

Faculty Senate Meeting  
October 27, 2020  
Zoom meeting 3pm

Members: Melissa LaBorde (President), Deborah Wood (Secretary) Jennifer Innerarity (Parliamentarian), Melissa Whitley, Kent Lachney, Richard Elder, Prakash Ghimire, Melissa Parks, Kerri Ordes, Carol Corbat

Guests: Dr. Coreil, Dr. Rowan, Beth Whittington, Holly Wilson, Mary Treuting, Daren Thaxton

**Dr. Coreil:** Mask memo requirements stay the in effect. Legally still under the Governors orders.

Hurricane - New Orleans to east Mississippi/Alabama tomorrow at 7 pm.

Policy 5 update

Chancey Slider is working with Senate to conduct policy statement review. Dr. Coreil discussed the need to work on Faculty Handbook revisions, PS 202 and 203 revisions, academic restructure, and best route to revise. Restructures =discussion= Dr. Rowan get the input changes made. Agreeing and impact. Step back and be objective. Commencement multiple exercises limiting guests and masks, fort LSU. Complement LSUA, LSUE move forward 3-4. 18 & 19 of December.

Details/decisions anything can happen

President search LSU – Wagner LSUA contribute with chancellor/ search firm through January

Jan applicants accept, Terra Smith Ag center 15 years ago meeting with her and??

M. LaBorde asked if faculty will be required to be at commencement exercises.

Dr. Coreil answered by saying limiting faculty or possibly no faculty.

**Dr. Rowan** stated faculty attending commencement exercises will be optional due to spacing. End of week how many ceremonies. Reminder all campus meeting Coughlin Hall and zoom. Couple of session Daniel Manuel safe zones students' safe FE schedule few more/responses putting together schedule no overwhelm

1.) Academic integrity –change in student code of conduct – have after or cheated academic misconduct faculty determine the penalty consistently. Alert office of student engagement Abbey Bain. Tally infractions, what's happening.

Structure active, approval, last year began prepare for future =COB/ college of Health and Human Services

Proposal evenly divide structure number of faculty credit hours better than it was last year.

Current chairs not be effected college of nursing 12 months 8-430 position various deans external relations teams COB works well

Structure to move forward

Making labels/names

Scholar Day is 4.22.2021. Dr. Rowan expressed his hope for full Faculty participation, stating classes would not be held in order to promote student and faculty attendance.

**D. Thaxton** – I will talk about two subjects. 1) Restructure and any change in allocations and to answer questions related to this subject and 2) I will also talk about a new budget model that a group of individuals from across campus will work to come up with a model that works for LSU. I will talk about the new budget model first because the restructure does have an impact on budget model. We have been in centralized budget model for many years. When I say it is centralized I do not mean it is assessed centralized but that all revenue flows into one revenue, in a central pot so to speak and is distributed out from there based upon needs. The other highly used model in higher education is called a responsibility center model (RCM). If it is a pure RCM model then the department that generates the revenue then the money goes back to that department. Being that all our revenue department on campus are academic and our administrative departments are not we cannot put into place a pure RCM budget otherwise the administrative departments would have no funding. So, what the majority institutions that use RCM model use a hybrid approach. Meaning that there is a base level of funding and is distributed to all departments that would include all administrative or support departments, as well as all the academic departments that are generating the revenue. We would have a base level, not unlike what we have now, just not at the level we have now. Then with some formula that we create, looking at various variables, or matrix, that we use to come with a formula that works for us. Plus the departments that generate additional revenue like increased enrollment have at least a portion of those dollars funneled back into those departments. I will take business for an example continues grow and increase their population in both on campus and online, they would receive a certain portion of that, although we would not know what that portion is, but once a formula is developed a portion of that would flow back into business for them to use as operational dollars for that department. That would be the same with every department on campus. This is an approach that has been successful in many institutes. We have not been to the point to where we come implement something like this in the past few years, quite frankly, I do not know if we are there now, but it is something that we need to proceed and pursue over the course of this next year. When you are strapped so tight for dollars, and you barely have enough to fund supplies and operational costs \$1000-\$2000 dollars annually not lot of resources to go around. Having said that, we are at a level where we have higher enrollments especially online enrollments. As that continues to grow and being that now we have a larger percent of that revenue generated from our online programs, that revenue is now 65% vs 50% with academic partnerships. We are near that threshold of being able to provide a base level funding across all campus departments, as well as having a RCM base on top of that to where the departments that are generating that increase in enrollments do see some payoffs going back into those departments.

One of the questions you may ask is what about the departments that are not revenue generated, I am talking about just academic departments now.

AEH has fewer majors than business department or the nursing department, so that is built into the formula, as well. With that, there are majors within department and then the courses taught by the department, we could look at those individually as a

whole, if you look at the courses taught by the department AEH is going to do very well because they teach a lot of the GEN ED courses. If you look at the majors in departments like business or nursing they would do very well because they have a very high number of majors within those departments. So, you need a blend of the two and that is a part of the process or your calculation coming up with that base level funding. It is not that the departments that have more majors are necessarily going to fair better than others because that is a part of it and it comes down to the number of courses your department is teaching. Let's stick with AEH who teaches a lot of GEN Ed courses, well obviously if business or nursing increase number of enrollment, well yes that helps them, but it also helps AEH because now they are teaching more sections and they have more SCH's of those courses. It is well rounded in a sense that enrollment growth helps not only the departments where the majors are, but the others who have the GEN ED courses. It is very widely used and we have done extensive research and talked to other universities on how they went about implementing it. The plan from here at the end of this fiscal year is to put together a team of individuals from across campus that will represent administrative departments, academic departments, and faculty senate. We do not know what that makeup is yet but I will announce it in the all campus meeting tomorrow and then it will be that team that comes up with the best model that works for us and how we raise SCHs and raise majors in each department. How to direct funding into support departments. That is something that we will work through over the next 8-9 months to come up with a model that works for LSUA. Now, as a part of that when you begin digging into the details on how this budget model works, the ones that seem more successful are the ones graduated organizational structure than just flat. Now I am getting into the restructuring. It allows those colleges, the Dean of those colleges, when the department under that college it gives under another level of review and level of divided up resources within the college and not just a flat amount out to individual departments. So, it helps with managing resources within the college itself, just like it would be managed now you have one level and then you have all the departments under that, this would have more levels to direct those resources and funnel those resources into a department that may need more resources, like additional faculty members. College of Health and Human Services, whatever the name ends up being whether it's Nursing, Allied Health, and Education. Let's say the dean of this college is looking to really grow education, but we know that nursing or allied health is bringing in the enrollment right now, that will give that dean the flexibility between those three to have some level of granularity between those funds as well. The structure that Dr. Rowan and everyone else has worked to put together was really independent of changing our budget model, it just so happens that they are coalescing at the same time and will really integrate well together. A different budget model has been my goal for that last 4-5 years. We have just really had ups and downs and never had revenue stability to the point where we thought it was feasible. Whether we are or not we do need to push control back into the area, academic areas that generated the funds. It is something that we want to do over the course of the next year. In terms of, switching just a moment to the new academic structure. In net new

dollars, the new structure in itself, I want to say it is in the 10-12 thousand dollar range depending on exactly how the course releases and how the division goes. I think there was some question at the beginning, or some concern with restructuring with current department chairs and not flowing into those positions and whether or not they would keep their current salary. The decision was made that no one would receive a decrease in salary throughout this process. While there is no new net effect there is an opportunity of a cost effect, with that while not being in that new cost. However, I do believe that is the right thing to do even though there is a net cost that goes along with that decision.

C. Corbat wanted asked about lab fees. You are saying the dean would have a lot of freedom to move money within the college. But, lab fees are collected for specific courses, as our course fees.

D. Thaxton relied saying the dean would have some freedom, not a lot of freedom. Lab fees are completely outside of those fall into a restricted account for those courses where they are collected. He stated he was simply talking about the unrestricted operating budget, not restricted.

M. LaBorde asked where is the funding coming from for new advisor positions.

D. Thaxton answered by saying we have looked at several additional positions across campus and I think there was a total 400-450 thousand in positions that collectively agree that they are critical moving forward especially depending on some changes of the advisory structure change with faculty freed up being released from advising. But, the majority of that in those new dollars there is risks in that, we are banking on enrollment growth and we back stopping that with any reserve accounts at this time. There is some risks but with any great reward there comes risks. In order to continue to grow and to continue to grow enrollment and to position ourselves in a structure that supports that and a larger number of students sometimes you have to take those risks. It is coming out of regular operating dollars back stopped with reserve funds, if needed. Current reserve amounts are around 3.8-3.9 million in reserve accounts. Which is up from 120 thousand 5 years ago.

**M. LaBorde** also asked what will happen to budget with the faculty we have lost. I think the person asking this question is referring to Jerry retiring and that position not being replaced.

**D. Thaxton** answered by saying right that is being evaluated under our current budget model. Which is any vacant position on campus those dollars are evaluated, the position is evaluated and is determined whether it needs to be refilled. If it is not than those dollars go back into pool of available funds to balance the budget for the current year or the upcoming year. So, they could redistributed in that department or not be it would depend on the critical needs at the time. Just to give you an update for this year, we went into this year with a budget that we balanced at the beginning, we did have some cuts that we had to make and some reshifting of resources. Just after census day we were down around 140 thousand. It will be the end of October before I can do a year to year again because we have comparative data on workday on revenue funding. As of yesterday, we were looking at gross funding this semester. In think we passed the line and we were up 170 thousand increase in grow revenue this year compared to last year. I predicted we would be at that point simply because after the first seven week session many of those students

had not yet registered for fall two. The SCHs were still at 6 or whatever it may be A&S subsequently the revenue would not be were a full time student until after that semester. After those students have registered for fall two, we are up around 270 thousand in gross revenue. It will be at the end of this week before I can tell you what the net impacted will be. If I had to guess I would say we are almost dead even with what we budgeted, meaning that we are right in line with where we need to be at this point to meet this year's budget. Meaning that we have the spring break even or to grow enrollment and be up a little by the end spring.

K. Lachney asked would the course fees follow the department that offers the course. D. Thaxton relied yes, that is something we would not be able to change.

K. Lachney asked about hybrid version RCM model is a great one to pursue that is as close as you can get into private industry. I think it is good we are looking into that model for us. Will you be taking into account a base year? Using this year or last year. D. Thaxton answered: probably the last 3 years.

**Dr. Rowan** interjected because the revenue that is generated has to cover all the expenses of the university, any particular department is only going to get credit for a certain percentage that it has for each student. Typically in these models 40%-42% the rest has to go cover overhead. It is the administrative cost that Daren referred to earlier. But, what is kind of exciting is we can decide as a group, as a university what is important and build that into the model. When I did one a few years ago we decided that university retention was important and we got some credit for that. Meaning that is a student started in a department and graduated from the university even if it was not in the department where the student started there was some credit applied to that department's budget.

**M. LaBorde:** In discussions we have heard there four new faculty positions. Can you tell us where those new faculty positions are going to be that we are going to fill for next year?

**Dr. Rowan:** I can answer where they are going to be: 1) Communication, 2) Biological science, 3.) Education, 4.) Psychology. Depending on how thing look at the beginning of spring it is not out of the question that there will be second tier of faculty positions we could look at. But we felt comfortable budgeting for these new faculty positions at this point.

M. LaBorde stated I know the communication position was a replacement, are the others replacement are all any new positions? Like additional faculty?

Dr. Rowan. Three of the four, you know replacements, they are all filling empty positions. If you are looking at it from a departmental perspective 3 of the 4 are replacing empty positions. The new one is in psychology, and these decisions made on various factors. Included in those factors are growth, and we have to continue to feed growth areas, if we do have the opportunity to add over faculty Kinesiology would be one and English we would look at and maybe one in history.

**C. Corbat:** asked if we keep all department chairs at the same salary so they are not harmed in salary which I agree is the right thing to do. Why would we not continue them at 12 months? Because they are being paid 12 months salaries now and if we are going to keep them at a 12 month salary why would we not have them work 12 months.

**Dr. Rowan:** We can talk about that it looks like there is going to be based on the latest discussion there is going to be 2 current department chairs who are going to be impacted, whose salary would be maintained even though the position description would be adjusted. So, if you think it is worth it, we can consider requiring 2- of the 12 department chairs to continue as division heads. I do not think that is crucial but I would listen to arguments otherwise.

**C. Corbat** another question is there any consideration of opening the dean position application to off campus to doing a national search?

**Dr. Rowan:** answered because those would be brand new positions and the thinking right now is we have some instructional needs not being filled in the areas I just mentioned. So, to bring someone to be an administrator and add a cost there rather than filling a significant teaching need was not what we thought would be prudent.

M. LaBorde asked will the current department chairs move into the dean position? Or will anybody who is qualified be able to apply for those positions? I could see how that would make an impact on the budget.

**Dr. Rowan:** Those questions get into the details of the next phase but, basically that would be open as far as I am concerned. I think at the dean level, in those high profile community positions we want to make sure they are tenured at least. To have an untenured faculty member and those faculty members making some politically influential decisions would be problematic. At the division head level I do not think you have to be tenured. The thinking is that it would be opened but again I have not gotten into the weeds about what those processes would look like and I do not want to make those decisions unilaterally. That is something that we all need to discuss collaboratively once we get there.

**M. LaBorde:** That would mean that this restructure would be more than 10-12 thousand if that were the case? If other people moved into those positions and had to be paid more over 12 months. **D. Thaxton:** Yes, that is hard to answer but potentially yes. M. Laborde state just wanted to make sure we are all on the same page.

**M. LaBorde:** Relayed information about others who had question about the details that have not been worked out as of yet. Things like these dean positions are permanent positions, not like what we have right now where some of the chairs are part of this rotation thing or the coordinators and how those rotate. Most of the questions I am getting are those kind of questions and we do not know the answers yet. Correct? **Dr. Rowan:** Correct.

**M. LaBorde** asked everyone as we move through this process that we do not take anything for granted and we get input at every level, because every little step we take impacts the next step after it. All of us are impacted by this and I think that is why there are so many questions.

## President Report

Chancey and I have gotten together about reviewing policy statements. PS 202 was our priority for now for the nursing staff. Then we looked at PS 203 which has to do with the work Kent has been doing with us. I am continuing to go back through our minutes trying to tie up loose ends when we had to pivot and go to remote meeting. Some issues just didn't get completely resolved and I am trying to pick up those issues. Dr. Coreil continues to invite me to the cabinet meeting, which kind of shows the big picture and then passing that information on to all of you. Chancey and the chancellor do have the list for policy statement rotation which Melissa made sure we all that list.

**M. LaBorde** stated sent the minutes from the first FPPC meeting and asked for approval of FPPC minutes

**R. Elder** moved to accept minutes and K. Lachney second the motion. Vote was unanimous yes.

## Old Business

Schedule of classes - tabled

**K. Lachney:** provided the committee members with an update on the evaluation form for department chairs last evening via email. The form was shared via zoom. M. LaBorde instrument for PS 203 could be used for employee administration as well.

**K. Lachney:** describe the rating 1-5 strongly disagree to strongly agree  
Actions verbs for some function to be evaluated. Also

M. LaBorde stronger than what we have had in the past.

K. Lachney next move would be approval.

**M. Waller:** states is so thorough and promote and work with community/collaborates. Had a question with #4 gets along with people, within the department? In the community? On campus?

J. Innerarity suggested builds collegiality among stake holder groups

C. Corbat suggested works well with others. #4 Builds or promotes

Works well with others external to the department is the wording revisions and K.

Lachney will send to M. LaBorde with suggested revisions and M. LaBorde send forward it move to administration.

**M. Waller** moved to send evaluation form to administration for approval to be included in PS 203. C. Corbat second the motion

The vote was unanimous to send the form to administration for approval.

**M. Parks** asked how many items were on that instrument due to wanting to know if the 8 page form could be placed in a digital format.

**K. Lachney** suggested that after the draft was approved that we get with IET and convert it to an electronic form.

**M. LaBorde** I will pass that along and make sure Chancey is aware. Faculty awards Bolton award committee take care of all 3 awards or 3 committees, any Recommendations?

**K. Lachney** my thoughts are that the 3 awards are different and those should involve 3 different types committees. However I am fine with one committee doing it all. **C. Corbat** favors 3 committees for that reason because they are very different sorts of set of contributions. I think different people have different strengths. **D. Wood** offered vote for 3 committees. **J. Innerarity** wanted all to be reminded about the smaller departments, we can have 1 committee or 3 committees more than likely will have the same people on all the committees.

**P. Ghimire:** suggested we do this next year due to new restructure we leave it the same and visit it again next year. **M. LaBorde** stated that is a point that the structure will change but we are going to have to figure out how to select the awards or **Dr. Rowan** is going to have to figure out how to select the recipients for the awards. **Dr. Rowan** made it up, called for nominations of the awards and then convened committee's faculty members who thought capable of choosing the correct winners for the awards. So, I don't mind doing that again but I think input from the faculty on what the processes should be would be appropriate.

**M. LaBorde** suggested since the Bolton Award committee is established was to ask for a brief summary of a candidate's research or of their service. We can say how many pages and then submitted to **Dr. Rowan** along with the same timeline as the Bolton award maybe. The he can convene a smaller committee or we can suggest people to be on that committee. **C. Corbat** liked the idea of having departmental input on who is on those committees if for no other reason it just comes off just a little more cleanly that it is a faculty chosen thing. **Dr. Rowan** stated he is not opposed to that as a general principle I think it is a good idea to balance some committees being faculty selected and other committees not because otherwise what happens is you get the same people being selected by the departments over and over again.

**M. LaBorde** asked for recommendations?

**C. Corbat** recommended 3 committees, chosen by the faculty.

**D. Wood** second the motion

**M. Whitley** opposed. 10 for and 1 opposed

**M. LaBorde:** Passed along to **Dr. Rowan**.

**K. Lachney** reported that the process looks favorable at this time and consider making a recommendation to move it forward. **Dr. Rowan** asked for an official recommendation from the chairs. Which we received at our last meeting. Most were strongly in favor but there was one who was opposed but, the reason for moving forward is this needs to go to the board of supervisors just like last year when we created the college of business. So if we approve the structure and get the process going with the board the other things we can take our time with and get it right and make sure we are all on board with respect to how we are going to make selection and what we are going to do there.

**M. LaBorde** asked that **Dr. Rowan** explain the changes to the restructure, the changes were the HIPS came out AEH and then chemistry and physics I have not seen that one pulled out before, and can you just speak briefly to that area.

**K. Ordes** answered by saying I am a social scientist and not in the humanities. The approach to the historians is positives and empirical so they fit into a social science mode of analysis better than being purely interruptive. We have a synergy going on



with our microbiology department and I would hate to split us up, I would be a fish out of water in the humanities. After discussing all this we agreed we would be happy to in the social science so we three agreed we could be together in the social sciences and not in the humanities. Dr. Rowan stated that change was made on faculty input. M. LaBorde with the MAPS splitting up was new? Dr. Rowan said no. C. Corbat asked with that was something that did not make sense to me, because it is a division that would have 5 faculty with 7 majors on the list that you sent to us once before, why pull it out of MAPS? Dr. Rowan relied more balance in terms of overall credit hours served, number of faculty. If we pull it out of MAPS there are 13-14 faculty in one department, so it would be the largest department. We have some potential growth areas with computer science for example. So we thought this was a more balanced way of approaching the future. P. Ghimire asked I heard that computer science and? Physics will be one department. Dr. Rowan answered the way it is now computer science is with mathematics, we can come back to the labels. That grouping I think makes sense. C. Corbat has another question about the name of the college of math and natural science. Why is it in that order when the largest department in that college will be biological science? Dr. Rowan stated we can change the name, this is not at this point about names. So, we are not committed to that name. C. Corbat the other question does not have to do with names but with you said this makes us more nimble at the last meeting. Have we reduced the number of colleges from this version versus the last time you presented the restructure to us? How many colleges were in it in the forum? Dr. Rowan answered it was the same, it was five. C. Corbat said one of these colleges is in effect approved because we have approval for the college of arts and sciences, and the college of professional studies, and once business was pulled out of professional studies, the remaining departments in that college are nursing, allied health, and education. So, that is just a name change of an existing college? Really the college that would be getting broken up is the college of arts and sciences. Dr. Rowan answered that is right, in fact the name change for part of professional studies is what went through last year. So, we already have the college of health and human sciences. So, you are right this is taking the massive college of arts and sciences on paper and making them three academic units?

**M. LaBorde** asked each senate member to talk about this and be sure everything is being looked at for the future. Dr. Rowan asked for a formal vote. M. LaBorde states it is premature to vote, but need to have input from faculty. Tabled until next meeting.

**M. Laborde:** reported that she and C. Corbat have not met yet about academic policy, but have plan to do so. Also received input from J. Westin about academic suspension and the block information, when committee gets to together will look at this provided information as well. Will also send the two emails sent by J. Westin so all senate members can look at what the suggestions are related to these topics. Suggests that that information be sent to A&S for input. M. LaBorde also talked about the Chancellors fund, unsure if will get those funds, could be that we just get the research funds. Or we may not get anything, those funds are still on hold. The transcript evaluation for students was on here, J. Westin did send that information to and will send it on to A&S. Any other questions for old business?

**K. Lachney** asked what we are waiting on for the chancellor's funds. If the budget has been put together? M. LaBorde answered first we were waiting on the 14<sup>th</sup> day, and when we were talking about it earlier it budget was not as robust as it is now, and now because of session two that is kind of what that is what saved us. I had asked about it in the last chancellors meeting but Daren had already left. I will try and nail that down in the cabinet meeting tomorrow. K. Lachney is concerned with the timing due to have submitted travel plans. M. LaBorde not sure about travel at this point.

## New Business

M. LaBorde asked C. Corbat to discuss course delivery for the spring. C. Corbat explained this has to do with instructors asking to not be on campus for the spring semester. The reason for the question is that a faculty member from another department, who wanted to remain anonymous, and did not want to go through their own senator for that reason. They were concerned that they had never even known that you could ask to teach off campus. Also that there was a formal process laid for all faculty to be able to apply and know what to do. So, I wanted to bring that issue up and from a departmental stand point, until those decisions are made we cannot solidify our schedules. Because some of our courses have to be taught face-to-face for professional students. So it is really hard not knowing what you are going to teach next semester or what times you are going to teach it and have students enroll in those classes and then we have to change the schedules around like we did this time. We are having to move a mass number of students schedules which is a real pain. So if we could get some idea about when that decision will be made so we can revamp the schedules if we need to. Dr. Rowan asked by saying last semester what happened was communications were sent to faculty indicating that in line with our desire to continue as much as possible with the robust on campus student population. We really didn't want faculty to teach off campus if at all feasible. We did say if faculty had significant health issues that they could put in a request with me and the chancellor to teach off campus for the fall. There were a few such requests and that was the process. That process will be made available again, I am not exactly sure when but probably before Thanksgiving. The issue is that health conditions can change. So what we can do is have an estimated classes that could be taught remote, but it will only be estimated on what we get back from faculty. M. LaBorde asked did people have to give any justification, or was there anything that you asked for or did those requesting just say I have this and I need to teach remote. Dr. Rowan stated they did not ask for a lot of detail. He stated that he checked with a few other institutions and everyone did it differently. LSU just said faculty have the choice, there was backlash, especially with freshmen. Shreveport required all kinds of documentation, the extreme opposite which had to be submitted through HR. LMLA was involved and we thought that was too much. So, we trust faculty and if there is legitimately something going on that we do not want faculty endangering themselves. So, it was an informal process. M. LaBorde states that assuming that in the spring semester if we all come back or whatever happens, what do you want us to tell our constituents? Dr. Rowan asks if there is a recommendation for an

alternative approach then he is all ears. However the plan is to do the same approach. Which, is to have faculty submit a request to be fully remote. Understanding that request must be related to a legitimate health issue that could be compromised by teaching on campus. Request should go to Dr. Rowan. M. LaBorde reiterated that if you would like to request to teach remote than that request should go directly to Dr. Rowan. Dr. Rowan stated that he will talk to senior leader at the next meeting and try and expedite that process to get a consistent message out to faculty. Tell colleagues something will be forth coming soon. C. Corbat asked that the chairs at least be copied that information because of scheduling, the chair needs a heads up if they are going to have to move classes around and assign them to different faculty. We are starting registration on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of November so this could quickly become an issue. Dr. Rowan said chairs will need to be made aware, either on the request or when the decision is made. C. Corbat stated even if on the request at least the chairs know it is coming.

**M. Laborde:** Incomplete grade policy. **J. Innerarity** asked for this to be on the agenda. For full session for incomplete grades you have until, I am reading from the policy, incomplete grades for online student get until the end of the fourth week. She stated that Dr. Marks and she were concerned about that, because before we were finished the first week of December. Now we are looking at the week before Christmas, and for students to come back with a 2 week break and be ready the 3<sup>rd</sup> day seems like a tight squeeze. She will do more research on it but is requesting for longer time to convert the "I" to a grade. Allow time to make up so student can succeed. C. Corbat replied that back when Dr. Hatfield was here we talked about the incomplete policy with regard to the different durations of terms or session that we have now. We voted on a change for it that was more consistent for all sessions regardless of their length and it never was implemented. M. Treuting answered by saying my memory was that we were going to use the semester format even for the online students. So that they would have enough time to complete their incompletes. She stated remember talking about it but does not remember what was decided. C. Corbat replied by saying we were trying to rectify that situation for the online students. M. LaBorde said that Jason will try and get the minutes from the academic council from the other server.

**M. LaBorde:** Graduation concerns, more information will be forth coming. However would like to talk about doing graduates grades before the actual graduation ceremony. C. Corbat stated she received a very negative response about students graduating before grades are posted. J. Innerarity stated the only concern was maybe the pressure it would put on faculty to pass someone because they had already graduated basically. There has in the past been pressure placed on faculty to pass a student. M. Whitley asked her faculty but no one had any input. K. Lachney stated that it seems like just a few years ago when you asked to turn in a list of students who were graduating and we figured their grades and turned it in. That may be an option if some have some concerns about the grades and graduation. M. LaBorde said someone asked what if you have a student that is supposed to graduate on that Friday but the final is not done until at the end of that Friday. The student has to take an exam and trying to get to graduation that could be problematic. Dr. Rowan replied there are no final exams that Friday, all final exams

will be Monday through Thursday. No guarantee that seniors will not have exams on the Thursday before Friday graduation. C. Corbat interjected that when we gave the list and we just gave the seniors their exams early. Dr. Rowan stated that all exams are on line and need to ensure that the proctor venue is not overlooked. He would like to remember that it is a very unique and difficult time to get everything done. He also said he was open to any alternative options. M. LaBorde is uncomfortable with the idea that graduates grades are not finalized before the student walks for graduation. Dr. Rowan continues to state there it is not uncommon for a few students go through the ceremony and not graduate. M. Parks wants to know how other universities in the system are handling this situation. Dr. Rowan answered by saying we were the only ones who had embedded all the graduates before the ceremony. M. LaBorde said we extended the semester the other universities did not extend the semester, so that adds to the dilemma. Dr. Rowan says at LSU they do have a list of prospected graduates. That is approved candidates, if they all success and graduate is not known before the graduation ceremony. C. Corbat wants to ensure that is made very clear to the graduates and their families. This is a change, because it has never been the case here that you could walk and not meet the requirements. They need to know that they could go through this ceremony and not graduate. She also concerned that after the fact that this person walked and has their pictures, their diploma cover, and did not make it, please change their grade so they can. Dr. Rowan asked how concerned you are all about grading 24-48 hours before hand and their families are coming in and they may not get to walk at all depending on the grade you give them. M. LaBorde states she would rather do it and make sure that they meet the requirements. Dr. Rowan says if there is a proposal he is open, only need one way of doing it. M. LaBorde says to talk to colleagues and see what they say about students graduating before knowing if they have met the requirements to graduate.

**P. Ghimire** wants to discuss the students who want to have 2 majors under the same degree. For example a BS in biology and a BS in chemistry at the same time. According to our current policy if a student wants to have a second major under the same degree then you have to complete another 30 hours behind that 120 credit hour degree. After discussion with MAPS maybe we need to revise that requirement because of different reasons. The first reason is if we revise it and remove that original 30 credits requirement that will save the student time and also money. Another reason is our neighboring university including LSU they don't have that original 30 credit hours requirement. M. LaBorde says that UUL has it, LSU has it, and Tech has it. Dr. Rowan reported the LSU verbiage says you can earn one degree with 2 majors listed on the transcript as long as you complete the academic requirements. So, there is nothing about an additional 30 hours. M. LaBorde says she was talking about 2 different degrees. Dr. Rowan says that is right that is different. P. Ghimire says he is talking about 2 majors under the same degree. C. Corbat stated the difference is, and she called the LSU registrar's office, it has to do with the way Louisiana does things. The BOR does not approve a Bachelor of Science or a Bachelor of Arts on our campus. They approve a Bachelor of Science in Biology, Bachelor of Science in Chemistry, those are separate degrees. So, if you talking about a student getting a major in biology and a major in chemistry then at LSUA that is 2

degrees, not two majors under one degree. Dr. Rowan states that is not the case, he will look at it again, but that is not the case. Other universities in Louisiana, even LSU allow 2 majors under the one degree. If it under one degree like general studies they can do that, but they cannot get a BS in biology and BS in chemistry listed under one degree. Dr. Rowan says yes they can. The language in the LSU catalog does not say anything about 30 hours. It does say that if you want a second BS degree then you must earn an additional 30 original semester hours. But, there is a distinction about 2 majors under one degree and 2 degrees. C. Corbat says that here at LSUA a BS in chemistry is a different degree than a BS in biology. Dr. Rowan states that the research should be done to see what is allowed. C. Corbat disadvantage to the university, one student only completes once and additional tuition. The other thing is the academic integrity. Dr. Rowan wants to look at what is in the best for the students and we need flexibility. M. LaBorde states that two different conversations going on here. Find out the information needed to move this the process. P. Ghimire we need to attract more students. M. LaBorde it has been on the radar for a while, but we need more information.

K. Lachney on the same level as pat on the back. At what point do we discuss what's going in our department. Couple of each time what is going on in our departments. Great is we could share.

M. Waller charge for the public relations committee.

Next meeting November 10, 2020.

D. Wood moved to adjourn, J. Innerarity 2<sup>nd</sup>