
For: 4/25/2023

Members Present: Beverly Alwell, Carol Corbat (Vice President), Rusty Gaspard, Julie Gill (President), Purujit Gurjar, Jennifer Innerarity (Parliamentarian), GuoYi Ke, Missy LaBorde, Matthew Stokes (Secretary), Cynthia Thomas, Debbie Wood

Members Absent: Hal Langford, Kerry Ordes, Sona Kumar

Guests Present: JiaLin Lei, Elizabeth Beard, Cole Franklin

Call to Order: 3:15 pm and quorum was established

Approval of Minutes:

J. Gill stated that minutes from previous meetings will be forthcoming and that an electronic vote will be taken for each set of minutes.

Brief Guest Updates:

Dr. Liz Beard

Dr. Beard reviewed criteria for merit raises. These eight criteria were established by the previous Provost, John Rowan, and the Dean's Council. Dr. Beard forwarded the criteria to J. Gill that were originally dated 16 March 2022. It is supposed to be a more robust and complimentary list to the three elements on the faculty plan.

As it stands now, the recommended process is that we will have annual faculty discussions with respective Deans/Directors regarding the Faculty Reports and the eight criteria that will count as the "evaluative discussion." In the event that faculty have submitted their Faculty Reports without discussion of the eight criteria, they will be encouraged/allowed to submit an addendum to their Reports. Since we do not know if the state budget will allow for an August merit increase, a faculty member may schedule another conversation with their Dean/Director regarding merit increases during the summer, if needed.

Dr. Beard explained that this list of eight criteria is not a check list and can be customizable based on the faculty member, such as instructors (no scholarship) and their responsibilities (different advising loads, etc.). Dr. Beard acknowledged that some have stated that the eight criteria are reasons to take away a raise; instead, these eight criteria should be viewed as an avenue to look for areas where that faculty member is strong.

This morning, the Dean's Council revisited these eight criteria and the consensus was that numbers 5, 6, and 8 are a bit more subjective and not as quantifiable, but we know that having professional respect is something that matters. Criteria number 5 really means professionalism, not going on "lunch dates," etc. The expectation is to be professional and that collegiality is especially noticeable when people have differences of opinion.

Julie asked if the deans discussed changing the word "collegiality." Dr. Beard stated that the term could be changed, but essentially collegiality is what we are looking for.

Cynthia asked about number 5, as it gives her pause. She has seen people who have had an unprofessional misstep and it appeared that the person was still "paying" for those actions years later. At some point, everyone needs to be able to "turn a corner," and at some point, the person should have the opportunity to not have the incident plague them for future evaluations.

J. Innerarity stated that "positive" is subjective. She also questioned service, as the previous Provost stated that certain activities in the community do not count towards this category.

Dr. Beard stated that criteria numbers 5 and 6 are definitely subjective, but an important value in the process is to use judgement as part of a holistic evaluation. There can still be evidence. Dr. Beard said it is not about whether someone smiles or not. She reported that one dean said that "positive" means the person is open to change/progress and is not resistant to change/progress; one should be willing to have a conversation about new things.

J. Gill stated that faculty are expected to implement and agree with ideas and the use of the term growth mindset is used. One then looks like they are not willing to support change when policies are not followed or there is pressure to not follow policies. Road blocks to progress are misconstrued when we are simply trying to follow policies.

Dr. Beard stated that we will look at policies and make sure they align with where we are headed. The goal of all of this is not to be punitive but to reward faculty for their hard work.

R. Gaspard entered the meeting.

M. LaBorde stated that people get nervous when they see this rubric because it seems like we have to hit all eight points.

Dr. Beard stated that Senate could propose different wording for criteria number 5.

Discussion ensued. It was restated that the eight-point rubric is meant to be flexible.

M. LaBorde stated that the College of Liberal Arts did not have trouble with previous Faculty Reports or merit increases because of Dr. Beard's guidance as Dean; however, now that Dr. Beard is the interim Provost, we need to make sure that all faculty are consistently evaluated.

J. Gill stated that one reason the Senate kept asking for merit letters during the fall 2022 semester was that some people never had a meeting regarding merit increases. Senate's request was that the letters be sent in a timely manner. Faculty have since reported that they may have received a letter, but there was no percentage or amount in the letter. Others have reported that they did not receive a letter if they did not receive a merit increase. It was stated that everyone is looking for consistency.

M. LaBorde stated that when one looks at faculty pay, some are paid highly and some are not. However, merit should not be a compression raise. The main thing is people just want to know how the number was arrived at.

M. LaBorde asked about Policy Statement 202 with words like “competent” and “highly competent.” Dr. Beard said that once the ad hoc committee makes a recommendation, then that can be revisited. For this year, we will stick with this current eight-point rubric.

P. Gurjar stated that his college colleagues thought they were doing a good job, but they came out at “average” with merit increases. He asked if there is there a way to quantify the eight-points with scores like “below average,” “average,” etc.

C. Thomas stated that everything is fine when everyone gets a raise, but when that does not happen, it is a concern. How do we quantify this? Faculty are afraid of a response such as “remember that one time you didn’t have a positive attitude?” etc.

Dr. Beard said a couple of the deans had issues with not knowing what the faculty member accomplished, as faculty did not report their accomplishments in the Faculty Report. It is important for faculty to report their teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments.

J. Gill stated that the new Faculty Plan/Report is more open-ended than the previous document that required 3-5 recorded goals/responses and that some think that they should not record what is part of their regular job description.

Dr. Beard again emphasized that the PS 202 ad hoc committee is already making a recommendation to a more enumerated list of goals instead of just the narrative. The idea was to make the new form less “punitive” so faculty could have more flexibility in explaining their work on campus and in the community; this allows for more autonomy in shaping their annual plan.

Dr. Beard did state that another problem with previous merit increases is that each college had to balance out the amount awarded amongst college faculty to be the allowed average (i.e. 3.5%). Therefore, if someone received more of a merit increase, another had to receive less. She went on to state that in cases where someone has really gone above and beyond, perhaps it should not come out of their unit, but the merit increase funds should come from the university.

R. Gaspard asked about the baseline for the merit raise. Dr. Beard stated that now, in theory, the average is supposed to be 4%.

J. Gill asked about the required trainings and whether or not they should be included within the merit increase criteria. A general statement was made to remind everyone that all LSUA required trainings are due September 30th, 2023. J. Gill went on to state that some reported that they completed the trainings, but did not submit certificates. Consequently, they were not awarded merit increases and were not notified that they did not submit their certificates until they were told that they would not receive a merit increase.

Discussion ensued regarding how other universities have certificates to automatically upload the certificates so that the user does not need to manually upload the certificates.

J. Gill stated that we appreciate the fact that SLT is addressing communication with faculty and attempting to be more consistent with evaluations and raises.

Dr. Beard stated that the Budget and Review committee is recommending that part of the merit raise be based on a cost of living increase along with some merit-based increase; as it stands now, the raise will be merit-based. However, with a separate pool of funds from the online tuition increase, another raise will address compression. In the \$1 million expected generated funds, \$500,000 will be dedicated to compression, and approximately \$500,000 will be dedicated to hiring new faculty positions and support staff.

Committee Reports:

FPPC 4.14.23

J. Innerarity motioned to receive minutes noting the incorrect date (it says 16)

D. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 10-0-0

J. Gill asked P. Gurjar to address the minutes as he is a member of the committee. P. Gurjar stated that he was not at the meeting but he read the minutes. The main concern was fine tuning the policies and working on definitions. Senate reviewed recommendations to PS 231. Discussion ensued regarding response time to student emails. The committee suggested 24 hours as ideal but no more than 48 hours. M. LaBorde said another policy deals with this and 231 needs to be consistent with that policy

One suggestion is to delete “promptly” respond and possibly say 48 “business” hours. It was noted that some faculty who teach exclusively online say they work on weekends, so “business hours” has a different meaning for them. A final recommendation is “respond to students, ideally within 48 hours.”

C. Corbat joined the meeting.

C. Thomas raised a question about “faculty with additional responsibilities may have reduced office hours at the discretion of the director/dean.” J. Gill asked if this was related to course reductions. C. Corbat explained if your load is reduced by 25%, then your office hours are automatically reduced by 25%. It was noted this phrase may be referring to people who do not have course reductions at all. One suggestion is to leave the original statement, but add in the statement as another paragraph.

Another recommendation is to use “online” throughout instead of the term, “virtually.” Another recommendation is to use the term dean or director in place of department chair.

C. Corbat noted there is a policy on e-mails, and there is a timeframe of 24 hours to respond to a student during a business week and 48 hours if it crosses a weekend. M. LaBorde said the policy is PS 254.

J. Gill made a note for PS 231 to look at PS 254 and make sure they are consistent. M. LaBorde said whatever change we make to one, we need to do to the other.

It was noted that PS 254 has 24 hours.

It was also noted that “chancellor” is spelled incorrectly

B. Alwell made a motion to accept recommendations from the committee and the Senate

D. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 10-0-1

PS 233 Part-Time Faculty

R. Gaspard made the recommendation to replace “Department Chair” with Dean/Director and to replace “developmental” courses with “supplemental” courses to keep abreast of changing course terminology.

C. Thomas recommended combining PS 211 and PS 233. C. Corbat stated she also recommended this to Dr. Rowan back in 2020. The recommendation is to incorporate PS 211 into PS 233 and retain the PS 233 numbering

P. Gurjar made a motion to incorporate PS 211 into PS 233 and retain the PS 233 numbering

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

C. Thomas recommended that the evaluations part of PS 233 be revised as there should be a standard evaluation.

C. Corbat stated that the university heavily relies on adjuncts and they are now teaching upper-level courses, including in online programs. She asked whether PS 233 include a more substantial process of selection besides just having the chair hire someone. Other faculty are not given a say in who teaches these courses.

Discussion also included adjunct credentialing. This needs to follow the same standards as credentialing for full time faculty. Since we were not using adjuncts in upper-level courses when this policy was written, it should be updated now. The adjuncts’ coursework needs to be tied to the course(s) they will teach.

It was pointed out that section II addresses C. Corbat’s first point about other faculty. It was also noted that the document should be changed to “Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs” and not “Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs.”

C. Thomas motioned to accept changes

B. Wood seconded the motion
Vote: 11-0-0

Old Business:

PS 207 Ad hoc committee

J. Gill presented the latest draft of the PS 207 proposed revisions as received by Cabinet via e-mail. The document did reflect the recommendation to have a disability complaint to be directed to the Disability Services Director and that faculty could appeal a decision to the next level of the chain of command. Senate proceeded to read through the draft and make comments.

Discussion ensued regarding the language “if a student believes they have been treated unfairly”
D. Wood stated the concern that it still combines academic grievances with non-academic complaints.

Discussion ensued.

B. Alwell left the meeting

J. Innerarity said even with “acted in a non-professional manner,” there is an issue. Who defines what is professional? E. Beard said there is a chain of command: Chair, Dean, Provost, etc. J. Innerarity responded, “Yes, but it’s still open to interpretation.” J. Innerarity noted that LSU PS 48 clearly spells this out.

It was mentioned that the Chancellor has stated that whatever policy is voted on at the Cabinet meeting on Thursday will not be revised until after the SACS review in September 2024.

D. Wood left the meeting.

Dr. Beard reviewed the main issues with the non-academic portion of the proposed revised policy:

1. Remove any class grievance
2. Revise “has been treated unfairly”
3. Need to give faculty or student the opportunity to request a panel

C. Thomas left the meeting.

The remaining members agreed to meet informally at 3:00 tomorrow in Science 109 to work on additional suggested revisions to PS 207.

J. Gill next mentioned an email from Sarita James. S. James had requested via e-mail in early March if she could take her “Chancellors” funds and give them to someone else in her

department. Senate responded with a “no” decision. Today, J. Gill received an e-mail requesting that her unused funds be used to pay for Catherine Doyle’s registration and mileage. J. Gill responded that she would present the situation to Senate, but C. Doyle may need to apply for unused funds in a new application.

Discussion ensued. Senators were concerned with setting a precedent of recipients choosing to transfer funds without consultation with the Senate. It was decided that J. Gill would respond with the decision that an e-mail would be required to state that funds were not used. The unused funds would be returned to the general travel, research, and field trip funds and an e-mail would be sent to all faculty members regarding a third application submission for funds.

M. LaBorde moved that Faculty Senate make an official statement that Faculty Senate funds for travel, research, and field trips would be non-transferable. Funds must be used by the person who applied for funds and received the funds.

J. Innerarity seconded the motion.

Vote: 8-0-0

J. Gill asked P. Gurjar to make a note that the funds are non-transferable for the upcoming criteria.

Another issue that was presented included the new Board of Regents requirements that students can be admitted to the university without ACT/SAT scores. Jerri Weston has requested that Senate approve the removal of the scores so that students can be admitted into courses without the scores.

C. Corbat made a motion to contact all academic departments and ask them to look at any course that might be impacted by the new BoR policy on not requiring ACT scores for admission.

Departments should complete the specific course modification forms and the respective MCOs with track changes. In order to expedite the process prior to the end of the semester, departments should not make any additional course modifications except for the course descriptions and they would not need to complete the RIS or CSS forms.

J. Gill seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-0

Announcements:

Next meeting: Tuesday, May 2, 2023

Pats on the Back: Include Matthew Stokes and Eamon Halpin from Alice Blackwell

Adjournment:

M. Stokes made a motion to adjourn

G. Ke seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-0

Meeting adjourned at 6:09 pm

Faculty Senate Agenda
April 25, 2023 at 3:15 p.m.
Live Oaks Room

- I. Welcome and Determination of quorum
- II. Approval of minutes
- III. Brief guest updates
 - Dr. Coreil
 - Dr. Beard
- IV. Report of President
- V. Reports of Committees
- VI. Old business
 - PS 207 Ad hoc committee
 - PS 233
 - PS 231
 - PS 210
 - PS 269
 - Faculty Senate Travel, Research, & Field Trip funds '23/24
 - Chancellor's Funds updates
 - Advising Concerns - updates
 - Update RE Revision of Policy Statements
 - PS 202 (A& B)
 - PS 245
 - Administrative Committees List
 - CurricuLog Update
- VII. Introduction of new business
 - ACT/SAT pre-req scores
- VIII. Announcements/Looking ahead
 - Next meeting: May 2, 2023 at 3 p.m.

 - Please send *Pats on the Back* to Julie and/or share at Senate Meetings
 - Pats on the back: Eamon Halpin & Matthew Stokes

 - Departmental accomplishments
- IX. Adjournment

**Faculty Personnel Policies Committee
Friday, September 16, 2022**

Attendance: Long Li, Jeff Fletcher, Rusty Gaspard, John Marks, Zeleke Negatu, Melissa Parks, Mary Kay Sunderhaus, Min Wu

Min Wu identified the following charges of the committee:

- To review PS 231, Faculty Office Hours, and PS 233, Part-Time Faculty
- To discuss suggestions for possible revisions to PS 231 and PS 233

Policy Statement (PS) 231

Regarding PS 231, Faculty Office Hours, a summary of the suggestions for possible revisions that resulted from the committee included the following:

- Throughout the policy, replace “Department Chair” with the appropriate individual such as Dean or Director.
- For Section I under “Definition” which states that “An office hour is defined as time when a faculty member is present on campus (or at an off-campus teaching site, and in his/her office or other assigned work area, and is available to assist students”, the word “virtually” needs to be included in the definition. With that addition, the definition would be stated as ““An office hour is defined as time when a faculty member is present on campus, an off-campus teaching site, in his/her office, other assigned work area or virtually, and is available to assist students”.
- For Section III under “Full-Time Faculty with Duties Other Than Teaching”, the statement, “Faculty holding full-time appointments, but whose duties are not 100% teaching, must keep a number of office hours proportional to their percent teaching appointment”, was unclear. A suggestion is that “proportional to their percent teaching appointment” need to be clearly defined. Another suggestion is that the number of office hours for faculty with responsibilities other than teaching can be made to the discretion of the dean or director. One other suggestion from the committee discussion was that faculty with additional responsibilities may have a reduction in office hours that is suitable to the workload.
- For Section VI, replace “electronically-delivered course” and “e-course” with “online course” to keep consistent with the terminology that is generally used across the university.
- For Section VI which states that “faculty must respond to student emails within 48 hours.”, replace “48 hours” with “24 hours” for a timely response.

Policy Statement (PS) 233

Regarding PS 233, Part-Time Faculty, a summary of the suggestions for possible revisions that resulted from the committee included the following:

- Throughout the policy statement, replace “Department Chair” with appropriate individual such as Dean or Director.
- In the policy statement where “Provost” is identified, modify by adding “of Academic Affairs” to read as “Provost of Academic Affairs”.
- For Section I under Definition”, FPPC questions the title “Lecturer” for part-time faculty and needs to confirm that the title is current and appropriate.

- For Section III under Academic/Professional Preparation, replace “developmental” courses with “supplemental” courses to keep abreast of changing course terminology.
- For Section V under “Rank”, the chart needs to be revised with appropriate titles in the case that “Lecture I, II, and III” are inappropriate titles for part-time faculty. The information explaining “Rank” needs to be updated by replacing “Lecturer I or II” with appropriate titles.

Note: After the meeting, the committee had further discussion via emails and it was proposed that for PS231 we change Section VI which states that “faculty must respond to student emails within 48 hours.”, to “” faculty is expected to promptly respond to students' emails, ideally within 24 hours, and no later than 48 hours. ”

SUBJECT: STUDENT COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

PURPOSE: The student complaint policy defines a formal procedure for addressing matters that have not been resolved through informal resolution. Students seeking redress of a complaint may do so without fear of retaliation.

Complaint Information

Although the primary purpose of this policy is to describe the formal steps and procedures of the student complaint policy, the University encourages informal resolution of issues. Thus, several important steps should be taken to resolve issues before they escalate to a formal complaint. In all cases, complaints will be handled equitably and professionally.

A student who is unsure if a concern warrants a written complaint or has any questions regarding the process should contact any Vice Chancellor or their designee.

If the complaint involves sexual misconduct or Title IX, the student should report through emailing titleixcoordinator@lsua.edu or [HERE](#).

If the complaint involves discrimination, the student should contact the Director for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion or [HERE](#).

If the complaint involves a disability or disability services, the student should contact the Disability Services Coordinator by emailing disabilityservices@lsua.edu.

If the complaint involves a grade in a course or an allegation of unfair treatment in a course, the student should follow the procedures outline in [Policy Statement 207](#).

Complaint Against a University Employee (not course related)

A student who alleges that a university employee has acted in a non-professional manner, should attempt to resolve the issue through an informal process. . The student is encouraged to meet with the employee and explain the concern. The purpose of this meeting is to attempt to reach an understanding and to resolve concerns in an informal, cooperative manner. If unsatisfied with the outcome of this meeting, the student may move forward with the formal complaint

Commented [FS1]: Relevant SACSCOC Standard

4 The institution (a) publishes appropriate and clear procedures for addressing written student complaints, (b) demonstrates that it follows the procedures when resolving them, and (c) maintains a record of student complaints that can be accessed upon request by SACSCOC.

(Student complaints) [Off-Site/On-Site Review]

Commented [FS2]: Make this a live link

Commented [FS3]: It seems like it would be good to have something in the introduction that says throughout this document when meetings are referred to they may be conducted in person or digitally.

procedure. The student or employee may have an informal advisor present at any stage of this process. The informal advisor may speak privately to the person they are advising, but may not speak for the student or employee in any oral or written aspect of the process.

Procedure for Formal Complaint Against University Employee (not course related)

Step 1:

If unsatisfied with the outcome of the informal procedure, the student should complete the Formal Complaint Form online. The form must be completed within 10 days of the matter or of the time a student could reasonably be expected to know of the incident. The Formal Complaint Form will be routed to the employee's supervisor.

Commented [FS4]: Make a live link to the form

Commented [FS5]: Is this a good time frame? Should it be within X days of the informal meeting?

The immediate supervisor will consider the report, talk with the student, the employee, and any other parties relevant to the issue. The supervisor will then make a decision and convey it in writing to both the student and any impacted employee within 10 business days.

Step 2:

If unsatisfied with the immediate supervisor's decision, the student or employee may appeal in writing to the administrator at the next level in the administrative structure of the university within five business days. At this point, either the student or employee may request a hearing by a panel or a decision by the administrator.

Commented [FS6]: Make a link to the organizational chart

If a hearing by panel is requested, the administrator will appoint a panel of 5 or 7 people. Student Government will be asked to name one student to serve on the panel, and either Faculty or Staff Senate (depending if the employee involved is faculty or staff) will be asked to name one representative to the panel. The remainder of the panel will be chosen by the administrator.

The administrator may also choose to convene a panel even if not requested by the student or employee.

The administrator will review all reports (including any produced by a hearing panel), talk further with the student, employee, and any other relevant parties before making a decision. The administrator's decision is final. Copies of any panel recommendations and the administrator's final decision must be given to all parties.

Complaint About a University Policy, Procedure, or Condition (not involving an employee and not course related)

A student who has a complaint about any University matter that is not covered in the preceding sections of this policy should attempt to resolve the issue through an informal process. The student is encouraged to meet with the unit supervisor most directly related to the issue and explain the concern. The purpose of this meeting is to attempt to reach an understanding and to resolve the concerns in an informal, cooperative manner. The student or may have an informal advisor present at any stage of this process. The informal advisor may speak privately to the student, but may not speak for the student in any oral or written aspect of the process. If

Commented [FS7]: Again, an organizational chart link

unsatisfied with the outcome of this meeting, the student may move forward with the formal complaint procedure.

Procedure for Formal Complaint about a University Policy, Procedure, or Condition (not involving an employee and not course related)

If unsatisfied with the outcome of the informal procedure, the student should complete the Formal Complaint Form online. The form must be completed within 10 days of the matter or of the time a student could reasonably be expected to know of the incident. The Formal Complaint Form will be routed to the Vice Chancellor or Chancellor who supervises the area or unit most related to the complaint.

The Vice Chancellor or Chancellor will consider the report and talk with the student and any other parties relevant to the issue. The appropriate administrator will then make a decision and convey it in writing to the student and any other appropriate parties.

Record of Student Complaints

The complete record of all steps and resolution of formal complaints by students will be housed ??

Commented [FS8]: Make a live link to the form

Commented [FS9]: Is this a good time frame? Should it be within X days of the informal meeting?

Commented [FS10]: Not sure what to put here. It should be a digital storage I would imagine. We need to specify though.

SUBJECT: PART-TIME FACULTY

PURPOSE: To define policies governing part-time faculty

GENERAL POLICY

I. DEFINITION

A part-time faculty member is one who is appointed for less than full-time service and receives a proportionately reduced stipend. Part-time faculty are members of the academic staff but not members of the Faculty Council. As a class, however, part-time members of the academic staff having the rank of Lecturer I or higher may be enfranchised to the degree deemed appropriate by the departmental faculty.

II. SELECTION

Selection of part-time faculty is accomplished primarily through the academic department. When making a part-time appointment, the department should present the candidate for review by the faculty if time permits. Once the department chair and/or faculty have made their determination, the department chair forwards his/her recommendation to the dean, who reviews and adds his/her recommendation of the candidate before forwarding the recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs.

III. ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Part-time faculty members teaching credit courses must have completed at least 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and hold at least a master's degree, or hold the minimum of a master's degree with a major in the teaching discipline. In exceptional cases, outstanding professional experience and demonstrated contributions to the teaching discipline may be presented in lieu of formal academic preparation. Such exceptions must be justified on an individual basis by the institution.

Part-time faculty members who teach developmental courses must have a bachelor's degree in a discipline related to their teaching assignment and either classroom experience in a discipline related to their teaching assignment or graduate training in remedial education.

Commented [MW11]: replace "developmental" courses with "supplemental" courses to keep abreast of changing course terminology.

All part-time faculty must have official transcripts of all college work sent to Human Resource Management within 30 days of their employment.

IV. PROFICIENCY IN WRITTEN AND ORAL COMMUNICATION

All part-time faculty must be proficient in written and oral communication in the language in which the course(s) is being taught. This proficiency must be documented as described in Policy Statement 232.

V. RANK

Part-time faculty (*other than retired LSUA faculty members*) are generally hired at the rank of Lecturer I or II based on their level of academic preparation .

Degree	Rank
Master's (non-terminal) or below	Lecturer I
Terminal ¹ or Master's with 10 or more years of service	Lecturer II
Terminal with 10 or more years of service	Lecturer III

A part-time faculty member who has retired from LSUA with ten (10) or more years of service at LSUA will be given an appointment at the rank held upon retirement regardless of degree.

VI. SALARY

Policy Statement 211 establishes a salary scale for part-time faculty members.

VII. ORIENTATION AND CHECKOUT

All part-time faculty members will receive orientation to department and university procedures prior to their first class by their department chair. The department chair will make certain that the faculty member receives keys, a place to conduct office hours, and other necessities. When a part-time faculty member's employment with LSUA is terminated, he/she must return all keys and other LSUA property, turn in the course grades

¹For the purpose of adjunct pay determination the following degrees would be considered terminal: EdD, PhD, MD, PharmD, JD, DDS, VMD, MFA, MLS, MSW.

for the semester, and give all class records and unreturned student materials (e.g., exams and papers) to the department chair.

VIII. EVALUATION

Each department must develop procedures for the annual evaluation of its part-time faculty. These procedures must include a review of student evaluations of instruction.

IX. OFFICE HOURS

Part-time faculty are required to keep office hours as described in Policy Statement 231.

X. PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

The expected standards of professional behavior for a part-time faculty member are the same as those for full-time faculty and are described in Policy Statement 213.

XI. ACADEMIC FREEDOM

LSUA is committed to the principle of academic freedom, which acknowledges the rights of teachers to explore fully within the fields of their assignments and to give in the classroom and elsewhere such exposition of their subjects as they believe to represent truth. This principle also includes the right of a member of the academic staff to exercise in speaking, writing, and action outside the university the ordinary rights of an American citizen, but it does not decrease the responsibility which the faculty member bears to the university, the state, and the nation. Among the many implicit responsibilities of academic freedom is that of refraining from insistence that students or others accept any controversial point of view as authoritative. Academic freedom does not extend to any kind of abuse or infringement of the rights of others.

XII. FACULTY GRIEVANCE

Any part-time faculty member who believes he/she has cause for grievance because of unfair treatment may petition the LSUA Faculty Senate. The petition shall set forth in detail the nature of the grievance and shall state against whom the grievance is directed. It shall contain any facts or other data that the petitioner deems pertinent to the case. The Faculty Senate shall decide if an investigation is appropriate and shall conduct such an investigation if it is deemed appropriate. The Faculty Senate will make a decision on the grievance petition and communicate that decision to the petitioner and all other directly-affected persons.

Other suggested changes:

- Throughout the policy statement, replace "Department Chair" with appropriate individual such as Dean or Director.
- In the policy statement where "Provost" is identified, modify by adding "of Academic Affairs" to read as "Provost of Academic Affairs".
- For Section I under Definition", FPPC questions the title "Lecturer" for part-time

faculty and needs to confirm that the title is current and appropriate.

- For Section V under “Rank”, the chart needs to be revised with appropriate titles in the case that “Lecture I, II, and III” are inappropriate titles for part-time faculty. The information explaining “Rank” needs to be updated by replacing “Lecturer I or II” with appropriate titles.

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AT ALEXANDRIA

PS 231
Page 1 of 2
Revision: 7
Effective: August 14, 2017

SUBJECT: FACULTY OFFICE HOURS

PURPOSE: To establish guidelines for faculty office hours

GENERAL POLICY

I. DEFINITION

An office hour is defined as time when a faculty member is present on campus (or at an off-campus teaching site) and in his/her office or other assigned work area, and is available to assist students.

Commented [MW12]: •An office hour is defined as time when a faculty member is present on campus, (or at an off-campus teaching site), in his/her office or other assigned work area or virtually, and is available to assist students".
We suggested adding "virtually" to recognize online office hours.

II. FULL-TIME FACULTY

Full-time faculty must keep at least 8 office hours per week each semester. Office hours must be spread over 4 days of the week during the fall and spring semesters. The times and days of the week will be determined by the faculty member with approval of the department chair.

Faculty members should schedule office hours at times students might reasonably be expected to take advantage of them. Office hours must be scheduled in time periods of 30 minutes or greater. Faculty teaching courses outside the traditional Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. must hold office hours convenient to students enrolled in those courses (e.g., prior to or after class). Faculty teaching courses at off-campus locations must hold some of their office hours at those locations.

Each semester and summer term, each faculty member must submit his/her schedule of office hours to the department chair for approval. The approved office hours must be posted on the office door of each faculty member by the end of the second week of classes. Copies of the approved office hours should be forwarded to the Provost by the department office. Office hours are to be clearly posted in every syllabus.

Commented [MW13]: •Throughout the policy, replace "Department Chair" with the appropriate individual such as Dean or Director.

Provision will be made for appointments to accommodate students who, during registration periods and for unavoidable reasons, cannot meet during the posted office hours.

III. FULL-TIME FACULTY WITH DUTIES OTHER THAN TEACHING

Faculty holding full-time appointments, but whose duties are not 100% teaching, must keep a number of office hours proportional to their percent teaching appointment.

Commented [MW14]: Suggested change:
"Faculty with additional responsibilities may have reduced office hours at the discretion of the director/dean"?

IV. PART-TIME ADJUNCT FACULTY

Part-time faculty must provide a means for meeting with students outside of class time. Generally, it is expected that part-time faculty will be available to students before and after their scheduled class time. Provision of making appointments should also be developed and announced to students. Part-time faculty must announce the method of arranging meetings and their availability before and after class to their students and should include this same information in the course syllabus. Provision will be made to accommodate students who, for unavoidable reasons, cannot meet during the posted office hours.

V. FACULTY TEACHING SUMMER SCHOOL

A. All faculty teaching during the summer session must keep office hours according to the following schedule:

1. Facultywith an appointment greater than 6 workload hours 4 hours
2. Faculty with 6 workload hours3hours
3. Faculty with fewer than 6 workload hours2hours

Office hours must be in time periods of 30 minutes or greater. Provision will be made to accommodate students who, for unavoidable reasons, cannot meet during the posted office hours.

VI. Any faculty member teaching an electronically-delivered course must provide virtual office hours. This is a scheduled time when the faculty member is at a computer to respond to email and other electronic communication from students. The faculty member does not have to be on campus to hold virtual office hours. Students in the e-course must be provided with the faculty member's e-mail address and/or a class discussion session. Faculty must respond to student emails within 48 hours. To assure an adequate communication channel for students, the e-mail address of the department chair may also be provided along with instructions to identify themselves by specific class in the subject line of the e-mail. Department chairs must respond to e-mails generated by students in e- courses within 48 hours.


Commented [MW15]: Change to "online course"

Commented [MW16]: Change to "Faculty are expected to promptly respond to students' emails, ideally within 24 hours, and no later than 48 hours"

Commented [MW17]: Change to "Department chairs are expected to promptly respond to students' emails, ideally within 24 hours, and no later than 48 hours"

VII. EXCEPTIONS

Any exceptions to the above policies must be approved by the faculty member's department chair and the Provost.

Approved 9/11/2017


Test scores on pre-requisites

Jerri Weston <jweston@lsua.edu>

Tue 4/25/2023 8:27 AM

To: Julie Gill <juliegill@lsua.edu>; Carol Corbat <ccorbat@lsua.edu>

Cc: Elizabeth Beard <ebeard@lsua.edu>; Shelly Gill <skieffer@lsua.edu>; Abbey M. Bain <abbey@lsua.edu>; Deron Thaxton <dthaxton@lsua.edu>

Hello, I had briefly spoken with Carol about this issue, it has been brought up at dean's council and the consensus was the test scores need to be removed as pre-requisites. We are requesting Faculty senate review this email and approve us to remove the test score pre-requisites from the courses.

It has come to our attention that since the Board of Regents set into policy that all Louisiana Universities would become test optional for admissions, we may no longer have test scores in our student information system. This is causing registration issues for those courses that have a test score set as a pre-requisite. We are requesting to remove the test score pre-requisite on all courses that it may be listed on. Secondly, we know this may cause problems with students registering for math and/or English courses in which they are required to enroll in a co-requisite course.

To mitigate students registering for a non-co-requisite course (when in need of one), a weekly report will be run and distributed to the Registrar's Office and Professional Advising office to make adjustments to students' schedules as needed.

Thank you and please let us know if you have additional questions. All the Best,
Jerri

Jerri Weston, M.Ed.

She/Her/Hers University Registrar

Honors Experience Director LSU of Alexandria jweston@lsua.edu

(318)-473-6509



"Whatever you choose to do, leave tracks. That means don't do it just for yourself. You will want to leave the world a little better for your having lived." RBG

Note: This e-mail may contain PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL information intended only for the use of the specific individual or entity named above. If you or your employer is not the intended recipient of this e-mail or an employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized dissemination or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately delete the message.

<https://outlook.office.com/mail/deeplink/attachment/AAMkAGEyYzQxZWQ4LTk3YjItNGQzOC04ODBiLWYwMThkMTMyNmNmNQBGAAAAACIZ0s0...> 1/1