

Faculty Senate Minutes  
For: 5/2/2023

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

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

**Guests Present:** Dr. Rob Wright, Dr. Cheryl Bardales, Dr. Christof Stumpf

**Call to Order:** At 3:07 p.m., a quorum was established and the meeting was called to order

**Approval of Minutes:**

**4.18.23**

B. Alwell made a motion to approve the 4.18.23 minutes

S. Kumar seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-0

D. Wood joined the meeting

C. Thomas joined the meeting

**4.25.23 Elections**

J. Gill stated that we need to send these minutes to the 2023/24 senators for a vote.

**4.25.23**

M. Stokes made a motion to approve the minutes

B. Alwell seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-2

**Electronic vote:**

J. Gill announced the following results for the 3.21.23 and 4.11.23 Faculty Senate minutes:

**3.21.23**

Vote: 9-0-1 with M. Stokes motioning to approve and R. Gaspard seconding the motion

**4.11.23**

Vote: 8-0-1 with M. Stokes motioning to approve and R. Gaspard seconding the motion

**Brief Guest Updates:**

**Dr. Bardales & Dr. Wright—QEP**

Dr. Wright mentioned a survey had gone out polling campus on possible areas the next Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) could address. Dr. Wright encouraged faculty to vote a second time if

desired—especially if they have new ideas. So far, almost 500 responses have been received from faculty, staff, administration, and students. 276 responses were from students, and 220 were from faculty, staff, and administration.

Dr. Wright first addressed the student survey data. 69% of students expressed more attention to academic support, 3% mentioned life skills, and the other percentage addressed academics in general. Dr. Wright noted that not all of the information received could be considering in a QEP plan—or in other words, it was not “QEPable” at this point. Currently, Dr. Wright and Dr. Bardales are trying to sift through the different areas mentioned to narrow down a focus. In short, it was apparent that students are less worried about life and academics than support.

Dr. Wright announced that another survey will go out mid to end June. In addition, there will be two more focus groups to further discuss findings and ideas. One will be this Thursday at 12:30 and the next one is the Wednesday before grad, May 10<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 am. Dr. Wright mentioned that the turnout for the first two focus groups was good, but they are hoping to get more feedback. Dr. Wright added that if a college is unable to participate, he and Dr. Bardales are happy to meet with the college. He emphasized that the desire is for this experience to be relevant to whole campus.

Next, Dr. Wright further elaborated on the academic aspect of what students have been mentioning. As the feedback is coming in, a number of issues are being mentioned such as students wanting more face-to-face and online offerings, more options for class times, changes in the online administration of classes, more synchronous activities for online classes, more degree plans, etc.

As far as academic support, Dr. Wright pointed out that students have mentioned advising, study/communal space, counseling/mental health, library, tutoring, and the Writing Center. One suggestion was to have “nap pods” in the library, though some questioned whether or not this would be good for student learning outcomes.

Dr. Wright next explained that in the next iteration of surveys in June, they will not be open ended but will be more quantifiable. For example, issues like advising will be narrowed to discussing what about it can be improved—what specific issues need addressing? First-time freshman advising? Availability of advisors?

J. Gill asked if Dr. Wright and Dr. Bardales expected a student response in June. Dr. Wright said they would just have to see when time comes. He noted that the previous QEP did a lot in the summer. Another reason to expect some feedback is that the online component will be active. Dr. Bardales added that of the student responses, roughly 70% have been from face-to-face students and 30% from online.

Next, Dr. Wright moved on from discussing the student responses and addressed responses from faculty, staff, and administration. Roughly 47% of the comments were related to academic support, 26% academics in general, and 6% life skills. In terms of academic support, topics included: advising, counseling, tutoring, etc. In terms of academics, topics included: active learning, blending online with in-person, etc.

Dr. Wright began to close by stating that the hope is to take all these findings, narrow them down, and then combine with additional information received in the summer. The data will be compiled and when everyone returns in August, Dr. Wright and Dr. Bardales will hopefully be able to “put meat on the bones” of a topic.

Dr. Bardales stated that she and Dr. Wright are more than happy to further discuss as needed.

C. Corbat asked if LSUA does an annual survey of students anymore. Dr. Wright said in the last six weeks, Eamon Halpin has recently sent out a survey and that QEP is interested in looking at that data. Dr. Bardales emphasized that there is some data they have found that does not apply to QEP; however, that data—particularly any relevant action items—will be shared as needed.

Dr. Bardales and Dr. Wright left the meeting.

### **Dr. Stumpf**

Dr. Stumpf stated that he had been elected as Vice Chair of the Conference of Faculty Advisors (COFA). Sanjay Kamboj is the Chair. Dr. Stumpf said he has been attending Board of Supervisors meetings. Dr. Stumpf indicated that his role is that to provide information in the form of reports about issues related to faculty and staff. He stated that in December, he spoke to the Board, as the Chair of the CFA was unavailable.

At the December BOR meeting in Eunice, Dr. Stumpf presented a strong need for tuition and fee authority. The funding situation is dire and it does not appear that the Legislature will give enough money for LSUA to adequately address its salary situation. Dr. Tate, the LSU System President, responded and put forward his type of budgeting where they are looking for “pots” of money that are not used or are inappropriately used. Dr. Stumpf next stated that he got to speak again at a BOS meeting here at LSUA. He pointed out that the model Dr. Tate had provided does not apply to small universities.

Next, Dr. Stumpf addressed recent attacks on tenure, particularly Senator Cathey’s attempt to change tenure practice and SCR 6, which was introduced last year. The committee Senator Cathey spearheaded never met. His own colleagues in the legislature did not like what he proposed. Senator Cathey then decided not to meet at all. He came up with a new proposal that was probably strongly influenced by James Henderson, the President of the ULL system. Dr. Stumpf noted that the problem is that each university is different. For instance, LSUA already has tenure and post tenure procedures. One approach cannot be applied to all universities.

Next, Dr. Stumpf returned to the issues with salaries. He stated that LSUA may not be able to attract enough talent with our low salaries. There are new proposals out there. Dr. Stumpf suggested that there is a built-in barrier with Dr. Tate offering his full support to LSUA in that his primary concerns are his duties as president of the Louisiana State University system, and chancellor of the flagship school in Baton Rouge.

The third highlight of speech by Dr. Stumpf was addressing an attack on diversity and inclusion. There is an approach to get rid of those things.

Dr. Stumpf noted that since he has been in his role for two years, he has gotten to know some board members. The current Chair, Valencia Jones, wants to support LSUA but does not know us very well.

Dr. Stumpf stated that he has an idea to collect base salary information from several departments and present these to the BOS.

Dr. Stumpf announced that the next meeting will be in June in Baton Rouge, so his suggestion is to collect data and also from our colleagues at similar universities and present it. We need their support but we need to give them a reason to support faculty.

The last thing Dr. Stumpf mentioned is that as faculty, we need support. He stated that he is an AAUP member, and the chapter at LSUA is currently down to six members; six members is insufficient for a separate chapter for LSUA, so members are just integrated into the national chapter and are not affiliated with a university chapter. Our goal is not to fight with administration and engage in civil war like at some universities.

C. Corbat mentioned that it might help if Bernard Gallagher could pitch AAUP membership to the faculty like he did a few years ago. Most faculty do not even know what it is. It was noted that there is a lot of good info AAUP has for faculty like resources and legal advice. It would behoove us to have an active chapter.

S. Kumar asked about membership dues and some present stated that it is prorated by one's faculty salary. Dr. Stumpf said he has no problem speaking to BOS if we want him to. C. Corbat said that Deron Thaxton should already have some data available on faculty salaries.

Dr. Stumpf stated that he would contact Deron Thaxton to get data; in addition, he would contact colleagues at other universities.

D. Shanks suggested that Dr. Stumpf include instructors and adjuncts in his numbers. He explained that when he took his position, it wasn't about whether he could get tenure—it was not offered. He stressed that some faculty are in that position. Dr. Stumpf stated that the only reason he did not initially include it was to keep things simple, but he sees the benefit of at least adding in instructors.

R. Gaspard left the meeting.

D. Shanks left the meeting.

### **Report of President:**

No official report was given, but J. Gill stated that she attended the cabinet meeting last Thursday. Essentially, the draft of PS 207 that was adopted was what Dr. Beard had put together and sent to Senate and shared with SLT. Therefore, the suggestions that came out of the informal meeting last Thursday afternoon were more or less not implemented.

J. Gill stated that she had asked Dr. Beard if Senate could go back and clean up some of the terminology. J. Gill explained that some of the Senate’s ideas were heard and implemented, such as removing the term, “attorney.”

J. Gill went on to explain that this new draft does allow faculty to request a panel or committee; in addition, students can request a panel/committee for academic complaints, but not for non-academic. It was noted that based on legal advice, the option to convene a panel/committee was not a provision for staff for non-academic complaints.

Next, J. Gill stated that Senate had wanted to add in language about an advisor not speaking in the meeting, but she was told that the laws had changed—advisors may treat meetings like a courtroom and cross examine those present. J. Gill will attempt to find the law and wording for a better understanding.

### **Committee Reports:**

#### **Budget and Review 4.20**

B. Alwell made a motion to receive the minutes

J. Innerarity seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-0

C. Corbat stated that this committee made four recommendations. Senate needs to decide if we wish to pass those on to administration. C. Corbat summarized the recommendations from the committee by stating that numbers 1, 3, 4, and 5 are recommendations—3 is based off of information in number 2. The recommendations were as follows:

1. The Committee recommends a two-tier structure for raises: tier one would use a percentage of the funds for cost-of-living increases; tier two would use a percentage of the funds for merit raises.

2. The Committee discussed the methods used for determining various raises and learned from Dr. Gill that an eight-point rubric was used to award merit. Those eight points include the following:

1. Successful attainment of annual goals (Faculty Plan—including Curricular Development and responsiveness to students)
2. Quality of Instruction
3. Scholarly successes/ grants
4. Service to the university and community
5. Consistent demonstration of positive. collegial attitude
6. Commitment to innovation
7. Advising, including the number of and responsiveness to advisees
8. Reliability in contributing to departmental/college goals

3. The Committee recommended that faculty from their respective colleges and schools comment on this rubric, suggesting that whatever rubric was adopted be considered as a guideline.

4. The Committee also recommended that a uniform letter be sent to all faculty, even if the faculty member did not receive a raise. The Committee also recommended that all letters be sent out at the same time.

5. The Committee recommended that each faculty member have an opportunity to discuss with his/her dean the reasons for what amount was awarded.

J. Innerarity stated that she appreciated that the committee had included the cost of living recommendation. Discussion ensued.

M. Stokes made a motion to approve and pass on all four recommendations (numbers: 1, 3, 4, and 5)

D. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-0

### **Old Business:**

#### **PS 207 Update**

J. Gill stated that she will put in a request to receive an official copy to see what will be online.

#### **PS 269**

Someone asked what this policy addressed and it was noted that it is the policy on policies. C. Thomas asked that senators come back next week with recommendations. C. Corbat commented that this policy was recently revised.

#### **Faculty Senate Travel, Research, & Field Trip funds '23/24**

J. Gill stated that several fall/spring recipients have completed their reports and had remaining funds. It was pointed out that some of the original funds that had been awarded were not spent; thus, some funds are left over. Discussion ensued.

B. Alwell made a motion that Senate advertise the remaining funds

S. Kumar seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-0

It was mentioned that starting in August, we will now be able to roll funds over if there are three application dates.

#### **Advising Concerns Updates**

No update. They might be trying to hire someone in the Registrar's office. One concern raised was that the College of Social Sciences' advisor is Abby Dupuy who is leaving. Discussion ensued regarding how quickly the advisors would be replaced. J. Gill said advising will be split up until they have replacements. Michelle Cloud is transitioning into Kathy Wimmert's position as well during the summer months.

B. Alwell asked if we know overall, how many advisors are in the advising center. Haylee Bryant was promoted to director. It was noted that there is not a dedicated professional advisor

for every college. For example, Business has their own in-house advisor and so does Nursing; however, Business, for example, has a lot of students.

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

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

J. Gill stated that B. Whittington said the ad-hoc committee hoped to have a document to Senate by the end of week. Once received, J. Gill will forward it on so we can start looking at it.

#### **PS 245**

J. Gill stated that she talked to Dr. Beard about this and we hope to have it before next Tuesday for review and discussion.

### **Administrative Committees List**

No update.

### **CurricuLog Update**

J. Gill stated that she talked to Deron Thaxton. R. Richardson in IET said he can set up a site but he has not been told about what is needed. C. Corbat said her next step is sitting down with R. Richardson and sketching out what is needed.

### **Introduction of New Business**

#### **ACT/SAT pre-req scores**

Dr. Beard reported that the Deans met earlier on May 2<sup>nd</sup> to discuss the necessary paperwork required to meet the Board of Regents fall 2023 admissions requirements. The Deans will complete paperwork and submit prior to C&C's scheduled meeting on Thursday, May 4<sup>th</sup>.

### **Announcements/Looking Ahead:**

**Next meeting:** May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 3:00 pm

**Pats on the Back:** C. Thomas gives one to Dr. Sandy Gilliland for coordinating Scholar Day.

#### **Departmental accomplishments:**

- M. Stokes announced that for ENGH, The Africana Studies program online just went live on LSU Online.
- M. Stokes announced the retirement of Dr. Ginger Jones
- It was announced that B. Whittington was named interim dean for the College of Social Sciences.

### **Adjournment:**

M. Stokes made a motion to adjourn

D. Wood seconded the motion  
Vote: 8-0-0

The meeting adjourned at 4:28 pm

**Faculty Senate  
Agenda**  
May 5, 2023 at 3:00  
p.m.  
Live Oaks Room

- I. Welcome and Determination of quorum
- II. Approval of
  - minutes 4.25.23
  - Electronic Votes for:
    - 3.21.23 -
    - 4.11.23 -
- III. Brief guest updates
  - Dr.  
Coreil
  - Dr.  
Beard
  - Dr. Bardales & Dr. Wright – QEP
  - Dr. Stumpf
- IV. Report of President
- V. Reports of Committees
- VI. Old business
  - PS 207 update
  - PS 269
  - Faculty Senate Travel, Research, & Field Trip funds ‘23/24
  - Chancellor’s Funds updates
  - Advising Concerns - updates
  - Update RE Revision of Policy Statements
    - PS 202 (A& B)
    - PS 245
  - Administrative Committees List
  - CurricuLog Update
- VII. Introduction of new
  - business
  - ACT/SAT pre-req scores

VIII. Announcements/Looking ahead

Next meeting: May 9, 2023 at 3 p.m.

Please send *Pats on the Back* to Julie and/or share at Senate Meetings

Departmental accomplishments

IX. Adjournment

Faculty Senate Minutes  
For: 4/18/2023  
DRAFT

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

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

**Guests Present:** Dr. Jim Rogers

**Call to Order:** At 3:02. pm a quorum was established and the meeting was called to order.

**Approval of Minutes:**

2.28.23

3.7.23

J. Gill announced that these minutes were approved electronically with the following vote:  
12-0-0

**Report of President:**

Though there was no official report, J. Gill stated that she did meet with Dr. Coreil, Dr. Beard, and Dr. Halpin on Friday regarding policy revisions. Following that meeting, she met with Dr. Coreil for a regularly scheduled meeting.

**Committee Reports:**

**C&C 3.6.23**

C. Corbat explained that Senate had already addressed the Math courses from these minutes, so we need to complete the review of the remainder of action items. C. Corbat also noted that Senate had already received these minutes.

C Corbat stated that the first thing to consider is the deletion of the Minor in Sports Broadcasting and Communications.

M. LaBorde made a motion to approve the deletion of the Minor in Sports Broadcasting and Communications

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

C. Corbat stated that there was also a modification to the BA in Communication Studies but it had been previously been approved.

C. Corbat explained the next set of items deal with Psychology courses. The name and content for three courses is being changed but the same number is being retained. C. Corbat noted such a change is tricky; however, she explained that Dr. Wright explained that some of these courses have never been offered; also, the changes that have been made to content are not significant. The most important change is to the course names.

First to consider is the addition of new course: PSYC 4081, Measurement, Interpretation and Experimental Design in Applied Behavior Analysis

C. Corbat made a motion to approve the addition of PSCY 4081

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

Modifications to PSYC 4085, 4086, 4087 were considered. As Dr. Wright had indicated to Dr. Corbat, proposed changes included title changes and slight content changes.

C. Corbat made a motion to approve these modifications to PSYC 4085, 4086, and 4087

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

Next under consideration was a modification to the Bachelor of Science Psychology Degree. The modification is to allow students to take either MATH 1021 or 1018 instead of only MATH 1021. In addition, there is a proposed change to the Clinical Psychology concentration to add additional electives. Finally, a new concentration is to be added—Applied Behavior Analysis.

C. Thomas explained why they changed the name of the courses. In order to become licensed, students need courses that align with requirements. Students will end up with same number of electives but will have more freedom on which ones to take since previously, some were not offered very often.

J. Innerarity made a motion to approve the modifications to the BS in Psychology

P. Gurjar seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

## **PS 202**

M. LaBorde made a motion to receive the seven sets of PS 202 ad hoc meeting minutes

R. Gaspard seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

C. Corbat noted that there are no action items—no recommendations to the Senate, so far. Discussion ensued regarding the extent in which the PS 202 ad hoc committee is reaching out to understand current processes; they have reviewed how IDEA is incorporated into the promotion and tenure process, how the policy should include guidelines for Library faculty, and they have consulted with Connie Cooper.

### **C&C 3.20.23**

D. Wood made a motion to receive the 3.20.23 minutes

S. Kumar seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

C. Corbat mentioned first under consideration is a modification to the course description in KINS 2010. It was noted that C&C voted on five modifications at once.

C. Corbat asked whether the department is doing away with Special Topics courses. J. Gill explained they still have a KINS 1999 if needed.

Of the proposed changes, it was noted that KINS 4513, Facilities Management, is a title change, and KINS 4517, Sports Administration, is a title change and course content change. It was asked if a new course number was needed for KINS 4517. J. Gill said no.

C. Corbat summarized the action items: modifications to five KINS courses.

M. LaBorde made a motion to approve all five of KINS modifications as presented: KINS 2010, 3801, 4501, 4513, and 4517

D. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

Next under consideration were three new KINS courses: KINS 2511, 3905, and 3910. J. Gill explained that during the C&C meeting, it was brought up that 3910 showed that it was going to be required for the Sports Management concentration. However, it will not be required for the concentration. J. Gill noted that they were trying to expediate things through. She asked if it needed to go back to the School of Education to fix the typo. It was stated that Eamon Halpin could fix it before it came to Senate. J Gill then realized that the same was noted on the KINS 3905 paperwork. E. Halpin made the correction on the respective document, as well.

C. Corbat made a motion to approve the addition of new courses: KINS 2511, 3905, and 3910.

D. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

C. Corbat stated that the next action item to consider is the deletion of the Certificate in Pharmacy Technology because enrollment in this curriculum declined. The general consensus among those present is they thought it was unfortunate that this program was being deleted.

C. Thomas made a motion to delete the Certificate in Pharmacy Technology

D. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

### **E-mail from Dr. Blackwell**

C. Corbat explained she had received correspondence from Dr. Blackwell concerning the addition of CYBR 4901. When it was approved, it had the wrong prerequisite. C&C took it back, corrected the prerequisites, then put it back in the Senate folder. Senate noted that the MCO does not match the paperwork as far as course numbers.

C. Corbat made a motion to send the addition of CYBR 4901 back to C&C because the MCO does not match the paperwork

J. Gill seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

C. Corbat made a motion to rescind our original approval of the addition of CYBR 4901

M. LaBorde seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

### **Improvement of Instructions 4.14.23**

B. Alwell made a motion to receive the minutes

G. Ke seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

C. Corbat explained that the committee offered four recommendations and the following summary:

The committee discovered that the IDEA survey results are indeed factored in when determining tenure and promotion, but they are only one of many factors considered. It is generally recognized that the IDEA surveys alone are an insufficient tool for evaluating faculty for many reasons, but most especially due to the low completion rates and the subjective nature of student responses. If nothing else, the surveys are used to identify possible “trends” or “patterns” that need to be addressed in a faculty member. The committee polled campus faculty and learned that the feedback most faculty found helpful was the qualitative comments—the personalized nature of these comments helped faculty pinpoint areas in which they are successful and others where they can grow.

The committee recommends staying with the IDEA evaluations but allow faculty to integrate other questions. In addition, the committee recommends that CTE or some other campus entity offer training in how to interpret IDEA results. Finally, the committee recommends that Senate and/or future members of Improvement of Instruction investigate the student user experience in taking the surveys and determine what changes can be made to improve response rates.

Discussion ensued. Some asked what other questions were available and how can a faculty member add questions? Also, someone asked, what is the process to stipulate a FIF (faculty information form).

D. Wood left meeting

M. LaBorde made the following motion: in line with IOI's recommendations, Senate will ask Dr. Haplin and/or CTE to arrange for a presentation to help faculty determine how to integrate additional questions into the IDEA survey, how to interpret student responses, and how to get better student response rates

M. Stokes seconded the motion

Discussion ensued. P. Gurjar and M. LaBorde made suggestions on incentivizing students. M. LaBorde gave an example: if there a 75% response rate was achieved, the class would get three bonus points on the final.

Vote: 11-0-1

D. Wood returned to meeting.

C. Corbat made a motion to charge next year's IOI committee with investigating the student user experience, why response rates are so low, and what can be done to improve them

D. wood seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

### **Old Business:**

#### **PS 207 ad hoc**

J. Gill explained that Abby Bain informed her and the Chancellor that this committee is not a Faculty Senate ad hoc committee. J. Gill was told it is an Administrative Working committee. J. Gill was not allowed to explain that a staff member could serve as chair on a Senate ad hoc committee.

Discussion ensued regarding e-mails and statements from Administration that Senate does not have the ability to provided suggested edits to PS 207.

Some expressed concerns about safeguards for faculty. We could lose our voice. It was suggested that the fact that a policy related to assigning grades, which is under faculty purview, is now being combined with a policy on general student complaints is a gross overreach on the part of administration.

It was noted that Dr. Coreil had stated he was adamant that this policy would be voted on in the April 27<sup>th</sup> Cabinet meeting.

Dr. Rogers explained that Policy statements are presented by the chancellor. He can decide what they say—he can cancel, add, etc. Ultimately, the Chancellor signs off on all policies.

J. Gill stated that she understood Dr. Rogers' point, but her concern is that the Chancellor is not giving Senate ample time to work on updates to this policy.

J. Gill indicated in her meeting with Dr. Beard, Dr. Halpin, and Dr. Coreil, that Dr. Coreil expressed an expectation that policies should be reviewed over the summer. He said, all policies

need to be approved by August 15<sup>th</sup>. J. Gill told him that faculty did not return until August 14<sup>th</sup> and are not paid over the summer semester. J. Gill then explained that in the meeting, Dr. Beard advocated for more time. It was noted how Senate expedited the recent MATH courses, as Administration was pushing for them to be approved by the Spring Preview Day for incoming fall 2023 freshmen, thus illustrating that Senate is willing and capable of working quickly. Dr. Coreil agreed to a September 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for approvals to new revisions of policies. This new due date allows Faculty Senate and respective standing committees the opportunity to review changes to policies, but suggested revisions must be provided prior to September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2023 for Cabinet vote.

Someone suggested that Senate draft a version of PS 207 and propose it.

It was pointed out that instead of creating a general policy on student complaints, which is what was missing, A. Bain and her committee added it on the grade appeals policy. It would be simpler if there were two policies.

Someone commented that the August 15<sup>th</sup> deadline is “artificial.” LSUA’s SACS report is not due until March of next year.

It was noted that the university could potentially be open to being sued with the policy as revised.

Discussion ensued on how to move forward with recommendations for PS 207, which is clearly under the purview of the faculty. Senate was unanimous that a general student complaint policy is needed but should be separate from the current grade appeals policy.

**Announcements:**

J. Gill announced that Dr. Beard would like to meet with Senate next Tuesday to talk about the up-coming merit raise.

**Next meeting:**

- April 25, 2023 at 3:00 p.m. for 2023/2024 Faculty Senate elections
- May 2, 2023 at 3:00 p.m.

**Adjournment:**

J. Innerarity made a motion to adjourn

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 12-0-0

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 pm

Faculty Senate Elections Minutes  
For: 4/25/2023  
DRAFT

**Members Present:**

Beverly Alwell, Julie Gill, Jennifer Innerarity, GuoYi Ke, JiaLin Lei, Matthew Stokes, Cynthia Thomas, Lisa Bradford, Cole Franklin, and Michelle Waller

**Members Absent:**

Hal Langford, Kerry Ordes, Carol Corbat, Sona Kumar

**Guests Present:** Missy LaBorde, Debbie Wood, Purujit Gurjar

**Call to Order:** 3:05 pm and quorum was established

Matthew Stokes served as Secretary for the meeting.

It was announced that officers who were elected for the 2023/2024 academic year will not officially take their positions until the first date of the fall 2023 semester.

**President**

**Nominations:**

C. Thomas nominated J. Gill for Senate President

G. Ke seconded the motion

M. Waller moved that nominations cease

C. Thomas seconded the motion

J. Gill was appointed Senate President by acclamation

**Vice President:**

C. Thomas nominated C. Corbat for Senate Vice President

C. Franklin seconded the motion

J. Gill explained that C. Corbat (absent for the meeting) had expressed that she would be willing to serve as Vice President.

M. Waller moved that nominations cease

C. Thomas seconded the motion

C. Corbat was elected by acclamation

**Secretary:**

M. Waller nominated M. Stokes for Senate Secretary

C. Thomas seconded the motion

M. Stokes declined the nomination

J. Gill nominated C. Franklin  
M. Waller seconded the motion

M. Waller moved nominations cease  
B. Alwell seconded the motion

P. Gurjar entered the meeting (as guest)

**Parliamentarian:**

M. Waller nominated J. Innerarity as Parliamentarian  
C. Thomas seconded the motion

M. Waller moved that nominations cease  
C. Thomas seconded the motion

J. Innerarity entered the meeting

J. Gill recommended that all members review the Constitution and Bylaws as well as LSUA policies and procedures prior to the first meeting of August 2023.

**Adjournment:**

M. Waller motioned to adjourn  
B. Alwell seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 pm

Faculty Senate Minutes  
For: 4/25/2023  
DRAFT

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

**Members Absent:** Hal Langford, Kerry Ordes, Sona Kumar

**Guests Present:** JiaLin Lei, Elizabeth Beard, Cole Franklin

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

**Approval of Minutes:**

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

**Brief Guest Updates:**

**Dr. Liz Beard**

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

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

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

This morning, the Dean's Council revisited these eight criteria and the consensus was that numbers 5, 6, and 8 are a bit more subjective and not as quantifiable, but we know that having professional respect is something that matters. Criteria number 5 really means professionalism,

not going on “lunch dates,” etc. The expectation is to be professional and that collegiality is especially noticeable when people have differences of opinion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

R. Gaspard entered the meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

receive a letter if they did not receive a merit increase. It was stated that everyone is looking for consistency.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

merit increases and were not notified that they did not submit their certificates until they were told that they would not receive a merit increase.

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

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

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

### **Committee Reports:**

#### **FPPC 4.14.23**

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

D. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 10-0-0

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

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

C. Corbat joined the meeting.

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

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

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

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

It was noted that PS 254 has 24 hours.

It was also noted that “chancellor” is spelled incorrectly

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

D. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 10-0-1

### **PS 233 Part-Time Faculty**

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

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

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

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

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

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

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

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

C. Thomas motioned to accept changes

B. Wood seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

### **Old Business:**

#### **PS 207 Ad hoc committee**

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

Discussion ensued regarding the language "if a student believes they have been treated unfairly"

D. Wood stated the concern that it still combines academic grievances with non-academic complaints.

Discussion ensued.

B. Alwell left the meeting

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

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

D. Wood left the meeting.

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

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

C. Thomas left the meeting.

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

J. Gill next mentioned an email from Sarita James. S. James had requested via e-mail in early March if she could take her “Chancellors” funds and give them to someone else in her department. Senate responded with a “no” decision. Today, J. Gill received an e-mail requesting that her unused funds be used to pay for Catherine Doyle’s registration and mileage. J. Gill responded that she would present the situation to Senate, but C. Doyle may need to apply for unused funds in a new application.

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

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

J. Innerarity seconded the motion.

Vote: 8-0-0

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

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

C. Corbat made a motion to contact all academic departments and ask them to look at any course that might be impacted by the new BoR policy on not requiring ACT scores for admission. Departments should complete the specific course modification forms and the respective MCOs with track changes. In order to expedite the process prior to the end of the semester, departments should not make any additional course modifications except for the course descriptions and they would not need to complete the RIS or CSS forms.

J. Gill seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-0

### **Announcements:**

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, May 2, 2023

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

**Adjournment:**

M. Stokes made a motion to adjourn

G. Ke seconded the motion

Vote: 8-0-0

Meeting adjourned at 6:09 pm

Louisiana State University at Alexandria  
 Budget & Review Committee  
 Meeting Minutes April 20, 2023

**Members Present:** Dr. Bernard Gallagher, Dr. Cathy Cormier, Dr. Christof Stumpf, Dr. Ahmed Shaffie, Dr. Jessica Ringo, Dr. Kent Lachney, Elizabeth Azua, Dr. Julie Gill (ex officio)

Absent: Dr. Doyeop Kim, Dr. Zebulon Bell

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	Dr. Bernard Gallagher called the meeting to order at 1200.	N/A
Minutes of Nov. 22	Everyone agreed that they represented what occurred.	Previously approved. Approved 6 Abstain 0 No 0
Merit Raises	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Committee recommend a two-tier structure for raises: tier one would use a percentage of the funds for cost-of-living increases; tier two would use a percentage of the funds for merit raises.</li> <li>2. The Committee discussed the methods used for determining various raises and learned from Dr. Gill that an eight-point rubric was used to award merit. Those eight points include the following:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Successful attainment of annual goals (Faculty Plan—including Curricular Development and responsiveness to students)</li> <li>• Quality of Instruction</li> <li>• Scholarly successes/ grants</li> <li>• Service to the university and community</li> <li>• Consistent demonstration of positive. collegial attitude</li> <li>• Commitment to innovation</li> <li>• Advising, including the number of and responsiveness to advisees</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Approved 6 Abstain 0 No 0

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability in contributing to departmental/college goals</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The Committee recommended that faculty from their respective colleges and schools comment on this rubric, suggesting that whatever rubric was adopted be considered as a guideline.</li> <li>4. The Committee also recommended that a uniform letter be sent to all faculty, even if the faculty member did not receive a raise. The Committee also recommended that all letters be sent out at the same time.</li> <li>5. The Committee recommended that each faculty member have an opportunity to discuss with his/her dean the reasons for what amount was awarded.</li> </ol>	
Next meeting	April 27 at noon in the Nursing and Allied Health Conference Room	
Adjourn	1:00	