

Faculty Senate Minutes
For: 10/11/2022

Members Present: Adena LeJeune (alternate), Matthew Stokes, Purujit Gurjar, Cynthia Thomas, Rusty Gaspard, (on phone), Sonja Kumar (alternate), Guoyi Ke, Carol Corbat, Jennifer Innerarity, Julie Gill, Melissa LaBorde, Cathy Cormier (alternate)

Members Not Present: Hal Langford, Beverly Alwell, Kerry Ordes, Mary Kay Saunderhaus, Sarah Barnes

Guests Present: John Rowan, Paul Coreil, Jim Rogers

Call to Order:

A quorum was established at 3:01 pm

C. Cormier joined the meeting as the alternate for M. Saunderhaus

J. Innerarity stepped out of the meeting.

C. Corbat made a motion to seat C. Cormier as the alternate for M. Saunderhaus

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

Dr. Rowan wanted clarification on the process of making corrections to his minutes. He wants to see the minutes beforehand to make sure they can be reviewed for accuracy. J. Gill indicated that he could have a copy of approved minutes. Should he find any errors or corrections, he should mention them in his next report, and his comments will go into the minutes for that meeting.

J. Innerarity returned to the meeting.

Minutes:

9/17 Senate Minutes

M. LaBorde moved to approve

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 7-0-5

Brief Guest Updates:

Report from Provost:

First, Dr. Rowan said that an approach would be instituted where some funding for student research and traveling to present will be an opportunity. He indicated that at this time, it was unclear how this opportunity will unfold, but there will be money set aside. It will go through the deans, and the process may involve a presentation by students and possibly involve a faculty

mentor. Dr. Rowan stated that the need for such an opportunity has come up because as more and more of our students are doing research beyond the university, they ought to be given that chance to present at conferences.

Second, Dr. Rowan said that in terms of personnel, we have now posted an open position for a permanent Director of Library Services. Michelle Riggs Waller has done an excellent job as interim.

Dr. Rowan then said that the Director of Facilities Services position has been reposted. He then expressed gratitude for all that Chad Gauthier has done.

Next, Dr. Rowan said that the Alexandria Museum of Art has their Plein Air Festival starting this Thursday at Inglewood. He said LSUA's own Jeremy Simmons won first place in last year's contest. Dr. Rowan encouraged everyone to come walk around and watch these artists as they paint various scenes and landscapes. There will be a fundraiser dinner that night, but just walking around is free. The festival will wrap up Sunday at 4:00 at the Alexandria Museum of Art. Paintings will be for sale.

Finally, Dr. Rowan said the announcement about IDEA surveys came out for the first fall session, at which time it occurred to him that in terms of the response rates, perhaps some faculty groups can look at other universities and see what they are doing. He said that LSUA could do better. He added that these evaluations are one aspect in looking at promotion and tenure under teaching, so if we could improve those rates, that would be great.

J. Gill thanked Dr. Rowan and asked for clarity about the Plein Air Festival dates. Dr. Rowan clarified.

Report from Chancellor:

Dr. Coreil said he has been asked to chair the search for the Vice President for Agriculture and Dean of the College Agriculture for the LSU Ag Center.

Dr. Coreil said he went to North Carolina State with the President and other LSU Board Members to look at the agriculture research station.

Dr. Coreil then mentioned that a ribbon cutting being held tomorrow has been 15 years coming. The new circle drives on the LSUA campus are really attractive. A lot of people, including legislators, are excited about what we have going on at LSUA. The Chair of LSU Board of Supervisors, Valencia Jones, will be here among other distinguished guests.

Dr. Coreil then stated that Rapides Parish Fair is starting Wednesday. He mentioned that Chief Collins put out a safety alert.

Next, Dr. Coreil stated that LSUA's next big capital outlay project, the health campus, was well received at a recent meeting. He said that if we can have facilities that can attract and graduate more students, that will help us. The location downtown has an advantage because of the nearby

hospital. Dr. Coreil said that this is a \$35-million project, and he thinks we can get some local support, including from local hospital administrators. Dr. Coreil said that this project is in response to a major problem—a shortage of healthcare workers. He said that almost 700 positions could be filled today. “Hospitals” are spending almost \$35 million a year on contract nurses

Dr. Coreil said Cathy Cormier was successful in submitting two grants to the Rapides Foundation, totaling almost \$1.3-4 million if combined.

M. LaBorde asked Dr. Coreil about money that was available about 30 years ago. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Coreil expressed disappointment that it looked like the new potential facilities director will not be able to come due to complications with selling his home. H has declined the position unless his home sells prior to LSUA hiring another Facilities Service Director.

Next, Dr. Coreil mentioned the “Campus Edge” project. He said we had received one development proposal, which was impressive. We will evaluate it with a consultant and see what it would take to accept the proposal. M. LaBorde asked about if Dr. Coreil could share some specifics. He noted that the among other things, the proposal included hotels and restaurants.

Dr. Rowan and Dr. Coreil left the meeting. M. LaBorde also exited the meeting.

President’s Report:

J. Gill stated that the Chancellor’s Cabinet meeting included a lot of good discussion on upcoming campus events.

J. Gill stated that Curriculog meetings will begin again on Friday, October 14th. She will meet with Dr. Coreil later this week to give him an update.

J. Gill then stated a Curriculog demo was held for Deans, Directors, and Department Chairs.

M. LaBorde rejoined the meeting.

J. Gill then said that only \$35,000 was approved for Chancellors funds, but \$40,000 was requested. Even if we could approve all requests, there would be nothing left for the spring. J. Innerarity asked if there was a possibility to ask for more funding for the spring. J. Gill said all we can do is ask. M. Labore mentioned that sometimes people do not spend what is originally requested, and that may provide funding for spring applications.

J Gill said it was nice to hear that student research funds are under consideration.

Committee Reports:

C&C 9.12

M. LaBorde moved to receive minutes

C. Thomas seconded the motion
Vote: 12-0-1

C&C 9.26

M. LaBorde moved to receive minutes
C. Thomas seconded the motion
Vote: 12-0-1

C. Corbat mentioned that these minutes have action items. First, is a modification to the BS in Criminal Justice. J. Innerarity explained a community college in north Louisiana wanted LSUA to allow Fire Science classes to be accepted as electives.

M. LaBorde moved to accept C&C's recommendation of Modification to the BS Criminal Justice degree
C. Cormier seconded the motion
Vote: 12-0-1

C. Corbat then said the second action item is modification to the BS Kinesiology degree.

J. Gill explained that M. Parks wanted to include the term "coaching" to the Health and Physical Education Concentration.

M. LaBorde moved to add the term "Coaching" to the BS KINS H & PE Concentration
C. Cormier seconded the motion
Vote: 12-0-1

C. Corbat said a third action item was an addition of a new course, Introduction to Public History. She pointed out that there was an error in the C & C minutes. This course was never on the Gen Ed list. C & C voted by email to correct the minutes.

Dr. Jim Rogers explained that since the Public History concentration is being added to the BA in History, a Public History course was needed. He stated that it is an introductory course but cannot be considered Gen Ed. It is a specialized field.

C. Cormier moved to accept the addition of HIST 3050 Introduction to Public History
M. LaBorde seconded the motion
Vote: 12-0-1

C. Corbat said the final action item was adding a minor in Public History.

Dr. Jim Rogers explained the minor is intended to attract students in other majors who might be interested in the public presentation and management of history. Public history deals with museums and experiences as opposed to what most historians do: reading, writing, giving presentations.

J. Gill asked how many hours is required for minor. Dr. Rogers said 18 hours.

C. Corbat asked if Public History was essentially conveying history to the public and educating them. Dr. Rogers said that description is correct, but it also depends on what a given organization is doing. Dr. Rogers added that it was not really intended for scholarly history, but educational, informational purposes to the public. He illustrated that how one displays information affects how it is received. He concluded by stating that public history is significantly different than scholarly history.

M. LaBorde moved to accept C&C's approval of the Public History minor
C. Thomas seconded the motion
Vote: 13-0-0

Improvement of Instruction 9.20

C. Corbat said there were no actions items to consider.

M. Stokes motioned to receive the minutes
C. Corbat seconded the motion
Vote: 13-0-0

Public Relations 9.19

M. LaBorde motioned to accept the minutes
C. Cormier seconded the motion
Vote: 13-0-0

C. Corbat announced a student representative, Myra Parks, to serve on the Public Relations Committee.

M. LaBorde made a motion to approve Myra Parks to serve on the Public Relations Committee
C. Thomas seconded the motion
Vote: 13-0-0

Old Business:

J. Gill began the discussion on advising by mentioning that she had heard from several departments regarding advising issues and challenges.

The first concern dealt with extending advising time periods. In many cases, faculty have to halt the advising process and wait on hearing back from other parties. In addition, there are problems with transfer students and pre-requisites. Also, the timing of getting transcripts evaluated is an issue. Transfer students have taken classes that applied to the degree, but those classes were not in Degree Navigator. Advisors must stop advising the student and wait for the Degree Navigator updates to happen. In addition, some returning or transfer students have "P" grades in some courses, so when a "C" or better is required in an LSUA course prerequisite, the "P"'s are not being recognized. It would be helpful if course sub forms were linked to Degree Navigator in order to have required fields completed, such as student name, ID, etc.

Some expressed concern that cumulative GPA's are important. However, in some cases, good students have low GPA's because their transfer courses on their transcripts are not being evaluated. Consequently, the transfer courses are showing up as "P's," but "P" grades don't factor in to GPA. Not only does this inaccurate method of calculating GPA's affect LSUA students, it is unclear how it might impact students who move on to grad school.

It was noted that Power Campus was set up so the grades would be entered as the grade the student earned. Since transfer students' transcripts are often not evaluated, however, their actual grades in courses are merely reflected as "P," which has no impact on GPA. Then, the "repeat delete" policy got started, which complicated the issue because students who failed certain courses could take them again and the previous grade would be replaced with the new one, but again, it is not clear how all of this impacts students' cumulative GPA.

In some cases, with transfer students, their specific courses aren't showing up. Instead, only a degree is listed along with "P" and their previous GPA, but now, in LSUA's system, the student has no GPA.

It was expressed that the expectation is that faculty are supposed to calculate GPA, but some pointed out that faculty don't know all the rules of calculating GPA's. One concern is that if faculty agree to calculate GPA's, they would be expected to continue to do so, but that would be overbearing, especially for faculty with especially large work and advising loads.

Another concern is that calculating GPA's needs to be standard, as the students' GPA's are sacred—they are a part of their permanent records.

Another concern is that the Registrar's Office has indicated they do not have the sufficient staff to calculate GPA. Instead, they could help to pick out required courses towards degrees in evaluating transcripts. However, some stated that even that is not happening; of particular difficulty is when students have multiple transcripts.

In some cases, with transfer students, specific courses are listed, but a "P" grade is still listed.

It was again stated that the issues mentioned often delay advising a student, meaning advisors have to "put off" student and ask him or her to wait, which results in a "service to students" issue.

Some indicated that opening registration at 8:00 am as opposed to midnight would aid in a smoother registration process for some students.

Another issue is when "block transfer" occurs. For example, instead of listing specific courses, the transcript just says, "All Gen. Ed.'s complete." However, this presents problems when programs want specific Gen. Ed. courses. This could also potentially be a SACS issue.

Another concern with online transfer students is that they need to complete the new student orientation before they move forward. There is much they don't know how to do because they skip orientation.

Another concern is that Session 1 and 2 need to show in Degree Navigator. Also, it is important that the Gen. Ed. Courses be listed out.

One issue seems to be with students being accepted too late after classes have started. Someone suggested an earlier cutoff date. It was pointed out that there is data that shows that students that come in at the last minute are not retained. Often, students who register late tend to drop out or fail. There used to be a three-day cut off for registering for courses, but this cutoff was changed and Senate recommended to change it back, but the recommendation was ignored.

If the deadline to apply for graduation could be after the schedule for the next semester comes out, it would help because students do not know what courses will be offered.

Summer advising is another issue in that faculty are being asked to advise in the summer, but some are not getting paid for it. A recurring sentiment is that even if faculty are teaching summer courses, advising only during their office hours is not practical, as the needs of advising students are ongoing and extend beyond the office hours.

Some indicated that Professional Advisors have been helpful, but a recurring problem is them being trained and then leaving.

In times past, new faculty were given the first semester to watch a faculty mentor, but in recent cases, new faculty are expected to begin advising in their first semester. Some suggested that compensation for advising should be considered. Some faculty have lots of advisees compared to others. One suggestion is to implement an “advising overload pay,” similar to teaching overloads.

The question was raised whether or not an ad hoc committee should be appointed to take on these advising issues.

Discussion ensued.

J. Innerarity said that we need a support system for employees, who often have heavy workloads on top of other things, including research and scholarly activity. If we’re going to recruit and retain more students, we need more support for faculty.

M. LaBorde reiterated that we are all on board with forward thinking, but we do not currently have the scaffolding and infrastructure to support long-term growth.

J. Gill mentioned that she was once paid to advise during summer as part an advising initiative when the Advising Center began. A. LeJeune commented that she was paid for advising, as well.

A question of whether or not an advisor is required to have an advanced degree was posed. Several responded with a “no answer, and J. Gill explained that it is preferred for an advisor to have or pursue a master’s degree, but it is not required.

Another concern with advising was mentioned in that some want advisees but cannot get them. In some cases, student advisees were taken away and were never assigned mentor faculty. Getting advisees as seniors is too late to line up summer internships. Some felt that having Professional Advisors works for freshman courses, but there are some critical factors, so it is disadvantageous to have to wait so long to be able to advise students. Passing advisees on could free up Professional Advisors to work with other departments with more advisees. Finally, some are finding that their students do not have eight-semester degree plans. This is especially true of transfer students coming in with courses and professional advisors are working on custom plans.

Some indicated that it would be more helpful if we put personnel into transcript evaluation rather than advising. Having more than 50 advisees is unreasonable for any faculty.

It was also mentioned that it is a real pain to be kicked out of Self-Service every five minutes.

J. Gill asked what the Senators wanted her to do with these notes on advising. The general consensus of the group was that advising is a big enough issue to put together an ad hoc committee on advising and to present the consensus to the Chancellor.

Schedule of Classes/Academic Calendar

J. Gill heard from Jerri Weston, who stated they asked multiple times during the spring 2022 semester for the Senate's feedback. J. Gill said that the Senate's minutes reflect that when the academic calendar was sent to the Senate, it was really for our consideration. However, M. LaBorde said she was told if we had suggestions, the Registrar's Office was open to those suggestions. Dr. Rowan had stated during the spring 2022 semester that we need to give suggestions two years in advance. J. Gill said she submitted a request for the 2023/2024 academic calendar and it will be forwarded once the Registrar has it ready.

PS 202B; Promotion

M. Stokes asked for clarification on what the new issues were with the revisions to this policy.

C. Corbat said that there used to be documented input (minutes), but now transparency has been lost. Now, changes can be made without faculty knowledge. The Senate does not see comments submitted to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. C. Corbat said that she had spoken to Dr. Coreil, and he did not realize this change had taken place.

A concern was raised that this may be an issue with accreditation. As per university policy, faculty must be evaluated regularly; however, faculty evaluations have been eliminated. PS 202B was created to assist a department with accreditation. Also, two years after the changes, we are only just now seeing a description of the new Department Chair role, for example. Another concern is with the organizational chart—transparency is important, but so is accuracy.

Discussion ensued regarding the current "repeat delete" policy, and there is a lot of confusion over this policy.

Further discussion ensued regarding PS 202B and evaluations. Most faculty have not had a formal evaluation in five years. Deans and Directors of Nursing and Education will now be the ones evaluating faculty.

It was stated that we need to make this policy a priority and have it re-written. We need to send PS 202 A and B back to FPPC or assemble an ad hoc committee.

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not to send PS 202 A & B to FPPC or to create an ad hoc committee. It was mentioned that the committee should consist of people who have been through tenure, but some felt that it is still helpful to have input and insight from non-tenured faculty, as well. It was suggested that perhaps a non-tenured faculty member could be an ex officio.

It was also mentioned that the original policy dealt with more than just tenure.

P. Gurjar motioned to form an ad hoc committee to look at PS202 A and B

C. Cormier seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

C. Corbat motioned that we send PS 245 to FPPC for discussion

M. LaBorde seconded

Vote: 12-0-0

C. Cormier said there still is not a workload policy for directors and department chairs. There is one for deans, but there really is not a difference between the workloads of deans and directors.

C. Cormier continued to explain that there needs to be a workload policy that specifically discusses the directors and their role, including workloads is and compensation.

Chancellor's Funds:

J. Gill asked for the Chancellor's Funds ad hoc committee to meet, rank order their recommendations, and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.

Curriculum:

J. Gill stated that work is continuing on Curriculum.

Announcements:

The next meeting is scheduled for October 25, 2022 at 3:00 pm.

Pats on the back: Martha Dauzat for her Library award, Carol Corbat for Curriculum, Chad Gauthier because he is currently working two jobs, and Chancey Slider for assistance provided to C. Cormier with the grant submissions.

Adjournment:

J. Innerarity motioned to adjourn
M. LaBorded seconded the motion
Vote:
12-0-0

The meeting adjourned at 5:16pm