

Faculty Senate Minutes  
For: 4/11/2023

**Members Present:** Beverly Alwell, Carol Corbat (Vice President), Rusty Gaspard, Julie Gill (President), Purujit Gurjar, Jennifer Innerarity (Parliamentarian), Sona Kumar, Missy LaBorde, , Matthew Stokes (Secretary), Mary Kay Sunderhaus (alternate for Debbie Wood), Cynthia Thomas

**Members Absent:** Hal Langford, Kerry Ordes, GuoYi Ke

**Guests Present:** Dr. Paul Coreil, Dr. Elizabeth Beard, Richard Elder

**Call to Order:** At 3:03 pm, the meeting was called to order and a quorum was established.

**Approval of Minutes:**

2.28.23

3.7.23

J. Gill made a motion to approve these minutes electronically

M. LaBorde seconded the motion

Vote: 10-0-1

**Brief Guest Updates:**

**Dr. Coreil**

Dr. Coreil stated that tuition and fee increases were approved for online courses. This increase will help address equity for peer salary. In fact, there are two opportunities this summer to address salary. One will be merit increases, 4% from legislation. In terms of the merit raise, Dr. Coreil explained that the goal is to have consistent evaluation procedures that all understand. In addition, there was one million dollars in extra revenue from fee increases. Around half will be dedicated to new positions, and an equal or greater amount will go towards increasing salaries when looking at positions as compared to peers. This second raise is not a merit raise. M. LaBorde asked if compression will be looked at. Dr. Coreil said that it would.

J. Gill asked whether “peers” meant in-house (LSUA) peers or peers across the southern region. Dr. Coreil explained that the goal is to look at peer salaries across the southern region.

Next, Dr. Coreil mentioned that there is a lot going into the new Health Education downtown campus. He stated that he was in Baton Rouge yesterday and is going back Thursday. Dr. Coreil stated that this is a good year for LSUA to be asking for capital outlay because of a surplus in the budget. Dr. Coreil said that we are running out of room on campus, so we will need more facilities. When Nursing and Allied Health move out, that will free up some space, as well as when we have the new student success center.

Next, Dr. Coreil noted that there is a bill on tenure, Senate Bill 174. The bill appears to have some mandates on evaluation. For instance, if someone gets a poor evaluation two or three years in a row, he or she could potentially be put under “loss of tenure.” The Association of Louisiana Faculty Senates (ALFS) is taking a close look at this bill. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Coreil asked that we please thank President Tate for approving the online tuition increase. He noted that LSUA is still 2<sup>nd</sup> to lowest in faculty pay among our peers, even with the increase. On a positive note, right now, enrollment is looking positive for the summer.

Dr. Beard praised Teresa Seymour and her team. A message was sent to online students explaining the tuition increase, and so far, she is not receiving any negative feedback from students.

C. Thomas asked about summer pay. She wondered if there has been any adjustment in summer and overload pay. Dr. Coreil said we can have a conversation about it, but it has not yet been discussed. Dr. Coreil stated that so far, only salary increases have been discussed, but the point about summer pay is a good one due to inflation.

Dr. Coreil expressed his hope that we would attend the groundbreaking at 9:00 am on April 21<sup>st</sup>. Governor Edwards will be in attendance, along with the LSU Board of Supervisors.

Discussion ensued on the popularity of 318 Burger.

Finally, it was pointed out that there was a recent announcement about a company coming in to extract rare earth minerals and they anticipate the hiring of chemists. P. Gurjar said that would be great for their program.

Dr. Coreil left the meeting.

### **Dr. Beard**

Dr. Beard first announced that Thursday evening, the inaugural Friends of the Gwartney Theatre even will take place. Some guests from the community have been invited. The event starts at 6:00 pm. Patrick Hunter, the new Mulder Arts Chair, will be there to introduce himself and his vision for the performing arts. Bob Harper will also be in attendance. Finally, the performance of *The Revolutionists* starts at 7:30. Dr. Beard noted that this show has an all-female cast.

Next, Dr. Beard announced that currently, there are three vacant Dean positions on campus. She noted that the Dean of Health and Human Services position has been posted. A committee will be formed and the search reinvigorated. Also, Dr. Mary Treuting will be taking leave, so there an interim dean will be named. Dr. Beard expressed a desire for respective faculty input and hoped to have it by the end of next week. Next, Dr. Beard explained a similar situation in the College of Liberal Arts—the Dean position will soon be vacant and input is being sought. Dr. Beard added that there would be financial compensation for the Interim Deans of both Social Sciences and Liberal Arts. Feedback may be submitted via an anonymous survey that will be sent out.

Next, Dr. Beard announced that they are in the final stages of making a decision for the CORE Director to replace Dr. Gilliland. That announcement should come out soon.

Dr. Beard then stated that Dr. Nate Sammons will be hosting an innovative teaching retreat this Friday at the Museum of Art from 9:00-2:00. The retreat will function as a “think tank” for people who have been having challenges in the classroom. The goal is to generate ideas and come back with strategies.

It was noted that as far as SB 174, recommendations were considered. This has been brought to Beth Whittington and the PS 202 ad-hoc committee’s attention. The two biggest things that would change are explicit annual evaluations of part-time faculty and an explicit evaluation of tenured faculty.

Dr. Beard then announced that plans are being made for a collaborative press conference with the Alexandria Zoo regarding the new Zoo Sciences Concentration; a tentative date is scheduled for May.

Next, Dr. Beard explained that the Dean’s Council is working on PS 245, the policy on Academic Department Chairs. She said in addition to looking at Department Chairs and their roles and responsibilities, they are adding language that explains what Director positions mean. The Dean’s Council will make a recommendation to the Chancellor.

J. Gill asked if PS 245 would come back through senate to go the appropriate committee for review. J. Gill then said some committees are meeting next week to look at some these policies. Dr. Beard responded that the policy would be sent to Faculty Senate.

Dr. Beard left the meeting

Discussion ensued regarding the ad hoc committee for PS 202. It was noted that the committee is trying to leave some of the titles broad to allow for growth of the university.

SB 174 came up for discussion again. C. Corbat said one can go to Legislative Website to see more about it.

J. Gill announced that she mentioned to Dr. Coreil faculty concerns regarding merit increases and the anticipated salary compression adjustments to Dr. Coreil. She also said she talked to Dr. Christof Stumpf since he is on Budget and Review. Dr. Coreil could come in and explain how salary compression will be evaluated. A meeting was requested with Dr. Coreil and Deron Thaxton last August and J. Gill attended. Hopefully, Budget and Review committee will take that the results of the meeting into consideration.

## **Report of President:**

J. Gill stated that she met with Dr. Coreil on March 2<sup>nd</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> to discuss review of policies and address concerns from faculty members.

Next, J. Gill stated that she met with Dr. Beard on April 3<sup>rd</sup> to discuss items of concern for Faculty Senate. In essence, J. Gill explained she wanted to give Dr. Beard an overview of Faculty Senate and where we are. J. Gill stated that she again met with Dr. Beard on April 4<sup>th</sup> to discuss policies and what was expected in terms of what should come through senate.

Next, J. Gill mentioned that she and B. Alwell met with Deron Thaxton and Dr. Abbey Bain regarding “P” grades. Dr. Bain will set up a meeting in the near future to also include Dr. Beard, Jerri Weston, and the Deans.

J. Gill stated she met with C. Corbat and Deron Thaxton on March 8<sup>th</sup> to discuss CurricuLog. D. Thaxton was to check on the LSUA space for the documents.

Finally, J. Gill explained that she has scheduled meetings with Dr. Beard (April 12th & 28th); Dr. Coreil (April 14th); Dr. Coreil, Dr. Beard, & Dr. Halpin (April 14th); and SACS Leadership Team (April 24th).

J. Gill then commented that it is good that there is now more of an open-door policy with administration.

M. LaBorde said when it comes to policy updates, policy revisions should be more than somebody simply changing titles. C. Corbat said that the university should follow the spreadsheet that accompanies 269.

**Committee Reports:**  
**PS 207 Ad hoc committee**

M. Stokes made a motion to receive the report

J. Innerarity seconded the motion

Discussion ensued and it was noted that as far as we can tell, these are not actually minutes and were not voted on by the committee members.

Vote: 11-0-0

J. Gill stated that Senate had set up an ad hoc committee for PS 207. They met and broke down the policy for revision. Dr. Bain’s intent was to update the Student Handbook. One major change that was noted is the inclusion of staff, who were not a part of the current policy. Essentially, the revised policy has been broadened to address student complaints beyond grades. It was pointed out that the committee’s goal was to attempt to streamline the policy and that the new policy would be one that was easily understood by all parties involved and that it would be efficient and workable. Another major change is that the committee has taken out the portion that provides a Grievance committee during the academic grievance process. J. Gill then explained that a Student Grievance Committee hasn’t existed since 2018. Finally, it was noted that with the proposed changes, some of the terminology had been softened and some time frames had been added in.

J. Gill wondered whether parts of this policy revision should go to A&S and others go to FPPC.

C. Corbat noted that there is nothing wrong with having a complaint procedure policy, but the issue is while the original policy strictly dealt with grade appeals, those appeals have now been combined with any kind of complaint against faculty and staff.

Discussion ensued on recent updates to the policy.

An issue was pointed out that in the proposed revision, the Vice Chancellor has final decisions with no recommendation from a committee of peers.

C. Corbat noted that another problem is this new policy gives the students the ability to appeal but does not afford faculty or staff the ability to appeal a decision.

One senator stated that recently, an online student had presented some challenges. The senator wondered about what recourse there was for a faculty member who is grieved by a student.

J. Gill noted that information on a grade appeal is lacking.

C. Corbat pointed out that it should be faculty or at least a whole committee who change grades, not merely the last person in the process as stated in the new policy. The way the new policy is written, if someone in the process tends to avoid conflict, the grade could be “unfairly” changed. Currently, our policy is that only a faculty member can assign a grade as per PS 218.

J. Gill reminded all that now, a new element is the inclusion of non-academic complaints. Also, there is now a staff element.

C. Corbat noted that something that allows for other complaints is missing, such as a complaint against the university as a whole as opposed to a specific person.

J. Gill mentioned that Senate is to provide feedback before April 27<sup>th</sup> for a cabinet meeting; however, she stated that she is going to put in a request for more time for A&S and FPPC to have appropriate time for discussion.

Discussion ensued regarding the lack of due process for faculty and staff in this proposed student grievance process.

M. LaBorde suggested that maybe the informal aspect of the policy can stand, but at some point, a committee should be convened to ensure due process for faculty. As it is written, a student can appeal a decision but not a faculty member. M. LaBorde suggested that maybe we should recommend that the Administrative Committee be reconstituted. J. Gill explained that the Student Grievance committee was taken off the Administrative Committee list thus the decision to make the current Faculty Senate ad hoc committee to include faculty in the discussion.

J. Gill proposed that Senate send initial feedback first, but let administration know that we are also forwarding this to the Faculty Senate standing committees A&S and FPPC. J. Gill will also request more time for faculty input in order to provide proper feedback regarding the proposed revision. J. Gill added that senators should discuss the proposed revisions within their departments as well.

It was suggested that PS 207 be retained as a grade appeals process and a new policy dealing with other student complaints be created. It was also stated that the LSU system attorneys should probably be consulted when it comes to grievances against faculty and staff.

Another concern is that staff are now included in this policy. With the current language, not all units are covered. Also, Staff Senate, as far as we know, have not seen the new changes to this policy.

Another comment was that PS 269, the policy on policies, requires track changes to ensure transparency to all stakeholders, but the new document does not provide track changes.

C. Corbat said we could send the ad hoc committee the general comments Senate has made and allow them a chance to revise it.

C. Corbat made a motion to authorize J. Gill to respond to Dr. Bain with Senate's concerns with the policy draft so far and request that they continue to work on it and resolve some of the issues.

M. Stokes seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

### **Old Business:**

#### **ICC – Senate Ad-hoc committee; charges**

Senate reviewed the language that was sent from C. Corbat:

The Interdisciplinary Curriculum Committee serves as a surrogate academic department in situations where courses or curricula (degrees, certificates, etc.) cannot be assigned to a single department but require interdisciplinary input. Responsibilities of the ICC are limited to development, modification, and deletion of courses and curricula and assessment of student learning outcomes for those interdisciplinary curricula. Within its area of responsibility, there are no differences in ICC and departmental actions. Faculty must vote on course and curricular matters and all ICC actions regarding courses and curricula must be submitted to the Courses and Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate for approval.

C. Thomas made a motion to accept the description as written

M. LaBorde seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

### **Chancellor's Funds**

J. Gill has yet to receive feedback from anyone who has received funds. She stated that as a reminder, those who travel should please complete the report and send back to J. Gill.

### **Advising Concerns – Report**

An issue with “P” grades was mentioned. B. Alwell stated that in the recent meeting, some useful information came to light. It was discovered that the parameters were creating some issues. Essentially, when the curriculum was set up in the Registrar’s office, it created a hurdle for the students and they are not allowed to self-register once advised.

J. Gill mentioned that the system may have worked when first set up, but it is not working now and the conversations include how to solve the “P” grade and overall GPA issue.

### **Update RE Revision of Policy Statements**

#### **PS 202 (A&B)**

J. Gill will reach out to B. Whittington and ask for updates.

#### **PS 245**

Dr. Beard gave an update earlier in this meeting.

### **Administrative Committees List**

No update.

### **CurricuLog Update**

C. Corbat continues to follow up with Deron Thaxton, but has yet to receive a response.

### **Bookstore**

No updates.

### **Introduction of New Business:**

PS 233

PS 231

PS 210

PS 269

C. Thomas asked that we look at these and make thoughtful comments because she has been charged with revising these. She wants Senate input.

J. Gill wondered if we should send PS 210 to A&S and PS 231 and PS 233 to FPPC.

C. Thomas also asked that senators talk to their departments to solicit input on these policies.

C. Thomas stated that nothing is preventing us from revising the policy on policies. M. LaBorde noted that presently, PS 269 is the policy that stands—not the memo that was sent out by Dr. Rowan. C. Thomas agreed that we would move forward with the current PS 269 and not Dr. Rowan’s memo.

C. Corbat and M. LaBorde noted that much work as already been done on a lot of these policies. C. Thomas requested that the information be sent to her. C. Corbat noted that PS 269 has been recently revised. She then stated that she had sent the other ones to Dr. Rowan but they did not go anywhere from there.

C. Corbat made a motion to send PS 231 and 233 to FPPC; in addition, PS 210 should be sent to A&S

J. Gill seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

### **Faculty Senate Funds**

P. Gurjar stated that applications for funds have been increasing, but we are working within a limited budget of \$35,000. Therefore, Senate should create criteria and sort through the applications. For example, what should be the criteria for awarding travel funds? Do we prefer first time-travelers? Do we differentiate between presenting vs. attending? What about in-state vs. out-of-state?

J. Gill showed a spreadsheet as to how the money was allocated this past year.

P. Gurjar asked for input from the senators.

C. Thomas suggested that for travel, if one is presenting, he or she should get priority. For field trips, if there will be a deficit, in some cases, students should ask SG for funds.

It was noted that if a field trip is mandatory for class, SG will refuse to fund it.

P. Gurjar stated that this time, travel exceeded \$21,000. Therefore, it is not feasible to continue dividing the funds up as \$15k for research, \$15 for travel, and \$5k for field trips.

M. LaBorde agreed that travel is becoming more and more expensive.

Some suggested that consecutive travel be considered. For instance, if someone traveled one year, perhaps that person should not be allowed to travel the next year using Faculty Senate funds.

It was noted that travel was once managed at the department level.

Discussed ensued on whether there should be a hard-cap on funds. Some preferred having flexibility. Some indicated that the hard cap could be worded in a way to allow flexibility.

P. Gurjar requested a review committee. It will consist of P. Gurjar, J. Innerarity, M. LaBorde, and R. Gaspard.

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not a faculty member should assume the responsibility of the Faculty Senate funds and no conclusion was reached.

**Announcements:**

**Next meeting:** April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 3:00 pm

**Adjournment:**

J. Innerarity motioned to adjourn

M. Sunderhaus seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

The meeting adjourned at 5:37 pm

**Faculty Senate Agenda**  
April 11, 2023 at 3:00 p.m.  
Live Oaks Room

- I. Welcome and Determination of quorum
- II. Approval of minutes  
3.7.23
- III. Brief guest updates
  - Dr. Coreil
  - Dr. Beard
- IV. Report of President
- V. Reports of Committees
  - PS 207 Ad hoc committee
- VI. Old business
  - ICC – Senate Ad-hoc committee; charges
  - Chancellor’s Funds
  - Advising Concerns - Report
  - Update RE Revision of Policy Statements
    - PS 202 (A& B)
    - PS 245
  - Administrative Committees List
  - CurricuLog Update
  - Bookstore
- VII. Introduction of new business
  - PS 233
  - PS 231
  - PS 210
  - PS 269
  - Faculty Senate Travel, Research, & Field Trip funds ‘23/24
- VIII. Announcements/Looking ahead
  - Next meeting: April 25, 2023 at 3 p.m.
  - Please send *Pats on the Back* to Julie and/or share at Senate Meetings
  - Departmental accomplishments
- IX. Adjournment

**DATE:** April 11, 2023  
**TO:** Faculty Senate  
**FROM:** Julie Franks Gill, Ph.D.  
Faculty Senate President  
**RE:** President's Report



1. Met with Dr. Coreil on March 2<sup>nd</sup> & March 29<sup>th</sup>; discussed review of policies and addressed concerns from faculty members.
2. Met with Dr. Beard March 3<sup>rd</sup> and April 4<sup>th</sup>; discussed items of concern for Faculty Senate, including policies.
3. Met with Deron Thaxton, Abbey Bain, & Beverly Alwell regarding the "P" grade issue. Dr. Bain will set up a meeting in the near future to include the four of us + Dr. Beard, Jerri Weston, and the Deans.
4. Met with Deron Thaxton and Carol Corbat to discuss CurricuLog on March 8<sup>th</sup>; Deron was to check on the LSUA space for the documents.
5. Scheduled meetings with Dr. Beard (April 12<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup>); Dr. Coreil (April 14<sup>th</sup>); Dr. Coreil, Dr. Beard, & Dr. Halpin (April 14<sup>th</sup>); SACS Leadership Team (April 24<sup>th</sup>)

Thank you!

## PS 207 Ad hoc committee

- Submitted by Dr. Abbey Bain via e-mail on 4.10.23

The committee was made up of:

Debbie Wood, Zeleke Negatu, Kent Lachney, Mike Wright, Brenda Ellington, Hailey Doyle, Amani Gray, Emrie Albritton, Carson Dausat, Theresa Langauer, and Abbey Bain as Chair. Daniel Manuel was brought in the last meeting to discuss the draft to represent staff senate. Carson, Emrie, and Theresa were not present for the final meeting and vote on the draft.

Here is a summary of the changes reflected in the attached:

- Committee wanted a streamlined policy that is easy to follow
- Committee wanted a policy that students would understand
- Committee wanted a policy that was efficient and workable for the campus
- Rename policy Student *Complaint* Procedure vs. *Grievance*
- A procedure for complaints against staff was added to the policy.
- The student has 10 days to submit grievance.
- Added notation of advocate role through student engagement if student has questions/needs help with the process.
- Added note for Title IX issues and discrimination complaints for a separate process.
- Informal process includes talking to the faculty member and then bringing in the department chair.
- Formal process starts w/ a form online. There is no longer a paper form in Academic Affairs.
- The formal process goes to Dean and then VC if needed. The VC decision is final.
  - There was heavy discussion regarding a committee involved in the process. The argument for a committee was to eliminate bias from faculty/staff/admin in a decision. The committee deliberated and discussed pros/cons. Student voice advocated not to have a committee. Many shared a committee would slow down the decision-making process especially for grade appeals that need a quick turnaround. Others shared that they wanted a more streamlined process with less steps and not more. After discussion there was a vote. Debbie voted for a committee and represented the college of Health and Human Services with her vote. The remainder of the committee voted against a committee in the process. There was also a comment that if there needs to be a change/addition of a committee at another date the policy could be revised in the future.
- Revised the verbiage to not be so negative – updating the terms *dispute* and *problem* with *issue* or *matter* throughout the policy.
- Added a statement regarding the grade change being included in the academic complaint procedure to be extremely clear.
- Add statement: If there is a change of grade, the last person to be involved in the appeal process will complete the Change of Grade Form. That sentence was discussed with the committee to ensure it was clear and concise for all involved. The original policy explanation was not as easy to understand, based on the committee feedback.

The committee unanimously agreed to support this updated draft of PS 207 on April 5.

---

SUBJECT: STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

---

PURPOSE: The student grievance procedure was developed to deal with disputes between students and their instructors. The student grievance policy defines a formal procedure by which disputes that have not been amenable to informal resolution can be resolved.

INFORMAL PROCEDURE

Although the primary purpose of this policy statement is to clearly describe the formal steps and procedures of the student grievance policy, there are important steps that must be taken to attempt to resolve issues before they escalate to the need for a formal grievance. The University encourages informal resolution of problems. Several things may be done by the student to clarify questions and concerns: 1) Review the course syllabus. 2) Review any course assignments that relate to the area of concern. 3) Investigate any concerns immediately. Before a formal grievance will be considered, a student must 1) Schedule an appointment with the faculty member to discuss concerns. 2) If a meeting with the faculty member does not resolve the issue, meet with the department chair and the faculty member. 3) If an informal discussion with the faculty member and department chair is unsuccessful, schedule a meeting with the dean.

Filing a formal grievance should be viewed as a last resort. Take this step only when all other avenues for resolution have been exhausted. The grievance process is not designed to address cases where students simply made a grade lower than desired in a particular class.

Authority of campus administrators over disputes between students and faculty is limited to cases involving violation of University policies, criminal or unethical mistreatment, or clearly prejudicial treatment of a student. Campus administrators do not have the authority to change grades, except as determined by the Student Grievance Committee as a result of a formal hearing described later in this policy. The basic role of campus administrators in the informal and formal grievance process is to assure fair and equitable treatment under existing University policies and to assist in conflict resolution.

## FORMAL POLICY

### I. BASIC PRINCIPLES

- A. The formal grievance procedure in no way infringes upon the important traditional informal channel of communications by which students and instructors may discuss any matter of interest to either. Practically speaking, it is the student's responsibility to attempt to resolve a problem with the instructor prior to the initiation of a formal grievance procedure.
- B. This procedure will not infringe upon students' rights; however, the student who has brought the grievance will have the responsibility at each stage of the proceeding for supporting and proving the accusation. A low grade in itself is not the basis for an appeal, nor is the difficulty of a course or test or specific test items.
- C. This procedure will not infringe upon the academic freedom of the instructor, including the right of the instructor to evaluate students fairly and properly and assign grades in the class. Only the instructor is empowered by the University to assign grades, unless a grade change is recommended by the Student Grievance Committee as a result of Step #4 of the grievance procedure.
- D. At each formal stage, a written summary will be made (respectively by the faculty member, the department chair, the dean, and the chairman of the student grievance committee -- if used) including a statement of reasons for any action or revision rendered. A copy of the formal documents will be retained by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs who has overall supervision of the process.
- E. Privacy rights of both students and faculty members will be respected. Access to the summaries for all legitimate purposes will be afforded to all principals until the grievance is resolved. Copies may be retained only by those parties against whom a grievance is alleged and by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs. Neither students nor faculty members will have these records made part of any permanent record.

### II. STAGES OF THE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

- A. **Step #1:** The student must come to the Office of Academic Affairs to obtain the forms necessary to initiate the grievance procedure. The formal grievance procedure is initiated when the student completes and returns to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs the LSUA Student Appeal Form for Implementation of the Student Grievance Procedure.

The Student Appeal Form along with all supporting documentation including, if any, a list of witnesses and a synopsis of their anticipated testimony must be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs no later than five class days after the first class day of the next regular semester or summer session

regardless of whether the student re-enrolls. The Vice Chancellor's office will date stamp the document upon receipt and forward a copy to the instructor named in the grievance. The instructor will sign the Record of Appeal Process form (hereinafter referred to as the RAP) indicating receipt of the student grievance materials. The instructor will return the grievance materials in person along with a written response to the Vice Chancellor's office by the end of the fifth class day after receiving the Student Appeal form and again sign the RAP indicating whether the appeal was granted or denied.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs will notify the student when the instructor's decision has been made. The student will go to the Office of Academic Affairs to review the instructor's decision and sign the RAP form indicating his or her acceptance or rejection of the instructor's decision.

For appeal involving courses taught the first half of a semester, the Student Appeal Form must be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs no later than ten class days after the first class day for courses taught during the second half of the semester, regardless of whether the student is enrolled in such a course.

- B. **Step #2:** If the student is not satisfied with the instructor's decision, the student must submit to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs a written request for continuation of the appeal to the department chair within five class days of the date the instructor's decision was rendered. A student's failure to timely initiate Step #2 precludes that student from seeking further relief pursuant to this process.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs will deliver the request for continuation of the appeal to the student's department chair and obtain the department chair's signature on the RAP indicating receipt of the appeal packet. The student and the faculty member will meet simultaneously with the department chair to present their viewpoints, at which time the instructor must provide his or her documentation, witness lists, and a synopsis of anticipated witness testimony. A written decision will be rendered by the department chair within five class days following completion of deliberations with the student and delivered along with all appeal packet materials including those submitted by the instructor to the Office of Academic Affairs, where the department chair will again sign the RAP indicating whether the appeal was granted or denied, unless the department chair determines that additional evidence needs to be presented. The Office of Academic Affairs will notify both the student and the instructor that the department chair's decision has been made. Both the student and the instructor will go to the Office of Academic

Affairs to review the decision and sign the RAP indicating their acceptance or rejection of the decision.

- C. **Step #3:** If either party is not satisfied with the department chair's decision, the dissatisfied party must submit a written request that the grievance proceed to the next step outlining the reasons for his/her dissatisfaction. This request must be submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs within five class days of the date the department chair's decision was rendered. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs will deliver the student's request and the appeal packet to the appropriate dean and secure the dean's signature on the RAP indicating receipt of the appeal. The student, faculty member, and department chair will all meet simultaneously with the dean to present viewpoints. The dean will render a written decision within five class days following the completion of deliberations, unless the dean determines that additional evidence needs to be presented and will return the appeal packet to the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor will notify all parties involved and obtain their signatures on the RAP indicating acceptance or rejection of the dean's decision.
- D. **Step #4:** If either party is not satisfied with the dean's decision, the dissatisfied party may appeal to the Student Grievance Committee by submitting a written request to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs. This request must be filed within five class days of the date the dean's decision was rendered. The Vice Chancellor will obtain the signature of the chairman of the Student Grievance Committee on the RAP indicating receipt of the appeal. The Student Grievance Committee will render a decision within five class days following completion of deliberations and will return the appeal packet to the Vice Chancellor.

The Student Grievance Committee will consist of 7 members. Two faculty members will be elected from each of the colleges for one-year terms. The term of each elected member shall begin in August and run for one calendar year. The faculty members and an alternate from each college will be elected by the faculty of the respective college at the beginning of each fall semester. The student members of the committee will be the president and legislative vice president of the Student Government Association. The SGA must annually elect an alternate for each representative. If an alternate is forced to serve for any reason, he or she must serve throughout the duration of a case. The registrar will also serve as a member of this committee. A faculty member will be elected chairman of the committee.

The functioning of the committee will include:

1. receipt and study of the original grievance and the written summaries of each preceding step;
2. solicitation of testimony from the student, faculty member, and administrators who have been involved in the grievance;

3. authority to "call" other witnesses.

The operating procedure of the committee will include a recorded vote to be taken on the issue; taping of the session (to be retained by the Vice Chancellor); and the right of legal representation (for student and faculty member).

The committee may, at its discretion, decide to grant the student some relief other than the "relief requested" by the student on the Student Appeal Form, if the committee believes that the student's grievance has merit, but that the relief requested by the student is inappropriate.

Operational Guidelines:

1. A majority of the committee will rule.
2. Attorneys/advisors will be limited to speaking only to their client(s)/advisee(s) and are not permitted to ask questions or otherwise make statements to the committee or to any witnesses called before the committee.
3. Since, prior to the hearing, each committee member receives and reads large amounts of evidence submitted by each party, the committee will limit redundant information.
4. An audio recording will be made of portions of committee meetings when witnesses are present before the committee, including any questions asked by committee members and/or testimony presented by witnesses or parties to the grievance. Committee deliberations will not be recorded.
5. Each party to the grievance will be allowed to submit witnesses on their behalf, however, the committee will determine whether testimony from those witnesses will be heard.
6. Attorneys/advisors are not allowed to be present for any part of the process other than when their client/advisee is before the committee.
7. All documents to be considered by the committee, including any supporting statements, must have been submitted by the student at the time the original appeal was made. Copies of all documentation must be made available to all parties of the grievance.
8. Students may wish to call witnesses to present relevant testimony to the committee. A list of such witnesses and a synopsis of their anticipated testimony must have been submitted along with other documentation at the time the appeal was initiated.
9. If either the student or the instructor wishes to submit additional supporting documents, the request must be made in writing at the same time the appeal's committee hearing is requested. If the request is granted, copies of the material must be made available to the other parties

- to the grievance and the other parties must be allowed to provide additional documents if they wish to do so.
10. Both parties to the grievance must be present before the committee during any presentation or testimony. Parties to the grievance will be limited in their statements to an opening statement, direct testimony, and responding to any questions that may be posed by the committee. Neither party to the grievance is permitted to examine or cross-examine witnesses; however, the student and the instructor may submit written questions to the committee which he or she would like a witness to answer. The committee has discretion whether to ask any such questions.
  11. The committee reserves the right to disallow testimony from any witness whose testimony is deemed to be irrelevant to the issues included in the grievance. Character witnesses will generally not be permitted, unless they have personal knowledge relevant to an issue raised in the grievance.

The scope of the Student Grievance Committee will be to submit to the Vice Chancellor a formal written account of the grievance proceedings including the committee's final decision. The committee may specify reassessment measures or other remedies as deemed appropriate. The chairman will communicate the committee's decision to the Vice Chancellor who will notify all principals involved. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs will be responsible for obtaining the signatures on the RAP of both the student and faculty member(s) named in the grievance indicating their acceptance or rejection of the committee's decision.

- E. **Step #5:** If either party to the appeal feels that a serious procedural error occurred or that there was an abuse of discretionary authority in reaching the decision, he or she may file a written petition for review with the Vice Chancellor. Such a request will include a copy of the original grievance and the summaries of all earlier steps, and will be made in writing within five class days after the date the committee's decision was rendered.

In making a decision, the Vice Chancellor may rely solely on written and taped documentation of the grievance proceedings. The Vice Chancellor may remand the matter to the Student Grievance Committee for further proceedings.

The Vice Chancellor's decision is final.

### III. GRADE CHANGES

The authorization for any change of a grade which might result from this decision resides with whomever presides over the last unchallenged step in the grade appeal process. The remaining signatures on the Student Grievance Grade Change Form merely acknowledge that the grade has been changed as a result of the student grievance procedure except that the change must have the approval of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs. The Student Grievance Procedure Grade Change Form must be properly completed and distributed to accomplish any change of a grade that might result from a student appeal.

**LSUA STUDENT APPEAL FORM  
FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE  
(LSUA POLICY STATEMENT 207)**

Please read the Student Grievance Procedure which appears in the LSUA Handbook (or is attached) before completing this form. When this form is completed and submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, the formal student grievance procedure is initiated. **If additional space is needed to answer any item below, you may attach additional sheets.**

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE:

1. Student's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ 2. SSN: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Last) (First) (Middle)
3. Student's academic major at the time the problem occurred: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Course Name and Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Sem/Yr course was taken

Instructor of the course: \_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTION OF THE GRIEVANCE:

5. Relief requested:
6. Statement of reasons supporting the relief sought. Attach a list of all witnesses and/or all the documents supporting the student's position.
7. I certify that I have read the Student Grievance Procedure, that I have sought an informal resolution of this grievance, and that I wish to initiate the formal Student Grievance Procedure.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Student's Signature Date

**SUBMIT THIS COMPLETED FORM (AND ANY ADDITIONAL SHEETS) TO THE PROVOST AND VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS (101 ABRAMS HALL).**

**RECORD OF APPEAL PROCESS**

(To be completed as indicated)

Date received in Vice Chancellor's office \_\_\_\_\_ Accepted by \_\_\_\_\_

---

**STEP #1: INSTRUCTOR - Must return a written decision and this form to the Vice Chancellor's office by the end of the fifth class day after receipt of the form.**

Instructor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date Instructor received appeal \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructor's Decision:**

Appeal Granted\* \_\_\_\_\_ Appeal Denied \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Instructor's decision received in Vice Chancellor's office:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student's reaction to Instructor's Decision:**

Accepted \_\_\_\_\_ Rejected \*\* \_\_\_\_\_ Student's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

**STEP #2: DEPT. CHAIR - Must receive written request for continuation of the appeal from the Student within 5 class days after Instructor's decision is rendered. Department Chair must render a decision within 5 class days following deliberations with Student and Instructor.**

Dept. Chair Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date Dept. Chair received appeal \_\_\_\_\_

**Dept. Chair's Decision:**

Appeal Granted\* \_\_\_\_\_ Appeal Denied \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. Chair's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**Student's reaction to Dept. Chair's Decision:**

Accepted \_\_\_\_\_ Rejected \*\* \_\_\_\_\_ Student's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructor's reaction to Dept. Chair's Decision:**

Accepted \_\_\_\_\_ Rejected \*\* \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Louisiana State University at Alexandria  
Faculty Handbook

---

PS 207 (continued)

207-10

**STEP #3: DEAN**      **Must receive written request for continuation of appeal from the dissatisfied party (Student or Instructor) within 5 class days after the Department Chair's decision is rendered. Dean must render a decision within 5 class days after deliberations with the Student, Instructor, and Department Chair.**

Dean's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date Dean received appeal \_\_\_\_\_

**Dean's Decision:**

Appeal      Appeal      Dean's      Date of  
Granted\* \_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**Student's reaction to Dean's Decision:**

Accepted \_\_\_\_ Rejected \*\* \_\_\_\_      Student's  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructor's reaction to Dean's Decision:**

Accepted \_\_\_\_ Rejected \*\* \_\_\_\_      Instructor's  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

---

**STEP #4: GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE -**

**Vice Chancellor must receive written request for continuation of appeal to the Grievance Committee from the dissatisfied party (Student or Instructor) within 5 class days after the Dean renders his decision. The Vice Chancellor will convene the Grievance Committee. The Grievance Committee must render its decision within 5 class days after completion of deliberations.**

Vice Chancellor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Vice Chancellor received appeal \_\_\_\_\_

Grievance Committee  
Chairman's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Chairman received appeal \_\_\_\_\_

**Grievance Committee Decision:**

Appeal      Appeal      Committee Chairman's      Date of  
Granted\* \_\_\_\_ Denied \_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**Student's reaction to Committee's Decision:**

Accepted \_\_\_\_ Rejected \*\* \_\_\_\_      Student's  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructor's reaction to Committee's Decision:**

Accepted \_\_\_\_ Rejected \*\* \_\_\_\_      Instructor's  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**NOTE:**      **If either party feels that a serious procedural error occurred or that there was an abuse of discretionary authority in reaching the decision, he or she may file a written petition for review with the Vice Chancellor. (STEP #5.)**

Louisiana State University at Alexandria  
Faculty Handbook

---

PS 207 (continued)

207-11

**STEP #5: PROVOST AND VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS**

To be pursued ONLY if either party feels that a serious procedural error occurred or that there was an abuse of discretionary authority in reaching the above decision. The dissatisfied party's written appeal to the Vice Chancellor must be made within five class days after the Grievance Committee's decision was rendered. The Vice Chancellor's decision is final and must be rendered within 5 class days after receipt of the request.

Vice Chancellor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date Vice Chancellor received appeal \_\_\_\_\_

**Decision:**

Vice Chancellor's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Decision \_\_\_\_\_

\* If granting of the appeal involves a change of grade, the Student Grievance Procedure Grade Change form must be completed properly and distributed by the appropriate personnel.

\*\*The dissatisfied party must submit a written request to have this form forwarded to the next step of the appeal process explaining the position relative to this decision.





SUBJECT: STUDENT COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

---

**PURPOSE:** The student complaint procedure was developed to deal with issues between students and employees at LSUA, including faculty and staff. The student complaint policy defines a formal procedure for addressing matters that have not resolved through informal resolution. Students seeking redress of grievances 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 are handled fairly and professionally.

A student who is unsure if a concern is a grievance or has any questions regarding the process should contact the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment and Student Engagement, or their designee, to provide additional information.

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

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

### Academic Complaint

If a student believes they have been treated unfairly by a faculty member, they are encouraged to resolve the matter through consultation with the faculty member. **This policy also includes grade disputes between a student and faculty member.** A student should first review the course syllabus and any course assignments that relate to the area of concern.

Before a formal complaint will be considered, a student must schedule an appointment with the faculty member to discuss concerns. The purpose of this meeting is to attempt to reach an understanding and to resolve concerns in an informal, cooperative manner. If a meeting with the faculty member does not resolve the issue, the student must meet with the department chair or director. The faculty member may also be a part of this meeting as needed. The department chair or director should consider all information and attempt to find a mutually agreed upon solution, if possible.

### Formal Academic Complaint Procedure

#### **Step 1:**

If unsatisfied with the outcome of the informal meeting with the faculty member and department chair or director, the student should complete the formal Complaint Form online. The request must be completed within 10 days of the incident or of the time a student could reasonably be expected to know of the incident.

The Dean will consider the report, talk with the student, faculty member, and any other parties relevant to the issue. The Dean will then make a ruling in writing to both the student and the faculty member within 10 business days. **If there is a change of grade as a result of the complaint procedure, the last person to be involved in the process will complete the change of grade form.**

#### **Step 2:**

If unsatisfied with the outcome of the Dean's decision, the student may appeal in writing to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The student has five business days to appeal after being notified of the Dean's decision. The Provost will review all materials and may choose to talk further with the student, faculty member, and any other relevant parties before making a ruling. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will make a decision in writing to the faculty member and student within 10 business days. This decision is final. **If there is a change of grade as a result of the complaint procedure, the last person to be involved in the process will complete the change of grade form.**

### Non-Academic Complaint

A student who feels unfairly treated by a staff member should follow a similar procedure by beginning with the informal process. The student is encouraged to meet with the staff person 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 procedure.

### Formal Non-Academic Complaint Procedure

#### **Step 1:**

If unsatisfied with the outcome of the informal procedure, the student should complete the formal Complaint Form online. The request 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 immediate supervisor will consider the report, talk with the student, the staff member, and any other parties relevant to the issue. The supervisor will then make a ruling in writing to both the student and staff within 10 business days.

#### **Step 2:**

If unsatisfied with the outcome of the supervisor's decision, the student may appeal in writing to the appropriate Vice Chancellor. If the staff member works in Academic Affairs the student should write to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost; if the staff works in Admissions or Student Engagement, the student should write to the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management

and Student Engagement; and if the staff member works in Accounting or Finance, the student should appeal to the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administrative Services.

The Vice Chancellor will review the report and may choose to talk further with the student, staff, and any other relevant parties before making a ruling. The Vice Chancellor's decision is final.

### Complaint Form Questionnaire

Name of person filing report:

Phone number:

Email:

Department of Issue: (insert a drop down of each college and each VC)

Class the issue is about (if applicable):

Professor/Staff Name:

Date of Issue:

Narrative about the complaint and include timeline with dates, times, location, and names of others who may be involved. Please include a summary of interactions with those who have been involved so far.

Action requested by the student to rectify the complaint:

Supporting documentation (ability to upload documents/photos):

X acknowledge the student has met with the faculty member and department chair and attempted an informal resolution for academic grievance or met with the staff directly for a staff grievance.

What was the date of the meeting with faculty:

Signature box:

\*\*\*form should be sent to Dean

\*\*\*form should also be sent to admin assistant

\*\*\*form should also have a reminder if not checked