

Faculty Senate Minutes  
For: 5/9/2023

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

**Members Absent:** Hal Langford, Kerry Ordes, Debbie Wood, Purujit Gurjar

**Guests Present:** Dr. Paul Coreil, Dr. Susan Bowers

**Call to Order:** At 3:04 pm a quorum was established and the meeting was called to order.

**Approval of Minutes:**

**5.2.23**

B. Alwell motioned to approve

C. Corbat seconded the motion

Vote: 10-0-0

**Committee Reports:**

**Budget and Review 4.27**

M. Stokes motioned to receive minutes

M. LaBorde second the motion

Vote: 10-0-0

C. Corbat noted that there was some repetition in these minutes compared to prior set. The committee did go on to say more on the eight-point evaluation rubric. In this set of minutes, they do make further recommendations. The committee did not make a recommendation on advising.

The first recommendation was to have a two-tiered structure for raises; this recommendation was already voted to be passed on at the last Senate meeting.

Second, the committee discussed the methods used for determining raises (specific recommendations are notated below in italics)

*1. The Committee recommends that everyone, including first-year employees, be eligible for "merit" raises.*

Some discussion ensued. It was noted that there are compression and inversion issues with faculty salaries. Newer faculty tend to come in with higher salaries. C. Thomas expressed that she did not necessarily think that should make them ineligible for a raise. J. Gill wondered if one year is sufficient time in which to establish merit.

Dr. Coreil entered the meeting.

Further discussion ensued. One recommendation is to strike “first year employee”

Next, Dr. Coreil briefly spoke. On the topic at hand, he stated that at his previous employment, if an employee was hired prior to January 1<sup>st</sup>, he or she was eligible for a raise; however, if an employee was hired after January 1<sup>st</sup>, that employee would be ineligible for a raise that year. It takes 6-8 months to know whether someone deserves/receives merit.

Dr. Coreil announced that he did not have a lengthy report but mainly wanted to let us know he is available. He stated that he is spending a lot of time in Baton Rouge to make sure the budget is approved. He stated that LSUA is planning to invest about \$600,000 into salary adjustments, hopefully in August; however, the budget needs to be approved first—that should happen in late June.

Dr. Coreil then stated that in Baton Rouge, some are in favor of not spending all the money now so the next governor, likely a Republican, would have some money. Dr. Coreil then stated that there is a 4.5 cent sales tax that is set to expire; in addition, there is talk of eliminating income tax, which would be a big hit to the economy. However, the state is in much better shape than four or even eight years ago. Higher education has been much better treated.

Dr. Coreil then stated that the recent ground-breaking for the Martin Student Success Center went well. Everyone is supportive of LSUA’s expansion on the student success center.

Dr. Coreil stressed that he is working hard. He welcomed any suggestions on ways he can improve. He stated that LSUA employees do not work for him—he works for them.

C. Corbat asked the response rates for the latest bottom-up evaluations. Dr. Coreil commented that for his evaluation, roughly 60-70 faculty/staff or 25% responded. R. Gaspard noted that some staff did not get the e-mail for the evaluations. J. Gill observed that while an initial e-mail went out, a follow-up reminder was not sent. M. LaBorde commented that faculty often have good intentions and “to do lists” but towards the end of the semester get busy with grading.

Dr. Coreil commented that he did survey response research in his PhD program, and 25% is not a bad number. He stated that in general, he got extremely positive reviews from the ones that did respond. A few mentioned areas in which he can improve.

R. Gaspard noted that the timing of the bottom-up survey is awkward. One is evaluating a supervisor in April but two months later, that supervisor is evaluating that employee. Dr. Coreil asked when would be a better time. R. Gaspard answered that any time after the supervisor evaluates the employee would be ideal. C. Corbat stated that bottom-up evaluations Were set to be done in the spring so that the supervisors of each administrator would have the results before

they evaluated the employee (top down) but that the bottom-up evaluations were done early in spring.

S. Kumar asked why department chairs were not included in the recent bottom-up evaluation. Dr. Coreil replied that they could be added if it would be valuable. C. Corbat noted that department chairs do crucial things like scheduling and dealing with student complaints. Dr. Coreil said chairs are evaluated by the dean but are not currently part of the bottom-up evaluation. M. LaBorde stated that we need to look at the responsibilities of the chairs even beyond bottom-up evaluations. It is still unclear whether they are a boss or just a faculty member.

Finally, Dr. Coreil announced that the current graduating class will be the largest in the history of the university. LSUA has had two record graduating classes lately, with 319 graduates last spring and 390 this spring. Dr. Coreil announced that Valencia Jones, Chair of the LSU Board and the first African American female Chair will be the commencement speaker.

Dr. Coreil left the meeting.

The committee returned to the Budget and Review 4.27.23 minutes and continued discussing the following recommendations (notated by italics):

*1) The Committee recommends that everyone, including first-year employees, be eligible for "merit" raises.*

Someone recommended striking "first-year employees" and just say everyone will eligible. Discussion ensued.

B. Alwell made a motion not to forward the recommendation to the Chancellor  
J. Innerarity seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

*2) The Committee recommends using the categories of teaching, service, and scholarship as areas to be considered when raises are being awarded. Responsiveness to students and quality of instruction fall under the heading of teaching. Scholarly successes/ grants fall under the heading of scholarship. Reliability in contributing to departmental and college goals falls under service.*

C. Corbat made a motion to forward the recommendation to the Chancellor  
M. LaBorde seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

*3) The Committee recommends removing the categories of collegiality, consistent demonstration of positive attitude and commitment to innovation as indicators of merit.*

C. Corbat moved to forward the recommendation to the Chancellor

M. Stokes seconded  
Vote: 10-0-0

S. Kumar made a motion to add the following language to recommendation #3:  
“‘Professionalism’ as defined in PS 213 should be considered as an indicator of merit”  
J. Gill seconded the motion  
Vote: 9-0-1

*4) The Committee identified advising as a problem category. Instructors have heavy teaching loads and do not advise. Some faculty spend time traveling to off-campus sites and do not advise. Some majors have more advisees than others.*

It was noted that although there is no recommendation here, it would still be a good idea to let administration know about the issue.

*5) The Committee recommends that a holistic method of evaluation be used, i.e., that the dean or director consider the total contribution of the faculty member.*

It was noted that using a “holistic method” can be problematic from a consistency standpoint. We have asked for consistency across campus.

M. Stokes made a motion to not forward the recommendation to the Chancellor, as recommendation #6 already addresses the issue  
M. LaBorde seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

*6) The Committee recommends that deans or directors be allowed to use their discretion when identifying the amount and the recipient of a merit raise.*

M. LaBorde made a motion to forward the recommendation to the Chancellor  
G. Ke seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

### **C&C 2.27.23**

B. Alwell made a motion to receive the minutes  
J. Innerarity seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

Addition of new course, CJ 4002, Conservation Law Enforcement.

M. LaBorde made a motion to approve CJ 4002  
B. Alwell seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

New Minor in Victim Studies using pre-existing courses.

J. Innerarity made a motion to approve the minor in Victim Studies  
R. Gaspard seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

Modification to the BS in Criminal Justice.

M. Stokes motioned to approve the modification to the BS in Criminal Justice  
B. Alwell seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

Addition of new course, HIST 4000, History of the Ancient Near East.

M. LaBorde made a motion to approve the addition of HIST 4000  
B. Alwell seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

Addition of new course, HIST 4010, Early Modern Europe

M. Stokes motioned to approve the addition of HIST 4010  
C. Corbat seconded the motion  
Vote: 10-0-0

#### **C&C 5.4.23**

J. Innerarity stepped out of the meeting.

The first item to consider is CYBR 4901. This course was previously sent to Senate, we approved it, then the department noticed there was an error in the prerequisite. C&C reconsidered it with the new prerequisite but when we got it the second time, we noticed the MCO did not match the new course description in terms of pre-requisites. We then voted to rescind our initial approval. It ultimately went back to the department. Now, the MCO matches the prerequisites for the course description.

B. Alwell made a motion to approve the addition of CYBR 4901  
G. Ke seconded the motion  
Vote: 9-0-0

Next to consider is the “corrigenda” at the end of the 5.4.23 C&C minutes.

J. Innerarity returned to the meeting  
M. LaBorde left the meeting.

It was noted in the corrigenda that the 5.4.23 C&C minutes have been corrected to be in alignment with what ICC submitted to C&C regarding a modification to the Humanities Concentration in the BGS degree. It was noted that the existing name of the curriculum is

incorrect. It should not be “BGS Humanities.” If they just put “BGS” for name of degree, that would be fine.

Senate agreed to correct the name of the degree.

C. Corbat made a motion to approve the modification to the BGS (specifically the Humanities concentration)

G. Ke seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

C. Corbat explained that in the last Senate meeting, in order to expedite the pre-requisite changes to lessen the number of overrides due to the Board of Regents new policy that allows admission of students with no ACT scores, she had motioned that we allow departments to put through their course modification forms without the need to attach RIS or CSS forms. The Senate approved that motion. What the Deans sent to C&C was not in accordance with that motion. The Deans used the E1 form for editorial changes, which cannot be used for pre-requisite changes and does not have a place to record faculty vote or approval signatures. They did not follow the Senate’s motion. Finally, C. Corbat noted that the course modifications are different for each college, so Senate cannot consider them all together. In short, the resulting forms sent to Senate does not follow the motion the Senate voted on. C. Corbat clarified that she would never motion to cut out the departmental faculty vote on pre-requisite changes.

J. Gill explained that the forms used for the course modifications were E1 forms. C. Corbat pointed out that the top of the forms indicate they are to be used for editorial changes and cannot be sent to C&C and Senate. J. Gill observed that the use of these forms was likely done in an effort to expedite the process. Since these modifications are in response to mandates by the BOR, we essentially do not have a choice but to ultimately make these changes. C. Corbat pointed out that there are multiple ways to address the BOR policy changes and that what was done may not coincide with what the faculty would want in terms of pre-requisites. Also, C. Corbat stated that not changing anything would not prevent a single student from registering. Senate was doing this to result in fewer overrides.

J. Gill stated that at present, Senate must decide if we will accept these forms. J. Gill explained that she has talked to Dr. Beard who had talked with Dr. Halpin. It was communicated to J. Gill that the necessary MCOs will be updated and are on the way. The MCOs will reflect the changes. C&C accepted these E1 forms and grouped them based on departments. J. Gill explained that she realizes using these forms is not following the rules of the form, but considering the time crunch, we should vote on whether or not to accept these forms.

Discussion ensued.

B. Alwell made the following motion:

Faculty Senate will consider the course modifications submitted on the E1 forms; however, final approval of each course will occur once the MCO has been modified and forwarded to match the

E1 forms; in addition, the chair of C&C, the Faculty Senate President, and the Chancellor must sign off on the documents (the current form does not allow for the signatures)

J. Gill seconded the motion

Discussion ensued.

Vote: 9-0-0

Senate proceeded to discuss and vote on the course modifications from the 5.4.23 C&C minutes.

#### **College of Health and Human Services**

HESC 1004 and HESC 1400: Deletion of the prerequisites altogether

B. Alwell made a motion to consider two courses together

J. Innerarity seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

B. Alwell made a motion to approve the course modifications to HESC 1004 and 1400

S. Kumar seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

#### **College of Liberal Arts**

ENGL 1001 and 1100: For both courses, remove prerequisite and add information on co-requisite as required per placement section in catalog

M. Stokes made a motion to approve the modifications

B. Alwell seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

#### **College of Natural Science and Mathematics**

BIOL 1001: It was noted that the prerequisite checker is not able to check high school GPAs, so the proposed modification will not really change anything—students will still need to be overridden.

BIOL 1001 and 1161 have the same proposed modifications

BIOL 1201 and 1101 have the same proposed modifications

It was explained that the system is able to process “grade of C or higher in ENGL 1001 and MATH 1021,” but it cannot process “or eligibility to take ENGL 1001 and MATH 1021 without their corequisite supplements as specified in the placement section of the catalog”

B. Alwell made a motion to approve the modifications to BIOL 1001, 1161, 1201, and 1101.

M. Stokes seconded the motion

Vote: 8-1-0

Next to consider in the College of Natural Science and Mathematics are Geology and two Physical Science Courses; however, it was noted that one proposed modification for a Physical Science course is not related to the new BOR mandates.

GEOL 1001 and PHSC 1001: both modifications are related to the new ACT score issue. The same prerequisite is being put in for these two courses.

M. Stokes motioned to approve modifications to GEOL 1001 and PHSC 1001  
S. Kumar seconded the motion  
Vote: 9-0-0

The next course is PHSC 2063: this change has nothing to do with the new ACT score issue.

Discussion ensued.

J. Gill made a motion to return modification to PHSC 2063 to the department, as this MOD has nothing to do with the new BOR requirements. This change needs to be on the proper C&C course modification form that indicates a department vote.

J. Innerarity seconded the motion  
Vote: 9-0-0

Next in the College of Natural Science and Mathematics are modifications to MATH courses.

MATH 1000: Strike ACT pre-requisite. Replace with MATH 1021 co-requisite.  
MATH 1008: Strike ACT pre-requisite. Replace with MATH 1018 co-requisite.  
MATH 1018: Strike ACT pre-requisite. Replace with information on MATH 1008 co-requisite if required as per placement section of catalog.  
MATH 1021: Strike ACT pre-requisite. Replace with information on MATH 1000 as co-requisite if required per placement section of catalog.

G. Ke motioned to approve the four modifications to MATH 1000, 1008, 1018, and 1021  
B. Alwell seconded the motion  
Vote: 9-0-0

### **College of Social Sciences**

PSYC 2000: remove all prerequisites.

S. Kumar motioned to approve the course modification  
C. Corbat seconded the motion

Discussion: C. Corbat asked if there is anything required in PSYC 2000 where a student would be at a disadvantage if they could not write well. C. Thomas explained that this course has gotten so large that papers are not assigned.

Vote: 9-0-0



**PS 202 Ad-hoc 4.6.23**

**PS 202 Ad-hoc 4.13.23**

M. Stokes motioned to receive both sets of minutes

J. Gill seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

**PS 202 Ad-hoc update**

S. Bowers explained that the committee has made some changes in attempt to improve clarity and consistency in how faculty are evaluated. The committee attempted to use language the called for every department using the same evaluation for faculty. S. Bowers explained that the committee was small and the members did not necessarily consult with their respective departments. Therefore, S. Bowers stated that now is a good time to bring this policy to the departments for input.

S. Bowers went on to explain that the committee tried to add more wording showing what the promotion, tenure, and reappointment process looks like. Also, instead of having PS 202 A and B, the committee suggested having the tenure and promotion pieces together in one policy statement and the instructor promotion portion of the policy statement as a separate policy. The committee also added more definitions. Finally, it was noted that some problems have arisen with some departments not having enough tenured faculty to make up a committee, so they tried to address that issue.

J. Gill reminded everyone that the Chancellor has asked for policy revisions by September 1<sup>st</sup>, and perhaps this policy should be considered first.

S. Bowers stated that one other thing that was a big change was defining which software would be used for the electronic portfolio.

C. Corbat made a motion that Senate send PS 202 A and B as developed by the committee to our departments and ask for their feedback for the first department meeting in the fall.

M. Stokes seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

**Old Business:**

**PS 269**

C. Thomas requested that senators give her feedback. C. Thomas then went on to discuss proposed changes to the policy:

The Chancellor will submit draft policy statements or draft revisions of policy statements to other campus groups (e.g., Faculty Senate, Faculty Council, Planning Council, Staff Senate, Chairs Council) for their review and recommendations. All relevant groups have up to 45 days to confer and make suggestions and comments for consideration.

The first change specified that the program used would be “Microsoft Word, or similar technology”

The next change replaced “The Chancellor ‘may submit’” with “will submit.”

Third, the following statement was added: “All relevant groups have up to 45 days to confer and make suggestions and comments for consideration.”

Finally, a change was to replace “his or her” with the gender-neutral pronoun, “their.”

B. Alwell motioned to accept the changes to PS 269

J. Innerarity seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

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

J. Gill stated that there were only had three applications. She requested that we send J. Gill our recommendations by tomorrow by 10:00 am

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

**PS 202 (A&B)** – discussed with the minutes received.

**PS 245** – will ask Dr. Beard for the updated policy statement.

**Administrative Committees List** – a final document was not revised and resent to the campus.

#### **CurricuLog Update**

C. Corbat said she has a meeting with R. Robinson first thing tomorrow to go over the structure of the site where we will house documents.

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

M. Stokes mentioned that a faculty member approached him and asked him to share that faculty not being allowed to take photos with students at graduation as usual will hurt the student experience. Several concurred and emphasized that such a limitation removes almost all faculty/student interaction.

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

**Next meeting:** August 2023

#### **Pats on the Back:**

John Marks and a CJ major Aaron Sharky have established a non-profit titled, Incarcerated Learners Program.

J. Innerarity thanked C. Corbat and J. Gill for their work on CurricuLog

S. Kumar thanked the Senate Officers for their hard work

**Departmental accomplishments:**

S. Kumar announced that Associate of Science in Medical Lab Science got 100 percent certification, graduation, and employment rate for the class of 2022.

**Adjournment:**

J. Innerarity motioned to adjourn

M. Stokes seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

The meeting adjourned at 5:14 pm

**Faculty Senate Agenda**  
May 9, 2023 at 3:00 p.m.  
Live Oaks Room

- I. Welcome and Determination of quorum
- II. Approval of minutes
- 5.2.23
- III. Brief guest updates
  - Dr. Coreil
  - Dr. Beard
- IV. Report of President
- V. Reports of Committees
  - Budget & Review 4.27.23
  - C&C 5.4.23
- VI. Old business
  - PS 207 update
  - PS 269
  - Faculty Senate Travel, Research, & Field Trip funds '23/24
  - Chancellor's Funds updates
  - Update RE Revision of Policy Statements
    - PS 202 (A& B)
    - PS 245
  - Administrative Committees List
  - CurricuLog Update
- VII. Introduction of new business
- VIII. Announcements/Looking ahead
  - Next meeting: August 2023 at a time to be determined
  
  - Please send *Pats on the Back* to Julie and/or share at Senate Meetings
  
  - Departmental accomplishments
- IX. Adjournment

Faculty Senate Minutes  
For: 5/2/2023  
DRAFT

**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. Christoff 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 considered 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 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 Caffey’s attempt to change tenure practice and SCR 6, which was introduced last year. The committee Senator Caffey spearheaded never met. His own colleagues in the legislature did not like what he proposed. Senator Caffey 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 Dr. Beth 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 Dr. Beth 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

Louisiana State University at Alexandria  
Budget & Review Committee  
Meeting Minutes April 27, 2023

**Members Present:** Dr. Bernard Gallagher, Dr. Cathy Cormier, Dr. Christof Stumpf, Dr. Jessica Ringo, Dr. Doyeop Kim, Elizabeth Azua, Dr. Julie Gill (ex officio)

**Absent:** Dr. Ahmed Shaffie (came but had to leave), Dr. Kent Lachney, Dr. Zebulon Bell

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	Dr. Bernard Gallagher called the meeting to order at 12:30	N/A
Minutes of April 20	Approved	Approved 6 Abstain 0 No 0
Merit Raises	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. The Committee discussed the methods used for determining various raises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee recommends that everyone, including first-year employees, be eligible for “merit” raises.</li> <li>• The Committee recommends using the categories of teaching, service, and scholarship as areas to be considered when raises are being awarded. Responsiveness to students and quality of instruction fall under the heading of teaching. Scholarly successes/ grants fall under the heading of scholarship. Reliability in contributing to departmental and college goals falls under service.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	Approved 6 Abstain 0 No 0

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee recommends removing the categories of collegiality, consistent demonstration of positive attitude and commitment to innovation as indicators of merit.</li> <li>• The Committee identified advising as a problem category. Instructors have heavy teaching loads and do not advise. Some faculty spend time traveling to off-campus sites and do not advise. Some majors have more advisees than others.</li> <li>• The Committee recommends that a holistic method of evaluation be used, i.e., that the dean or director consider the total contribution of the faculty member.</li> <li>• The Committee recommends that deans or directors be allowed to use their discretion when identifying the amount and the recipient of a merit raise.</li> </ul>	
Next meeting	None Designated	
Adjourn	1:00	

**Courses & Curriculum Committee  
Minutes  
February 27, 2023**

Present: Alice Blackwell, Sandra Purifoy, Laurie Pittman, Richard Elder, Beverly Alwell (proxy for Bob Jones), Chris Stacey, Cole Franklin, John Allen, Jennifer Dupont, Beth Whittington, Eamon Halpin (Ex-Officio), and Jerri Weston (Ex-Officio)

Absent: Andrew Pham, Michael Waller, and Conley Hathorn

Guest: Jim Rogers

A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 12:01 pm.

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the February 6, 2023. Laurie Pittman noted the nursing accrediting body was ACEN so the change was made in the minutes. Pittman moved to approve the February 6, 2023; Franklin seconded. The motion passed with 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstaining. Three members were not present to vote.

The first course considered was CJUS 4002, *Conservation Law Enforcement*. This course, which is an elective, is being added because of industry demand. This course will not have any prerequisites. It would focus on protection of natural resources. The CSS was reviewed. Course content does not overlap with any other course content. The RIS indicated that adjuncts could teach the course. Ms. Beth Whittington indicated that Dr. John Marks, a current faculty member, could also teach the course. Dr. Richard Elder moved to approve the new course; Beverly Alwell seconded the motion. The motion passed with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Three members were not present to vote.

The Minor in Victim Studies was discussed. The Department of Criminal Justice approved the new Minor unanimously. All of the courses for the minor are currently “on the books”; none are new classes needing approval. Dr. Elder made a motion to approve the Minor in Victim Studies. Dr. Chris Stacey seconded the motion. The motion carried with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Three members were not present to vote.

Modification of the BS Criminal Justice degree was discussed. Form AC indicated the department was in favor of the modification of this degree. The department feels modifying the degree will address low enrollment in some criminal justice courses and will strengthen the curriculum. By changing some elective courses to required courses, the department hopes to improve enrollment in those courses. A change in the Social Science General Education requirement deletes POLI 2051, *American Government*, and adds CJUS 1107, *Introduction to Criminal Justice*, with no change in credit hours. PSYC 2000, *Introduction to Psychology*, will remain as the other 3 credit hour course for a total of 6 Social Science credit hours. Dr. Jim Rogers, a guest at the meeting, questioned the removal of the POLI course from the concentration; Ms. Whittington responded that some of the material from POLI 2051 was absorbed in CJUS courses. After moving CJUS 1107 from “Core Major Requirements” to the Gen Ed Social Science requirement, the department added CJUS 4108, *Constitutional Law and Criminal Justice*, a 3-credit hour course, to “Core Major Requirements.” The department added CJUS 3530, *Corrections Within the Community*, to the Criminal Justice Concentration and deleted CJUS 4108 and ENGL 3002, *Technical Writing*, from that concentration’s requirements. The department adjusted the CJUS electives from 15 to 24 credit hours for the Criminal Justice Concentration; “approved electives” for this concentration were dropped from 15 to 12 hours. Three CJUS courses, CJUS 2092, *Dynamics of Family Violence*, CJUS 4461, *Criminology*, and CJUS 4465, *Victimology*, were added to the Criminal Psychology Concentration. For the Criminal Psychology concentration, the CJUS 3-credit hour elective was removed, but the other PSYC and ENGL courses remained unchanged. hours. Lastly, the free electives for the Psychology Concentration changed

from 24-credit hours to 18-credit hours. Richard Elder made a motion to approve the Modification of the BS Criminal Justice degree with Beth Whittington seconding the motion. The motion passed with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Three members were not present to vote.

HIST 4000, *History of the Ancient Near East*, was reviewed. Dr. Rogers noted that ancient civilizations can often lead to knowledge of today's civilization. The department unanimously approved the non-general education course. All signatures were clearly indicated, and the prerequisites were noted. The RIS was reviewed. Current faculty can teach this course. Dr. Elder made a motion to approve the course with Dr. Cole Franklin seconding the motion. The motion passed with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Three members of the Committee were not present to vote.

The last course reviewed was HIST 4010, *History of Early Modern Europe*. Dr. Rogers stated that a new textbook sparked his interest in creating this course, which would expand course offerings for students. The department approved the non-general education course. All signatures were clearly indicated. The CSS and RIS were reviewed. The course description and objectives were in alignment with each other. Dr. Chris Stacey made a motion to approve the new course with Dr. John Allen seconding the motion. The motion passed with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Three members were not present to vote. Dr. Rogers thanked the Committee and Dr. Halpin for considering the course.

Dr. Halpin outlined the possible agenda items for next week's meeting. Dr. Blackwell outlined other agenda items that may need addressing.

With no further business Beth Whittington made a motion to adjourn with Jennifer Dupont seconding the motion. The motion passed with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining . Three members were not present to vote.

The meeting officially adjourned at 12:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Purifoy  
Secretary

C&C Minutes for May 4, 2022

In attendance:

Pham, Blackwell, Hathorn, Whittington, Alwell, Franklin, Purifoy, Pittman, Elder, Dupont.

Absent: Stacey, Waller, Allen.

Guests: Halpin, Ellington

Blackwell called the meeting to order at 12:02

Blackwell proposed that the courses be batched by “college.”

- Motion: Whittington
- Second: Pittman
- Vote: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstaining. 3 not voting for reason of absence.

Once this was passed, the committee moved on to the course modifications. These modifications reflect the new Board of Regents’ standards.

Deans have all signed off on these changes. All deans’ signatures were noted as present.

### **College of Health and Human Services**

HESC 1004 - *Client Care Interactions*: remove pre-rec

HESC 1400 - *Health Care Language Applications*: remove pre-rec

Motion to accept removal “eligibility for ENGL 1001” as prerequisite: Hathorn

Second: Whittington

Vote

- Approve: 10
- Opposed: 0
- Formal abstention: 0
- Not present: 3

### **College of Liberal Arts**



ENGL 1001- *English Composition I*: remove pre-rec. Add information on co-requisite as required as per placement section in catalog.

ENGL 1100 – *English Composition I Supplement*: remove ACT score as pre-requisite. Add information on ENGL 1001 as co-requisite.

Motion to accept changes to description: Pittman

Second: Whittington

Vote

- Approve: 10
- Opposed: 0
- Formal abstention: 0
- Not present: 3

### **College of Natural Science and Mathematics**

BIOL 1001 (*General Biology I*), 1101 (*Biology for Science Majors I*), 1201 (*Biology for Science Majors I*):

Change to prerequisites

FROM

- Eligibility for ENGL 1001 and MATH 1021

TO:

- a grade of “C” or higher ENGL in 1001 and in MATH 1021; or eligibility to take ENGL 1001 and MATH 1021 without their corequisite supplements as specified in the placement section of the catalog.

BIOL 1161 (*Human Anatomy and Physiology I*): strike current prerequisites (ACT scores). Prerequisites now read: “*grade of “C” or higher in ENGL 1001 and in MATH 1018 or MATH 1021; or eligibility to take ENGL 1001 and MATH 1021 without their corequisite supplements as specified in the placement section of the catalog.*”

GEOL 1001 (*General Geology: Physical*): change to prerequisites FROM “*eligibility for Math 1021*” TO “*: a grade of “C” or higher in MATH 1018 or MATH 1021; or eligibility to take MATH 1021 without its corequisite supplement as specified in the placement section of the catalog.*”

MATH 1000 (*College Algebra Supplement*): Strike ACT pre-requisite. Replace with MATH 1021 co-requisite.

MATH 1008 (*Applied Algebra Supplement*): Strike ACT pre-requisite. Replace with MATH 1018 co-requisite.

MATH 1018 (*Applied Algebra*) Strike ACT pre-requisite. Replace with information on MATH 1008 co-requisite if required as per placement section of catalog.

MATH 1021(*College Algebra*): Strike ACT pre-requisite. Replace with information on MATH 1000 as co-requisite if required per placemen section of catalog.

PHSC 1001(*Physical Science I*): strike this pre-requisite: "ACT math score of 19 or higher or a "C" or better in MATH 0092 or MATH 1021." Replace with following: "a grade of "C" or higher in MATH 1018 or MATH 1021; or eligibility to take MATH 1021 without its corequisite supplement as specified in the placement section of the catalog."

PHSC 2063 (*Meteorology*): Add "C or higher in MATH 1018" to list of acceptable pre-requisites for course. Students may now take any one of three math courses as a pre-requisite for this course.

Motion to accept changes to prerequisites and co-requisites: Purifoy

Second: Hathorn

Vote

- Approve: 10
- Opposed: 0
- Formal abstention: 0
- Not present: 3
- College of Social Sciences

PSYC 2000 (*Introduction to Psychology*): Strike "Eligibility for ENGL 1001" as pre-requisite.

Motion to strike prerequisite from description: Hathorn

Second: Dupont

Vote:

- Approve: 10
- Opposed: 0

- Formal abstention: 0
- Not present: 3

AND FINALLY

CYBR 4901 (*Special Topics in Cybersecurity*) is to be considered. Previous versions of the request did not have the correct prerequisite. The course is already approved. The correct prerequisite is CYBR 3501, not CYBR 3001.

Motion to accept amendment of prerequisite: Whittington

Second: Pittman

Vote:

- Approve: 10
- Opposed: 0
- Formal abstention: 0
- Not present: 3

**Corrigenda for returned minutes for Feb. 6, 2023:**

We recorded IN ERROR that the “Humanities Degree” was modified. There was also a wording error.

Here is issue, according to Fac. Senate:

- However, the C&C Minutes state this was a Modification of the BGS Humanities degree – it should be a modification to the Humanities Concentration within the BGS Degree.
- The order that was being changed was disciplines within the Humanities, not enrichment block order in the degree (which was already alphabetical).
- The minutes also say there was an expansion of choices of enrichment blocks, but that is not correct. The number of enrichment blocks did not change. However, the disciplines available in the Humanities enrichment block did expand.

Thus, the **CORRIGENDA** should reflect the following, per Faculty Senate:

The modification was to the BGS with a Humanities Concentration.

The order changed was to the disciplines in the Humanities.

The number of enrichment blocks did not change. The number of disciplines available in the Humanities enrichment block changed.

Motion to accept amendment of minutes: Hathorn

Second: Dupont

Vote:

- Approve: 10
- Opposed: 0
- Formal abstention: 0
- Not present: 3

With no further materials to consider, the meeting was adjourned at 12.30 by unanimous consent.

**Louisiana State University at Alexandria  
Faculty Senate Ad Hoc**

**Attendees:** Beth Whittington, Cathy Cormier, Susan Bowers, Kent Lachney

**Absent:** Bernard Gallagher

**DATE:** April 6, 2023

**TIME:** 2pm

<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>ACTION/DISCUSSION</b>	<b>PLAN</b>
I. Call to Order	Beth called the meeting to order at 12 noon	
II Approval of Minutes.	Minutes from 3/23 and 3/30 were approved	
II. PS 202 Ad Hoc	<p>The committee updated Kent on discussions from 3/30.</p> <p>Members present continued with discussion of full-time tenured faculty PS 202 (refer to track changes) Committee members agree that guidelines for the tenure portfolio needed to be streamlined. A letter to external reviewers need to be included in an Appendix and additional criteria regarding qualifications for external reviewers needed to be outlined in the policy.</p> <p>Due to time constraints Cathy agreed to continue working on policy and present recommendations to the committee next week.</p>	Cathy will distribute minutes and track changes to committee members before the next meeting.
Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm	

**Louisiana State University at Alexandria  
Faculty Senate Ad Hoc**

**Attendees:** Beth Whittington, Cathy Cormier, Kent Lachney

**Absent:** Bernard Gallagher, Susan Bowers

**DATE:** April 13, 2023

**TIME:** 2pm

<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>ACTION/DISCUSSION</b>	<b>PLAN</b>
I. Call to Order	Beth called the meeting to order at 12 noon	
II Approval of Minutes.	Minutes from 3/23 and 3/30 were approved	
II. PS 202 Ad Hoc	The committee reviewed suggestions by Cathy & Susan for external reviewers. This was added to track changes in PS 202. Cathy commented that the third-year review, outlined in original policy no longer exists. The committee agreed to work on this for final proposal. In the interest of time Cathy will add information and submit to committee for review.	Cathy will distribute minutes and track changes to committee members before the next meeting to include information on 3 <sup>rd</sup> year review.
Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm	

## POLICY STATEMENT 269 POLICY REVIEW

Revision: 1  
Last: Reviewed: March, 2021  
Effective: March 24, 2021

**PURPOSE:** To define a procedure for Louisiana State University at Alexandria administrative officers to implement new policy statements and revise current policy statements.

### GENERAL POLICY:

LSUA’s administrative officers are charged with reviewing those policy statements that affect their areas of responsibility and for making recommendations for changes to the Chancellor. Each policy statement will be reviewed at minimum every three years. A schedule that indicates the year in which each policy statement is due for review will be kept in the Chancellor’s office. The Chancellor’s office can initiate review of a policy statement outside the three-year rotation at any time it is deemed necessary. Reviews for those policy statements designated for each year of the review rotation will be initiated in July of each year with proposed revisions that require review by other appropriate groups sent to those groups no later than October 1<sup>st</sup> of each year.

The normal procedure for implementation of new policy statements and revisions of existing policy statements involves the following steps:

1. New policy statements will be prepared in draft form by the appropriate administrative officer or governing body and submitted to the Chancellor for review.
2. Revisions to existing policy statements will be entered with “track changes” in Word, or by some similar method, so that all reviewers can see proposed additions and deletions.
3. The Chancellor may submit draft policy statements or draft revisions of policy statements to other campus groups (e.g., Faculty Senate, Faculty Council, Planning Council, Staff Senate, Chairs Council) for their review and recommendations. All relevant groups may have up to 45 days to confer and make suggestions and comments for consideration.
4. After review by the appropriate groups, the Chancellor and his or her Cabinet will review the proposed new policy or proposed revisions to a policy, as well as recommendations received from the review, and will finalize the wording of the policy statement.
5. Once the Chancellor approves the policy statement (new or revised), it will be formally issued by his or her office to the campus community and posted on the website.

An important aspect of the review process is ensuring that LSUA’s policies are in compliance with the policies of both LSU permanent memorandums and its accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.

As stipulated in PS 266, the university’s liaison to SACSCOC, who is appointed by and who reports directly to the Chancellor, is responsible for ensuring that policy reviewers are aware of the requirements and guidelines presented in the Commission’s policies.

Commented [CT1]: Do we want to use non gendered language here?

Commented [JG2R1]: Their?

Commented [CT3]: Do we want to use non gendered language here?

Commented [JG4R3]: Their?

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chancellor Paul Coreil, Ph.D

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



**Chancellor's Faculty Development Funds**  
**Field Trips**

The Chancellor has provided funds to encourage and support faculty led field trips during the academic year 2022-23. Please note this funding opportunity covers the entire academic year; however, proposals may be accepted twice a year if all money is not allocated.

All funds will be used to support the enhancement of student learning, effective teaching, and research productivity. *Please note funding for travel and research are excluded on this form.*

An ad-hoc committee of the LSUA Faculty Senate will accept applications from faculty members for reimbursable expenses related to field trips. Recommendations of the ad-hoc committee will be forwarded to the Senior Leadership Team. Faculty may apply for funds up to \$5,000 but the awards will range in size and may be limited. Partial awards may be recommended as well. No award will exceed the actual cost for the field trip and other allowable expenses. Documentation must be provided for all expenses. The faculty member must follow all LSU Purchasing and Travel rules and regulations. Field trip Funds may be used for:

- 1) Any off-campus travel that is faculty or instructor led which serves to enhance the educational experience of student(s) participating in the field trip;
- 2) Field trips may include participants from entire classes, subsets of classes, groups of interested students within a major, and student travel to conferences;
- 3) Recurring field trips will require an application for every occurrence and will depend upon the outcome of the previous field trip in achieving stated learning objectives.

These funds will not roll over at the end of the fiscal year and must be encumbered and expended in the fiscal year in which awarded; therefore, **all field trips must be completed by June 15<sup>th</sup>. Funds must be used on the field trip suggested in the application. Reimbursement is only permitted for expenses incurred and not exceeding the amount approved. Note: Trips exclusively for student competition are not allowed under this fund.** At the end of the field trip, a report must be submitted to the Faculty Senate President and include the following information:

*Name of Faculty; Department; Purpose of field trip/value to student learning; Outcome of student learning goals; and Amount Expended.*

All full-time faculty and department chairs at LSUA are eligible to apply. Interested faculty members must fill out an application form with supporting documentation and submit it electronically to Julie Gill (juliegill@lsua.edu). **The deadline for submitting applications is May 9, 2023, at 9:00 a.m. Email submissions to juliegill@lsua.edu.**

Chancellor's Faculty Development Fund – **Field Trips**  
Application Form

Name: Susan Bowers Phone: 318-473-6433

Department: Biology Email: sbowers@lsua.edu

Date and Destination of Field Trip: June 12<sup>th</sup> New Orleans Aquarium and Insectarium

Expected Number of Participants: 7

Description of Field Trip:

Should include a detailed description of the field trip, including student learning objectives associated with the field trip, benchmarks, the value of the field trip to student education, benefits and/or expansion of curricula, and an explanation of how students will communicate their learning through the written word, an artistic endeavor, or presentation of papers and/or posters.

This field trip is part of the Biology Department's Summer Research Experience (SURE). Part of this summer program includes excursions that students and faculty will participate in. The biology faculty wanted to choose excursions that were fun but also educational, and something the students may not experience otherwise. The Audubon Nature Institute is heavily involved in conservation and has a large role in protecting the wetlands, gulf and is part of the coastal wildlife network. In addition, the insectarium holds many insects with potential medical significance. While the students will be involved in research that is tailored around their interests the students are also expected to read current literature and discuss other areas of research. A part of the program is also learning about collaborations and project design. Visiting the aquarium and insectarium will not only allow students to see specimens they may not get to see in other settings but will also present a platform on how collaborations with institutes such as Audubon lead to research in wildlife, conservation and even in areas such as medical science. The students will have to discuss how they could use the aquarium or insectarium settings in their own research during one of our Friday Forums.

We can use the biology SUV but it is not large enough to accommodate all the students. I am adding a rental to the expense items below just in case motor pool does not have an appropriate vehicle to use.

Amount requested: \$ 570 (Attach itemized budget of projected expenses)

Are you applying to any other sources for funding of this trip? If so, where? no

The following applies only to Chancellor's Field Trip Fund:

Have you ever applied for Field trip funds? No If so, when? \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever been awarded Field trip funds? No If so, how much? \_\_\_\_\_

*Submit this form to Julie Gill at [juliegill@lsua.edu](mailto:juliegill@lsua.edu).*

*Deadline: May 9, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.*

**Itemized Budget:**

Tickets for 7 students (55.00 each) = **\$385**

Gas = **\$75**

SUV Vehicle Rental (1 day) = **\$110**

Chancellor's Faculty Development Funds  
**Research**

The Chancellor has budgeted funds to encourage and support faculty research and faculty led student research during the academic year 2022-23. Please note this funding opportunity covers the entire academic year, therefore, faculty considering fall, spring or summer research projects should apply by the deadline. If there are any unused funds, another call for applications will be announced early in the Spring semester.

All funds will be used to support research in its broadest sense, but may NOT be used for salaries/stipends, travel, consultants, memberships, conference/workshop fees, facilities, or utilities. *Please note funding for travel and field trips are excluded from this application form.*

An ad-hoc committee of the LSUA Faculty Senate will accept applications from faculty members for reimbursable expenses related to research projects. Recommendations of the ad-hoc committee will be forwarded to the Senior Leadership Team. Faculty may apply for funds up to \$10,000 but the awards will range in size and may be limited to no more than \$3,000 except under extraordinary circumstances. No award will exceed the actual cost of allowable expenses. Documentation must be provided for all expenses. The faculty member must follow all LSU Purchasing rules and regulations. Research Funds may be used for:

- 1) Consumable research supplies and materials;
- 2) Art supplies;
- 3) Biological specimens;
- 4) Chemicals;
- 5) Glassware;
- 6) Personal protective equipment;
- 7) First aid supplies and materials;
- 8) Cost of tools used for collecting data (surveys);
- 9) Portable research instruments, equipment and tools.
- 10) other items as approved by the LSUA Faculty Senate

These funds will not roll over at the end of the fiscal year and must be encumbered and expended in the fiscal year in which awarded. **Funds must be used on the research suggested in the application. Reimbursement is only permitted for expenses incurred and not exceeding the amount approved. Projects that involve students are encouraged.** At the end of the project, but no later than the end of the fiscal year, a report must be submitted to the Faculty Senate President and include the following information:

Name of Researcher; Department; Objective of Expenditure; Relevance of Expenditure to Research; and Amount Expended.

All full-time faculty and department chairs at LSUA are eligible to apply. Interested faculty members must fill out an application form with supporting documentation and submit it electronically to Julie Gill at [juliegill@lsua.edu](mailto:juliegill@lsua.edu). **The deadline for submitting applications is May 9, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.**

Chancellor's Faculty Development Fund - **Research**  
Application Form

Name: Susan Bowers Phone: 318-473-6433

Department: Biology Email: sbowers@lsua.edu

Title of Research Project: Animal Physiology Research Lab and General Research

**Description of Research:**

Should include a detailed description of the research project, how the research benefits the University/Student learning, whether the project is for faculty research only or is it faculty led student research, and will the funds support publication and/or presentation for all researchers involved?

These materials are for research projects that I will be conducting in Animal Physiology (BIOL 3150) lab and also for my BIOL 3990 research classes. Animal physiology is the scientific study of function, morphology, regulation and intercellular communications and dynamics within vertebrate and invertebrate animal species. Animal Physiology (BIOL 3150) is offered once a year and with an enrollment of 18-20 students. The class counts as a major course requirement or area of concentration elective for all of our biology concentrations. The lab is designed for students to gain skills in scientific reasoning and critical thinking while they conduct experiments associated with maintaining homeostasis in animal systems. There is a lab fee associated with this class, however these items below are wish list items since they are higher cost items. The purchase of these items would allow new laboratory exercises to be added to the class but would also enhance the labs that are currently being implemented. Students are also involved in one-on-one research with faculty and the equipment below would also be used in that setting. I have started working on oral health/dental research to help our pre-professional students that wish to go to dental school. As a side note, we use teeth from cattle for this research.

I have included a list of the animal physiology labs that the students participate in below:

**Lab Experiments:**

1. Nerve Function - Action potential in neurons.
2. Basic Transport Function - Osmosis/active transport in biological membranes will be explored in several ways.
3. Muscle Function - Basic muscle physiograph experiments will demonstrate contraction, fatigue, recovery, nerve/muscle interaction, neurotransmitter actions.
4. Cardiac muscle and its Neuronal Regulation – demonstration of cardiac muscle physiology, vagal action, action of neurotransmitters
5. Endocrine Physiology - Role of insulin, epinephrine, and glucose on behavior and blood glucose concentration will be demonstrated.
6. Renal Physiology - Renal effects of various diuretics will be explored. The action of water, caffeine, and ethyl alcohol will be demonstrated.

Amount requested: \$1012.84 (Attach itemized list of items to be purchased and price)

Are you applying to any other sources for funding of this research? If so, where?  
no

The following applies only to Chancellor's Research Fund:

Have you ever applied for Research funds? yes If so, when? 2022-2023

Have you ever been awarded Research funds? yes If so, how much? \$2080.00

*Submit this form to Julie Gill at [juliegill@lsua.edu](mailto:juliegill@lsua.edu).*

*Deadline: May 9, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.*

### **Itemized List of Equipment:**

Levo Plus Pipette Filler, Motor (8 Speeds) and Gravity Dispensing 3 X \$286.40 = **\$859.20**

Forceps, Extracting, #32, Mortech = **\$49.32**

Forceps, Extracting, #150A, Mortech = **\$49.32**

Shipping = **\$55.00**

## Chancellor's Faculty Development Funds Travel

The Chancellor has provided funds for scholarship and professional development of LSUA faculty during the academic year 2022-23. This money will be used to provide faculty with the financial support needed to attend conferences, in person or virtual, or engage in off-campus professional development activities during the current fiscal year. Please note this funding opportunity covers the entire academic year, therefore, faculty considering fall, spring or summer conferences should apply by the deadline. If there are any unused funds, a call for applications may be announced early in the Spring semester.

*Please note funding for research projects and field trips are excluded for this form submission.*

An ad-hoc committee of the LSUA Faculty Senate will accept applications from faculty members for reimbursable expenses related to participation in professional development programs or conferences. Recommendations of the ad-hoc committee will be forwarded to the Senior Leadership Team. Faculty may apply for funds up to \$3,000 but the awards will typically range in size and may be limited to more than \$1,500 except under extraordinary circumstances. No awards will exceed the actual cost of travel and other allowable expenses. Documentation must be provided for all expenses. The faculty member must follow all LSU Travel Guidelines. Professional activities may include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Presentations at discipline-specific conferences or professional meetings (virtual or in-person);
- 2) Travel for the purpose of conducting discipline-specific research;
- 3) Presentations at pedagogical conferences or meetings (virtual or in-person);
- 4) Attendance at discipline-specific conferences or professional meetings, or active involvement in professional organizations through service as an officer or through participation in a conference as a panelist, discussant, or session chair (virtual or in-person);
- 5) Attendance at pedagogical conferences or meetings (virtual or in-person);
- 6) Other scholarly or developmental activities.

These funds will not roll over at the end of the fiscal year and must be encumbered and expended in the fiscal year in which awarded; therefore, **all travel must be completed by June 15<sup>th</sup>. Note that LSU travel regulations do not allow for travel beginning mid-June. Funds must be used on the travel suggested in the application. Reimbursement is only permitted for expenses incurred and not exceeding the amount approved.** At the end of travel, a report must be submitted to the Faculty Senate President and include the following information: Name of Faculty Awarded Funds; Department; Purpose of travel; Benefit to LSUA faculty/students; and Amount Expended.

All full time faculty and department chairs at LSUA are eligible to apply. Interested faculty members must fill out an application form with supporting documentation and submit it electronically to Julie Gill ([juliegill@lsua.edu](mailto:juliegill@lsua.edu)). **The deadline for submitting applications is May 9, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.**

Chancellor's Faculty Development Fund - **Travel**  
Application Form

Name:    Skyler Braswell    Phone:    8706440277   

Department:    Nursing    E-Mail:    smankin@lsua.edu   

Date and Location of Event:    June 14-17; Virtual conference   

Your role in event (check all that apply):

- Presenter  
 Attendee  
 Officer/Board Member  
 Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Description of event you plan on attending/have attended (attach documentation):

Should include a detailed description of travel, purpose attending this particular professional development opportunity, and benefit to University/Student learning.

2023 INACSL Conference from June 14-17, 2023 (will register for virtual event, so transaction is completed prior to June 15 deadline). No travel required since event is virtual. Conference registration is \$565.00. Total cost for conference is \$565.00.

Attending the International Nursing Association for Clinical and Simulation Learning will help advance the simulation component of the nursing curriculum. The conference will provide foundational knowledge for the incorporation of more simulation and the addition of virtual simulation through the utilization of education, practice and research. The opportunity to attend this conference virtually will vastly expand my professional knowledge and provide me with the background to disseminate my knowledge to other faculty members. We can then collaborate to create a simulation experiences that improve critical thinking and clinical judgement through real life scenarios for our nursing students.

Amount requested:    \$565.00    (Attach itemized list of funds requested including travel, registration, lodging, etc.)

Are you applying to any other sources for funding of this trip? If so, where?    No   

The following applies only to Chancellor's Travel Fund:

Have you ever applied for Travel funds?  Yes  No If so, when?    Spring 23   

Have you ever been awarded Travel funds?  Yes  No If so, how much?    \$995.00



Submit this form to Julie Gill at [juliegill@lsua.edu](mailto:juliegill@lsua.edu).  
Deadline: May 9, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.

### INACSL23 Virtual Extension

Select sessions from the in-person conference will be recorded and available to registered INACSL23 attendees after the conference at no additional charge. Now you can take the best of INACSL23 home with you to watch on demand.

For those unable to join us in person in Providence, Rhode Island, the INACSL23 Virtual Extension can be purchased separately to enjoy select sessions from the in-person conference experience from your home or office. More details about the Virtual Extension sessions to be announced soon.

INACSL23 Virtual Extension	\$565
----------------------------	-------

---

**SUBJECT: SELECTION, RETENTION, ANNUAL EVALUATION REVIEW  
AND TERMINATION OF FULL-TIME TENURED AND TENURED  
TRACK FACULTY**

---

**PURPOSE:** To define policies governing full-time faculty personnel actions.

I. Definitions	
II. Basic Principles	1
III. Roles and Responsibilities	2
IV. Faculty Participation	3
V. Initial Faculty Appointments	3
VI. Reappointment	8
VII. Annual Review	11
VIII. Termination and Disciplinary Actions	12

Commented [CC5]: Replace page numbers

**I. DEFINITIONS**

Academic Unit - The basic budgetary and/or academic department organized for the purpose of teaching. The Library is included among academic units.

Appropriate Faculty - For initial appointments all departmental faculty who are appointed full time (excluding temporary appointments) for at least a one-year period have the right to vote. For reappointment and non-reappointment recommendations, full-time departmental faculty with tenure have the right to vote. In the case of promotion, full-time departmental faculty senior in rank to the candidate shall have the right to vote. In tenure considerations all

departmental faculty with indeterminate tenure shall have the right to vote. Since the department chair makes separate and independent judgments on all personnel actions, he/she shall not vote as a member of the faculty.

Continuous Service - Service uninterrupted by non-reappointment, resignation, or termination action. A series of term appointments for successive semesters, or academic or fiscal years is deemed to be continuous service. Tenured and tenured track faculty are defined as full-time members of the academic staff holding the rank of Instructor or higher and Library personnel holding equivalent ranks.

Non-reappointment - Upon expiration of a term appointment, the employee is a free agent to whom the University System has no obligation. The University System may reappoint the employee to the same or a different position.

Portfolio - A faculty portfolio is meant to include a representative sample of the work of an individual. It is not intended to be a compilation of all work of that individual. It is incumbent that, through a faculty portfolio, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure demonstrate that he/she has met the expectations for instruction, scholarship, and service. Advising; is considered an aspect of instruction but also has aspects which are university service.

Community Service - Activities done on a voluntary basis through which the faculty member is actively involved with civic or professional groups or organizations in LSUA's service area.

Examples of such activities are: addresses to school, civic, or community groups; free consultation to a community group; and active involvement in community organizations. Faculty members are not paid for community service activities. Membership alone does not constitute service. Faculty members must document active involvement. A faculty member may officially or unofficially represent LSUA through such activities.

Reappointment (Retention) - The option exercised by the university to continue employment of a person who completes a term appointment.

Split Appointment - The appointment of one person concurrently in two or more budgetary units of LSU Alexandria.

Term-Appointment - An appointment for a stipulated period.

Termination - An administrative action which ends a tenure appointment or a term appointment prior to its stated ending.

## GENERAL POLICY

### II. BASIC PRINCIPLES

Appointment, retention, non-renewal, annual review, and termination decisions have the most serious long-term implications for the quality of tenured track faculty, and therefore for the university. All such decisions, not based on financial exigency or change in programs, shall be made solely on the basis of professional merit, quality of contribution to the university, and the competent and regular performance of assigned duties. Judgments may not be based on attributes of the candidate that are irrelevant to professional performance, such as race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, marital status, veteran's status or exercise of ordinary citizen's rights.

Members of the faculty share certain rights, privileges, and responsibilities not shared by other employees of the university. Members of the faculty are responsible by regulation of the Board of Supervisors, for the determination of the educational policy of the university, subject to the authority of the Board of Supervisors. In addition, appropriate members of the faculty are expected to participate with administrative officers in the selection of new members of the academic staff and in decisions affecting retention, promotion, tenure and other personnel actions. This participation should be neither vague nor haphazard, but formal and positive, following ethical and impartial procedures clearly established for the advantage of the university.

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

### III. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES<sup>1</sup>

The key administrative official in recommending appointment, promotion, tenure, non-renewal or termination is the Dean/Director. In general, the faculty of a given academic unit will provide the most reliable professional judgment as to whether promotion or tenure is deserved, and the Dean/Director must therefore consult thoroughly with all appropriate members of the faculty. In all promotion decisions, academic unit faculty senior to the individual being considered shall cast a vote on the action. For example, all associate professors and professors would vote on a candidate being considered for promotion to associate professor. All tenured faculty would vote on persons being considered for tenure. Although a Dean/Director is required to consult with the faculty in the manner described above, he/she makes a separate and independent recommendation on all personnel actions.

Because LSU System regulations require that the Dean/Director, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Chancellor, and LSU President all review and act upon recommendations, candidates for appointment or other personnel actions must therefore be careful not to assume that the faculty's or the Dean/Directors recommendations are final. Recommendations become official only when they have been approved by the LSU Board of Supervisors.

### IV. FACULTY PARTICIPATION

Participation of the faculty in personnel actions is a serious obligation. Careful consideration must be given to the role, scope and mission of the university in order to

provide programs of instruction, service, research or scholarly activity of the highest order for the people of the community and state. LSUA's primary mission is quality instruction. Therefore, the faculty should make recommendations for personnel actions that support the instructional mission.

Academic departments shall devise and carefully adhere to procedures which will ensure the participation of appropriate faculty members in the selection and re- appointment process. Announcements of available positions must adhere to the university's Affirmative Action Plan bringing the position to the attention of as many potential applicants as possible.

#### V. INITIAL FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

General System policy regarding appointments of the academic staff is set forth in PM-

23. The criteria and procedures that follow are in accordance with that document. Because these guidelines are designed to apply to the entire university including the Library, they are stated with some generality.

##### A. Initial Appointment

Academic unit faculty shall establish search committees for initial appointments. Membership of search committees shall be determined by the respective academic unit. Faculty in the same and closely related disciplines may be represented on the search committee. To facilitate continuity and communication between the administration and the search committee, the Dean/Director shall be a non-voting member of the committee. The search committee will consult with the appropriate academic unit faculty, each of whom shall have access to the search committee's records. Proceedings and deliberations of each search committee shall be recorded. Faculty shall recognize the individual's privacy rights with respect to personnel records. The recommendations of the search committee will be submitted to the appropriate academic unit faculty for their recommendation and subsequently to the Dean/Director and other administrative officers. The appropriate academic unit faculty shall determine the applicant's "fluency in the English language" as required by Act 754 of the 1991 Regular Legislative Session and the Dean/Director will complete the memo certifying fluency in English (as prescribed by PS 232) for any candidate recommended to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

For an initial full-time appointment to any rank, a personal interview shall be conducted by the search committee, the departmental faculty, the department chair and other administrative officers including both the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor.

B. Credit Toward Tenure

After the conclusion of interviews, the Dean/Director shall consult with the academic unit faculty regarding an appointment. Recommendations from the academic unit faculty are not binding on the Dean/Director who makes an independent recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who, in turn, will make a recommendation to the Chancellor. Once the Chancellor has approved a salary offer, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will ask the Dean/Director to make a verbal offer to the candidate. Once a candidate has given his/her verbal acceptance of the terms of the initial appointment, the appropriate documentation is forwarded to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who, after review, will make a recommendation to the Chancellor. The formal letter of offer is issued with the signature of the Chancellor and can be issued only after appropriate documentation is submitted.

All candidates will receive a written tenure policy at the time of hire. This policy will include the general expectations for tenure including requirements for teaching, scholarship and service. Candidates with prior LSUA teaching experience may count time in service towards tenure if they choose to do so. Time in service shall be weighted with every 48 credit hours taught counting for one year towards tenure for a maximum of two-years of service allowed for prior and continuous full-time faculty and full-time temporary faculty. An agreement on the amount of credit toward tenure must be in writing at the time of the initial tenure-track appointment. All candidates have the right to refuse credit for prior service if they choose to do so.

A candidate hired at or above the level of associate professor may be considered for tenure up to two years early, if he or she chooses to count the years of prior service at another University. An agreement on the amount of credit toward tenure from full-time teaching at another university must be in writing at the time of the initial tenure-track appointment at LSUA. All candidates have the right to refuse credit for prior service if they choose to do so.

The University reserves the right to hire people with full tenure only if the person is being hired at the level of full or associate professor. Such

an approach will be rarely used and is generally reserved for the hiring of senior administration officials who have earned tenure at another University. Tenure, if granted at the time of initial employment, is as a faculty member and not as an administrator.

In certain special cases, a position may be advertised as fully tenured stating the requirements for full-tenure in the advertisement. These positions can be hired at either the associate professor or full professor level. These are contingent upon the needs of the university and only upon recommendation by the Dean/Director and Provost and Vice chancellor of Academic Affairs with final approval from the Chancellor. Certain conditions include but are not limited to advanced levels of scholarly research or publications, prior or continuing grant approvals that benefit the university, community, or society, and/or special needs or limitations that restrict available qualified applicants.

#### C. Criteria by Rank

LSUA strives to hire faculty with the doctorate when appropriate and available. However, all individuals being considered for employment must meet the minimum qualifications of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In general, this means they "must have completed at least 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and hold at least a master's degree or hold the minimum of a master's degree with a major in the teaching discipline.") Only in the most exceptional of circumstances will the university accept recommendations for appointment of candidates who do not meet the following minimum qualifications.

##### 1. General Librarian

A Master's in Library Science (MLS) or Master's in Library and Information Science (MLIS) from an institution that accredited by American Library Association. Expected to perform, under supervision, library tasks of a complex nature and to exercise responsible judgement in administering library routine.

##### 2. Assistant Professor

- a. Doctoral degree in the subject matter area or a closely related area with 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching field (as recommended to the administration by the academic unit faculty) from a regionally-accredited institution-- In exceptional cases, an applicant with a master's degree and years of related professional experience and/or professional licensure/certification may be appointed at the assistant professor rank.
- b. Evidence of potential for effective teaching and advising of students
- c. Evidence of potential for productive community service,



- d. research, and scholarly or creative activity
- d. When appropriate, evidence of successful practice in the discipline
- 3. Assistant Librarian
  - a. A Master's in Library Science (MLS) or Master's in Library and Information Science (MLIS) from an institution that is accredited by American Library Association.
  - b. Varied experience in college and/or university libraries is expected.
  - c. Individuals are under the supervision of a library administrator to supervise the work of professional and nonprofessional assistants and to aid in the development of materials and services to meet the instructional, research, and extension needs of the University.
- 4. Associate Professor
  - a. Doctoral degree in the subject matter area or a closely related area with 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching field (as recommended to the administration by the departmental faculty) from a regionally-accredited institution
  - b. Except in exceptional cases, current rank of associate professor at another regionally-accredited institution and at least five years of service at the rank of assistant professor at that institution
  - c. Demonstrated record of effective teaching and advising of students
  - d. Demonstrated record of highly competent work in the following: administration; departmental/college or university committees; and professional organizations
  - e. Demonstrated record of effective community service and contributions to the development and progress of the university
  - f. Demonstrated record of productive scholarship, research or creative activity
- 5. Associate Librarian
  - a. A Master's in Library Science (MLS) or Master's Degree in Library and Information Science from an institution that is accredited by American Library Association.
  - b. A graduate in a subject field, in addition to the graduate degree in library science, is desirable for this rank.
  - c. This rank calls for proven administrative qualities of leadership, and other personal and academic qualifications should be contributing factors. The individual, as delegated by the Director of Library Services, assists in the administration of major areas of library service and contributes to the formulation and execution of an effective library program.
- 6. Professor

- a. Doctoral degree in the subject matter area or a closely related area with 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching field (as recommended to the administration by the departmental faculty) from a regionally-accredited institution
  - b. Except in exceptional cases, current rank of professor at another regionally-accredited institution and at least five years of service in the ranks of associate professor or professor at that institution
  - c. Demonstrated record of excellence in teaching and advising of students
  - d. Demonstrated record of exemplary service in one or more of the following: administration; departmental/college or university committees; professional organizations
  - e. Demonstrated record of exemplary community service and outstanding contributions to the development and progress of the university
  - f. A consistent record of productive scholarship, and research or other creative performance of high order in his/her profession over a substantial period of time.
7. Librarian
- a. A Master in Library Science (MLS) or Master's in Library and Information Science (MLIS) from an institution that is accredited by American Library Association.
  - b. A graduate degree in a subject field, in addition to the graduate degree in library science, is desirable for this rank.
  - c. This rank calls for extensive administrative experience in which responsibility and judgment of an independent nature are required.
  - d. The individual should be capable of exercising the top administrative functions of the library.
  - e. Librarians assist in the administration of all aspects of library service and operation and share in the formulation and execution of policy.

## VI. REAPPOINTMENT

### A. Criteria

All reappointments shall be made upon the same criteria, terms, and conditions as the candidate's preceding appointment unless expressly indicated to the contrary in the notification of a reappointment. Faculty are expected to demonstrate an increasing level of achievement in all aspects of their duties to ~~earn~~ earn reappointment.

### B. Terms of Reappointment by Rank

1. Assistant Professors, Assistant Librarians

Assistant professors and assistant librarians are appointed for terms not to exceed one year. They may be reappointed for one-year terms for up to six successive years

2. Associate Professors, Associate Librarians

Associate Professors and Associate Librarians who join the faculty at that rank may, after an initial term appointment, be reappointed on a term basis through not more than six years of total service at LSUA.

3. Professors, Librarians

Professors and librarians who join the faculty at that rank may, after an initial term appointment, be reappointed on a term basis through not more than six years of total service at LSUA.

C. Procedures

I. Implementation

To implement these policies, academic units will observe the following procedures:

- a. In the Fall of each academic year the Dean/Director will send written notification to each person eligible for consideration, stating that the review process is to begin and advising the candidate to provide any information he/she wishes to have considered. It is the candidate's

responsibility to provide relevant information concerning his/her work. An up-to-date curriculum vita, Annual Faculty Plans/Reports/Evaluations, papers or presentations, published reports, books, newspaper articles, student evaluations, advising evaluations, information concerning personal qualities and ability to work harmoniously with colleagues and students are examples of material which could be used to support reappointment. Candidates are required to submit, at a minimum, results of the campus-wide student evaluations of teaching and advising for at least the two immediately prior semesters. Teaching evaluations should be from all courses taught each semester. In the event of a first-year faculty member, teaching evaluations from one semester will be sufficient.

- b. These materials will be reviewed and discussed at a meeting, conducted by the Dean/Director of all academic unit faculty charged with the responsibility of participating in the evaluation process. Each academic unit will determine the appropriate faculty. Such a meeting will give appropriate faculty the opportunity to hear any additional information or comments which members of the group may have to contribute. Written notice of the meeting should be given at least ten working

- days in advance to appropriate faculty members along with a statement of the agenda. The meeting should be conducted so as to afford a reasonable opportunity to discuss the materials presented, to ask questions, and to offer further information and judgments. Confidentiality must be strictly maintained.
- c. The faculty of each academic unit will develop its own system of recording the vote of the appropriate faculty on whether to recommend reappointment of the candidate. Whatever method is chosen, a verifiable record of the recommendation must be kept, and the result made known to the faculty and the candidate.
  - d. Following the faculty vote, the Dean/Director will make a separate and independent recommendation and forward it to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, together with the vote and the recommendation of the faculty.
  - e. A candidate whose reappointment is not being recommended by the Dean/Director must be verbally informed within ten working days after the decision is made. Within ten working days following verbal notification, the Dean/Director will provide written notification to the candidate. This written notification serves to formalize the Dean/Director decision and ensures that the unsuccessful candidate is not left in a state of uncertainty. A copy of this written notice is to be sent to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
  - f. Candidates whose reappointments are recommended by the Dean/Director should be so advised within ten working days. They should be reminded of the review process that still remains before the recommendations become official.
  - g. The Dean/Director will notify the academic unit of his/her recommendation within ten working days after the individual(s) has been notified.
  - h. A candidate whose reappointment is recommended by the Dean/Director but subsequently refused by another reviewing official must be so notified by the Dean/Director within ten working days after the department chair has been told of the decision.

## 2. Expiration of Appointment

A term appointment or a series of term appointments carries no assurance of reappointment or promotion. Reappointment is based up the needs of the academic unit and university.

Upon expiration of a term appointment, the employee is a free agent to whom

the University System has no obligation. The University System may reappoint the employee to the same or a different position. Non-reappointment carries no implication whatsoever as to the quality of the employee's work, conduct, or professional competence.

Written notice of the decision not to reappoint will be given to the employee in accordance with the LSU by-Laws and Regulations. This notice is in addition to any routine notice given to individual on their appointment forms. When an employee is not to be reappointed, written notice will be provided no later than March 1 of the academic year. The faculty member is responsible for completing assigned workload for remainder of the academic year

General System policy regarding promotions of the academic staff is set forth in PM-23. The criteria and procedures that follow are in accordance with that document. Because these guidelines are designed to apply to the entire university including the Library, they are stated with some generality.

## VII. TENURE & PROMOTION

### A. PURPOSE

Louisiana State University at Alexandria has a critical interest in attracting and retaining faculty of the highest quality. All members of the faculty considered for tenure and promotion or promotion to a higher rank shall have contributed to the mission of the university through highly effective teaching, scholarship, and service.

This interest is enhanced by ensuring that faculty members are promoted and tenured in ways that are unbiased and equitable. To ensure equity in administering the system of academic tenure, the University must provide consistent conditions and standards for teaching, scholarship and service. A faculty member who has been awarded tenure and who continues to perform his or her duties effectively can normally expect continuation in his or her position. Tenure is not an unconditional guarantee of lifetime employment, but it does provide that the faculty member will not be terminated except for cause and through due process, or for bona fide financial exigency or institutional change. Put another way, the burden of proof on whether to grant an individual tenure rests with the individual candidate; the burden of proof on whether to withdraw tenure from an individual rests with the University.

Decisions on tenure and promotion are most important, therefore, the academic unit must be convinced that the candidate will be a highly valuable and productive member of the faculty for an indefinite period of time.

### B. Criteria by Tenure and Promotion or Promotion to a Higher Rank

*Time in rank in a temporary appointment cannot be counted toward the minimum time in rank requirements for promotion.* However, the time in rank need not be continuous. A maximum of one year interruption due to leave of absence or to part-time service may be permitted. No credit toward years in rank will be earned

during the leave of absence or part-time service period. In addition, a faculty member may choose to extend their time in rank by removing no more than one year from consideration for tenure and promotion. This provision allows for a faculty member who, due to personal considerations, is able to perform all aspects of their appointment other than scholarly activity or community service but wishes to exclude the year that is not representative of their best effort from consideration. It should be noted that mere length of service in one rank and competent performance of one's assigned duties do not in themselves constitute cause for tenure or promotion to the next academic rank. Tenure and promotions are always based upon merit and outstanding achievement. The quality of service is more important than the length of service.

- i. Assistant Professor
  1. Normally possess a doctoral degree in the subject matter area or a closely related area (as recommended to the administration by the academic unit faculty) from a regionally-accredited institution
  2. Normally not less than five years of service as instructor at LSUA
  3. Evidence of highly effective teaching and advising of students
  4. Demonstration of scholarship, research, creative activity and service to the community, the profession and the university
2. Assistant Librarian
  - a. A Master's in Library Science (MLS) or Master's in Library and Information Science (MLIS) from an institution that is accredited by American Library Association.
  - b. Varied experience in college and/or university libraries is expected.
  - c. Individuals are under the supervision of a library administrator to supervise the work of professional and nonprofessional assistants and to aid in the development of materials and services to meet the instructional, research, and extension needs of the University.
  - d. Normally not less than five years of service as General Librarian at LSUA
3. Associate Professor
  - a. Doctoral degree in the subject matter area or a closely related area (as recommended to the administration by the departmental faculty) from a regionally-accredited institution
  - b. Five years' service in the rank of assistant professor at LSUA or any other regionally-accredited institution; at least three of the five years as assistant professor must be served at LSUA
  - c. Continued record of highly effective teaching and advising of students
  - d. Highly competent work in one or more of the following: administration; departmental/college or university committees; and professional organizations
  - e. Continued demonstration of highly competent service to the university,

- f. the profession, and the community
  - f. Continued demonstration of productive scholarship, research or creative activity appropriate to the academic discipline
4. Associate Librarian
- a. A Master's in Library Science (MLS) or Master's in Library and Information Science (MLIS) from an institution that is accredited by the American Library Association.
  - b. A graduate degree in a subject field, in addition to the graduate degree in library science, is desirable for this rank.
  - c. This rank calls for proven administrative qualities of leadership, and other personal and academic qualifications should be contributing factors. The individual, as delegated by the Director of Library Services, assists in the administration of major areas of library service and contributes to the formulation and execution of an effective library program.
  - d. Five years' service in the rank of assistant librarian at LSUA or any other regionally-accredited institution; at least three of the five years as assistant librarian must be served at LSUA
5. Professor
- a. Doctoral degree in the subject matter area or a closely related area (as recommended to the administration by the departmental faculty) from a regionally-accredited institution.
  - b. At least five years' service in the rank of associate professor at LSUA or any other regionally-accredited institution. At least three of the years as associate professor must be served at LSUA
  - c. A sustained record of excellence in teaching and advising of students
  - d. A sustained record of exemplary service in one or more of the following: administration; departmental/college or university committees; professional organizations
  - e. A sustained record of outstanding contributions to the university, the profession and the community
  - f. A sustained record of productive scholarship, and research or other creative performance of high order in his/her profession during a substantial period of time
6. Librarian
- a. A Master's in Library Science (MLS) or Master's in Library and Information Science (MLIS) from an institution that is accredited by American Library Association.
  - b. A graduate degree in a subject field, in addition to the graduate degree in library science, is desirable for this rank.
  - c. This rank calls for extensive administrative experience in which responsibility and judgment of an independent nature are required.
  - d. The individual should be capable of exercising the top administrative

- functions of the library.
- e. Librarians assist in the administration of all aspects of library service and operation and share in the formulation and execution of policy.
  - f. At least five years' service in the rank of associate librarian at LSUA or any other regionally-accredited institution. At least three of the years as associate librarian must be served at LSUA.

#### A. Intent to Apply

Intent to apply for tenure and promotion or promotion to a higher rank must be communicated to the Dean/Director and Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at the conclusion of the semester of eligibility. Candidates applying for tenure and promotion will apply in the fifth year of service for continued employment. Criteria for tenured faculty to apply for promotion to a higher rank is outlined in Section VI-B above.

If a faculty member received credit towards tenure at hire and chooses to accept the credit towards tenure the intent to apply must be submitted to the Dean/Director and Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs during the spring semester prior to eligibility. Faculty who are hired with a given number of years credit towards tenure will have the option of applying those years. There will be no obligation to do so, and therefore all tenured-track faculty will have the full allotment of years on the tenure clock if desired.

#### B. External Reviewers

To be considered for tenure/promotion and promotion to a higher rank, candidates must submit a list of six potential external reviewers, including contact information, to the Dean/Director. The Dean/Director will contact all potential external reviewers and identify a minimum of two to review the candidate's scholarly work. A sample letter to external reviewers is presented in Appendix B. The process should be repeated until a minimum of two external reviewers' consent to participating. External reviewers should be identified early in the Spring of eligibility to provide adequate time for responses.

External reviewers must hold an academic rank equal to or higher than the rank to which the candidate aspires to be promoted and hold expertise comparable to the academic or research fields of the candidate. The external reviewers should not be a past mentor, advisor, or have a personal relationship with the candidate. The external reviewer will be provided the candidate's curriculum vita, summary of professional achievements, and a minimum of two samples of the candidate's most recent



scholarly research or creative works. The request of the external reviewers will be to provide a general assessment of the quality of the scholarship or creative works. This information will be used by the tenure committees in the assessment of whether the candidate's scholarship meets the criterion of strength of excellence. The external reviewers will not be asked to comment on a candidate's teaching or service, nor will they be asked to provide a recommendation on promotion and/or tenure.

### C. Portfolio

The candidate requesting consideration for tenure and promotion or promotion to a higher rank must prepare an electronic portfolio that illustrates achievements in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. It is expected that the portfolio will be kept to a reasonable size and highlight best works in teaching, scholarship, and service. The following list constitutes the expectations for the portfolio which must be submitted to the Dean/Director in sufficient time for full review.

1. Current curriculum vitae
2. Statement of teaching philosophy (three pages or less)
3. Annual Evaluations - last three years only
4. Student Evaluations - last three years only
5. Examples of instruction selected from courses reflective of teaching assignments.
6. Scholarship - listing in appropriate bibliographic form with representative examples. Portfolio need not include copies of grants, articles submitted for publication, publications themselves, etc. These will be requested if necessary.
7. Service - listing of university, professional, or community service with documentation of special services provided (leadership of a subcommittee or task force, for example)
7. Documentation of External Review of Scholarship

### C. Procedures for Final Tenure and Promotion or Promotion to a Higher Rank Review

#### 1. Academic Unit Committee

Each Fall the Dean/Director will appoint an Academic Unit Committee comprised of a minimum of three tenured faculty members equal to or higher to which the candidate is seeking promotion. If the academic unit has fewer than three tenured faculty members, additional faculty will be recruited from outside the academic unit for this task. The Dean/Director will serve as a non-voting moderator of the committee and the committee will select a chairperson.

The committee members will consider each candidate's portfolio to determine whether the candidate has met the criteria established for teaching, scholarship, and service. Following discussion of the candidate's portfolio the committee will vote by secret ballot. Independent of each the chairperson and the Dean/Director will complete the

Evaluation Summary Form presented in Appendix A. The committee chair will submit the Evaluation Summary Form to the Dean/Director. The Dean/Director will submit both Evaluation Summary Forms to the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

The University Tenure and Promotion Committee will be convened by the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. The university committee will consist of seven faculty members at the rank of professor. Deliberations will consider the question of whether the candidate has met the criteria in each of the three categories to be evaluated: teaching, scholarship, and service. Following the deliberations, the committee members will vote by secret ballot whether to recommend promotion. A memo from the committee to the Chancellor will be composed, providing the justification for the committee vote by describing how the criteria in each of the three categories were, or were not, judged to have met.

The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, as the Chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, will not have a vote but will be present for committee deliberations to facilitate discussion in a neutral manner, answer relevant questions and collect the ballots of the committee members when they vote. The Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs will also write a memo to the Chancellor with his/her recommendation and justifications, describing how in his/her view the criteria in each of the three categories were, or were not, met.

DRAFT

2. At least six months in advance, the Dean/Director must send written notification to each person eligible for consideration, stating that the review process is to begin and advising the candidate to provide any information he/she wishes to have considered. In an effort to give timely notice to the University community that an individual plans to seek tenure and promotion and to facilitate the appointment of an appropriate mix of individuals to the University-wide tenure and promotion committee, any individual eligible for and seeking tenure and promotion should notify the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs of his/her intent no later than September 1 of the year in which they plan to seek tenure and/or promotion. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the portfolio as shown in Section VI Part B of this policy statement.
3. These materials will be reviewed and discussed at a meeting, conducted by the Dean/Director of all academic unit faculty charged with the responsibility of participating in the evaluation process. Such a meeting will give appropriate faculty the opportunity to hear any additional information or comments which members of the group may have to contribute. Written notice of the meeting should be given ten working days in advance to appropriate faculty members with a statement of the agenda. The meeting should be conducted so as to afford a reasonable opportunity to discuss the materials presented, to ask questions, and to offer further information and judgments. Confidentiality must be strictly maintained.
4. The faculty of each department will develop its own system of recording the vote of the appropriate faculty on whether to recommend promotion of the candidate. Whatever method is chosen, a verifiable record of the recommendation must be kept, and the result made known to the faculty and the candidate.
5. Following the faculty vote the Dean/Director makes a separate and independent recommendation and forwards it, with written justification, to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, together with the vote and the recommendation of the faculty.
6. A candidate whose promotion is not being recommended by the Dean/Director must be verbally informed within ten working days after the decision is made. At this time the Dean/Director should counsel verbally with the candidate concerning the candidate's areas of weakness. Within ten days following verbal notification, the Dean/Director will provide written notification to the candidate. This written notification serves to formalize the Dean/Director's decision and ensures that the unsuccessful candidate is not left in a state of uncertainty. The

memorandum should be brief and simple but should relate the decision to the relevant criteria. A copy of this memorandum is to be sent to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

7. Candidates whose promotions are recommended by the Dean/Director should be so advised within ten working days. They should be reminded of the review process that still remains before the recommendations become official.
  8. The Dean/Director ~~department chair~~ will notify the departmental faculty of his/her recommendation within ten working days after the individual(s) have been notified.
  9. A candidate whose promotion is recommended by the Dean/Director but subsequently refused by another reviewing official must be so notified by the Dean/Director within ten working days after the Dean/Director has been told of the decision.
  10. An unsuccessful candidate for promotion has the right to receive a verbal explanation of the reasons underlying the decision from the person who has made the unfavorable determination. If the candidate so wishes, a written explanation must also be provided. Unlike the verbal explanation, which serves as a counseling mechanism, the written explanation will be brief, categorical, and expressed as a judgment.
2. **Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs**  
Before making decisions on promotion/tenure recommendations, the Vice Chancellor for Academic ~~and Student~~ Affairs may conduct informal discussions with the Dean/Director. The Vice Chancellor may also choose to interview each candidate. The Vice Chancellor will appoint an advisory group composed of senior faculty, preferably full professors representing a broad spectrum of disciplines to review all candidates' materials and make recommendations to the Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor will forward all recommendations, including those that he/she has endorsed, to the Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor will notify each department chairperson of the decisions that have been made.

Implicit in all of the above procedures is this basic fact, which deserves emphasis: Although a Dean/Director is required to consult with the faculty and pass on to higher authorities the recommendations and vote of the appropriate faculty, the Dean/Director makes a separate and independent judgment on whether to make a favorable recommendation. Although the Vice Chancellor for Academic will have an advisory group, the decision whether to recommend a promotion is the Vice Chancellor's. Hence the authority and the responsibility for recommending promotion

rests with individual officials of the university, except that final approval is always reserved to the LSU Board of Supervisors.

b. Salary Adjustments Due to Promotion

Promotion in rank brings with it a salary adjustment; such salary adjustments are to an individual's "base pay" and are implemented in the fiscal year following approval of promotion.

From	Instructor	to	Assistant	Professor:	
					\$1,5
					00
	From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:				\$2,250
From	Associate	Professor	to	Professor:	
					\$3,5
					00

Adjustments are budgeted by the University and do not, in themselves, diminish funding which might be available for other forms of salary adjustment. Promotion based salary adjustments are not to be confused with other adjustments which might occur from time to time to reflect completion of a terminal degree or market conditions.

VIII. Pre-tenure/Promotion Review (Third Year Review)

1. Purpose

The purpose of the pre-tenure/promotion review is to ensure that the faculty member acquires tenure or promotion only after evaluation by the appropriate departmental faculty, Dean/Director, and other university officials.

2. Procedure

Appointment on the tenure track represents a significant commitment by the University to an individual and an individual to the University. For the

University the commitment is to work with an individual to ensure progress toward tenure and progress in fulfilling the expectations of teaching, research and service. For an individual the commitment is to progress in the development of his/her faculty role such that the decision on tenure can be made in a timely and positive manner. To facilitate this process, Deans/Directors will discuss policies and procedures for tenure and promotion during the Fall Faculty Plan Meeting and Spring Annual review. Meetings should be documents on the Faculty Plan Form and Faculty Plan Annual Review Form.

In the third year of service in a tenure track position or earlier if requested by a faculty member but in no case later than the third year, the tenured-full time faculty of the academic unit will conduct a pre-tenure review for faculty expected to be eligible for tenure and promotion. Each academic unit will adhere to procedures outlined in this policy.

To prepare for the pre-tenure review the faculty will prepare a portfolio as outlined in Section VI Tenure and Promotion. Tenured faculty in the academic unit will meet to review the portfolio and determine if the faculty member is or is not on track for tenure and promotion. The Dean/Director will appoint a tenured faculty member to facilitate the process. The appointed tenured faculty will prepare a report to the Dean/Director outlining the outcome of portfolio review. The Dean/Director will conduct an independent review of the portfolio and document recommendations. The recommendations from the Dean/Director and academic unit pre-tenure committee will be forwarded to the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. The Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs will facilitate a meeting with the University Tenure and Promotion Committee who will also conduct an independent review of progress towards tenure. The pre-tenure review may be completed in conjunction with the reappointment process but should be a separate activity. Recommendations from the Dean/Director, academic unit pre-tenure review committee, and University Committee will be filed in the academic unit.

If the third-year report is negative and it seems apparent that the candidate is not making sufficient progress toward tenure, the Dean/Director should reflect that in ~~its~~ his/her recommendations for reappointment. If an individual is not making sufficient progress and is non-reappointed, the University will notify the individual and the next contract year will be considered the "terminal" year for that individual.

If the third-year report is positive and it seems apparent that the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the Dean/Director will make a written record of that as part of the reappointment process.

It must be understood that a positive third year report does not guarantee tenure but merely affirms that an individual is making appropriate progress toward achieving tenure.

## **IX. ANNUAL EVALUATION**

### **A. Purpose**

To assist with decisions regarding reappointment, promotion, tenure and merit increases, the Dean/Director annually shall make an evaluation of each faculty member. In order to make this review meaningful to the university and to the employee, the evaluation will be discussed with the faculty member so that he/she understands how his/her contribution is viewed by the academic unit. The evaluation document shall be prepared annually by the Dean/Director.

### **B. Criteria**

All annual reviews of performance evaluation shall be made according to the criteria, terms, and conditions set forth in this Policy Statement. Performance evaluations are filed in the academic unit and the Office of Human Resource Management. It is important that the process be inherently fair, systematic, and uniform within the academic unit. The procedure should be without bias, and not consider in any way those attributes of the candidate that are irrelevant to professional performance. Evaluations must be built around an analysis of the tasks involved in the faculty position and must be limited to areas of consideration necessary to perform the responsibilities of the position. Explicit measurement standards will be utilized by each academic unit.

### **C. Procedure**

The academic unit will utilize the university evaluation form presented in Appendix A. In the Fall of each academic year faculty will develop a Faculty Plan and Evaluation Form. The Faculty Plan and Evaluation Form will include a self-assessment of teaching and goals for the year related to teaching, scholarship and service. The Dean/Director will meet with each faculty to discuss the Faculty Plan and Evaluation.

In the Spring semester all full-time faculty will be evaluated by the Dean/Director. Faculty will complete the Faculty Plan and Evaluation Form, created in the<sup>22</sup> Fall, and describe progress toward meeting each goal established for the year. The Dean/Director will meet

with each faculty to discuss progress towards established goals. The Dean/Director will document comments on strengths, areas for improvement, and goals for the future. In addition, each area will be rated as “Highly Competent”, “Competent”, or “Needs Improvement”. The annual evaluation may also include the assessments of colleagues, the individual, the Dean/Director, students, or others as appropriate. The faculty member can provide a written response to the evaluation. The Dean/Director and faculty member will sign the Faculty Plan and Evaluation Form.

Original copies of the annual evaluation report will be kept in the academic unit. The Dean/Director is responsible for providing the Office of Human Resource Management an electronic-copy of the entire Faculty Plan and Evaluation Form within two weeks of the evaluation.

If a faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may submit a signed statement to that effect and may request and shall receive a review by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Both the statement and the results of the review shall become part of the record. After review by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the evaluations will be filed in the academic unit, with an electronic copy sent to the Faculty Plan and Evaluation Form.

#### D. TERMINATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

##### A. Dismissal for Cause

Any appointment, whether tenured or term, may be terminated for cause. Adequate cause for dismissal will be related, directly and substantially, to the professional capacities of faculty members as teachers or researchers. Dismissal for cause shall proceed according to the AAUP definition of academic due process in such matters [Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure 5.(c), AAUP Policy Documents & Reports, 1990 edition]. Before consideration of dismissal for cause, a faculty member shall be entitled to have the charges stated in writing and to have a written description of the evidence supporting such charges with a list of witnesses and a brief summary of each witness' testimony, and to have a hearing, with counsel, before a special committee of the faculty appointed by the Chancellor. This committee will be charged to make a recommendation to the Chancellor with respect to dismissal of the faculty member. If the faculty member elects not to have a hearing, the Chancellor may provide for a hearing before a special committee of the faculty prior to taking action. If the Chancellor recommends dismissal for cause, the faculty member may request that the President hear an appeal.

##### B. Termination for Financial Exigency or Change in University Programs

All appointments, whether with tenure or for a term, are made subject to the



continued need and availability of funds for the position. Any appointment may be terminated because of bona fide financial exigency or change in university programs. In such case every reasonable effort will be made to find some appropriate alternate assignment for the individual within the university. Policy Statement 220 (Procedures for Dealing with Financial Exigency) defines the policy and procedures to be followed in case of a financial shortfall so great that it impacts academic programs.

---

---

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR  
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY OF ALEXANDRIA

PS  
Page 1 of  
Revision:  
Effective:

---

SUBJECT: SELECTION, RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND ANNUAL EVALUATION  
AND TERMINATION OF FULL-TIME INSTRUCTORS

---

PURPOSE: To define policies governing full-time Instructors and General Librarians personnel actions.

I.	Basic Principles.....	2
II.	Roles and Responsibilities.....	3
III.	Faculty Participation.....	3
IV.	Initial Instructor and General Librarian Appointments...	4
V.	Reappointment.....	5
VI.	Promotion.....	7
VII.	Annual Evaluation.....	8
VIII.	Termination and Disciplinary Actions.....	9

---

#### DEFINITIONS

Academic Unit - The basic budgetary and/or academic department organized for the purpose of teaching. The library is included among academic units.

Appropriate Faculty - For initial appointments all academic unit faculty who are appointed full time (excluding temporary appointments) for at least a one-year period have the right to vote. For reappointment, non-reappointment, and promotion recommendations, full-time academic unit faculty with tenure and senior instructors have the right to vote. Since the Dean/Director makes separate and independent judgments on all personnel actions, he/she shall not vote as a member of the faculty.

Community Service - Activities done on a voluntary basis through which the instructor is actively involved with civic or professional groups or organizations in LSUA's service area. Examples of such activities are addresses to school, civic, or community groups; free consultation to a community group; and active involvement in community organizations. Instructors are not paid for community service activities. Membership alone does not constitute service. Instructors must document active involvement. An Instructor may officially or unofficially represent LSUA through such activities.

Continuous Service - Service uninterrupted by non-reappointment, resignation, or termination action. A series of term appointments for successive semesters, or academic or fiscal years is deemed to be continuous service. Faculty are defined as full-time members of the academic unit holding the rank of Instructor or higher and Library personnel holding equivalent ranks.

Excellence - Indicates performance at a very high level.

Non-reappointment - Upon expiration of a term appointment, the employee is a free agent to whom the University System has no obligation. The University System may reappoint the employee to the same or a different position.

Portfolio - A faculty portfolio is meant to include a representative sample of the work of an individual. It is not intended to be a compilation of all work of that individual. It is incumbent that, through a faculty portfolio, an instructor for reappointment or promotion demonstrates that he/she has met the expectations for instruction, professional development, and service. Advising is considered an aspect of instruction but also has aspects which are university service.

Promotion - Advancement to a higher academic rank.

Reappointment (Retention) - The option exercised by the university to continue employment of a person who completes a term appointment.

Split Appointment - The appointment of one person concurrently in two or more budgetary units of LSU Alexandria.

Strength – Strength indicates performance above and beyond a level of mere competence.

Term-Appointment - An appointment for a stipulated period.

Termination - An administrative action which ends an appointment or a term appointment prior to its stated ending date.

## GENERAL POLICY

### I. BASIC PRINCIPLES

- A. Appointment, retention, promotion, non-renewal, annual evaluation, and termination decisions have the most serious long-term implications for the quality of the instructor, and therefore for the university. All such decisions, not based on financial exigency or change in programs, shall be made solely based on professional merit, quality of contribution to the university, and the competent and regular performance of assigned duties. In accordance with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, decisions pertaining to employment, including but not limited to, appointment, retention, non-renewal, annual evaluation and termination shall not be based on race, color, religion, pregnancy, childbirth, medical condition related to childbirth, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age (40 or older), genetic information, or family medical history. Instructors share certain rights, privileges, and responsibilities not shared by other employees of the university. Instructors are responsible by regulation of the Board of Supervisors, for the determination of the educational policy of the university, subject to the authority of the Board of Supervisors. In addition, Instructors are expected to participate with administrative officers in the selection of new members of the academic staff and in decisions affecting retention and other personnel actions. This participation should be

neither vague nor haphazard, but formal and positive, following ethical and impartial procedures clearly established for the advantage of the university.

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

## II. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. The key administrative official in recommending appointment, promotion, non-renewal or termination is the Dean/Director. In general, the faculty of a given academic unit will provide the most reliable professional judgment as to whether reappointment or promotion is deserved, and the Dean/Director must therefore consult thoroughly with all appropriate members of the faculty. In all promotion decisions, faculty senior to the individual being considered shall cast a vote on the action. For example, all senior instructors, associate professors and professors would vote on a candidate being considered for promotion to Senior Instructor. Although a Dean/Director is required to consult with the faculty in the manner described above, he/she makes a separate and independent recommendation on all personnel actions.
- B. Because LSU System regulations require that the Dean/Director (where appropriate), the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Chancellor all review and act upon recommendations for promotion candidates for appointment, promotion, or other personnel actions must therefore be careful not to assume that the faculty's or the Dean/Director's recommendations are final.

## III. FACULTY PARTICIPATION

- A. Participation of the faculty in personnel actions is a serious obligation. Careful consideration must be given to the role, scope and mission of the university in order to provide programs of instruction, professional development, and service activity of the highest order for the people of the community and state. LSUA's primary mission is quality instruction. Therefore, the faculty should make recommendations for personnel actions that support the instructional mission.
- B. Academic units shall devise and carefully adhere to procedures which will ensure the participation of appropriate faculty members in the selection, re-appointment, and promotion of Instructors. Announcements of available positions must adhere to the university's Affirmative Action Plan bringing the position to the attention of as many potential applicants as possible.

#### IV. INITIAL INSTRUCTOR AND GENERAL LIBRARIAN APPOINTMENTS

General System policy regarding appointments of the academic staff is set forth in PM-23. The criteria and procedures that follow are in accordance with that document. Because these guidelines are designed to apply to the entire university including the Library, they are stated with some generality.

##### A. Initial Appointment

Academic units shall establish search committees for initial appointments. Membership of search committees shall be determined by the respective academic units. Faculty in the same and closely related disciplines shall be represented on the search committee. In order to facilitate continuity and communication between the administration and the search committee, the Dean/Director shall be a non-voting member of the committee. The search committee will consult with the appropriate academic unit faculty, each of whom shall have access to the search committee's records. Proceedings and deliberations of each search committee shall be documented. Faculty shall recognize the individual's privacy rights with respect to personnel records. The recommendations of the search committee will be submitted to the appropriate faculty for their recommendation and subsequently to the Dean/Director and other administrative officers. The candidate shall submit documents to the Dean/Director to verify "fluency in the English language" as required by Act 754 of the 1991 Regular Legislative Session and the Dean/Director will complete the memo certifying fluency in English (as prescribed by PS 232) for any candidate recommended to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

For an initial full-time appointment, a personal interview shall be conducted by appropriate academic unit faculty, the Dean/Director and other administrative officers including both the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chancellor.

##### B. Criteria by Rank

All individuals being considered for employment must meet the minimum qualifications of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission of Colleges. In general, this means they "must have completed at least 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and hold at least a master's degree or hold the minimum of a master's degree with a major in the teaching discipline.") Only in the most exceptional of circumstances will the university accept recommendations for appointment of candidates who do not meet the following minimum qualifications.

###### 1. Instructor

- a. A master's degree with 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching field
- b. Evidence of potential for effective teaching and advising of students in addition to the service expectations of all faculty appointments
- c. When appropriate, evidence of successful practice in the discipline

- d. Instructors are expected to teach a 15-credit hour load or equivalent. Instructors pursuing a terminal degree may receive consideration for that in lieu of service requirements.

2. General Librarian

- a. A Master's in Library Science (MLS) or a Master's in Library and Information Science (MLIS) from an institution that is accredited by American Library Association
- b. Expected to perform, under supervision, library tasks of a complex nature and to exercise responsible judgement in administering library routine

V. REAPPOINTMENT

A. Criteria

All reappointments shall be made upon the same criteria, terms, and conditions as the candidate's preceding appointment unless indicated to the contrary in the notification of a reappointment. Faculty are expected to demonstrate an increasing level of achievement in all aspects of their duties to earn reappointment.

B. Terms of Reappointment

Instructors and General Librarians are appointed for terms not to exceed one year. They may be reappointed for any number of successive one-year terms.

C. Procedures

1. Implementation

To implement these policies, academic units will observe the following procedures:

- a. For years 1-3 at least six months in advance, the Dean/Director must send written notification to each person eligible for consideration, stating that the review process is to begin and advising the candidate to provide any information he/she wishes to have considered. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide relevant information concerning his/her work. An up-to-date curriculum vita, Annual Faculty Plans/Reports, papers or presentations, published reports, books, newspaper articles, student evaluations, advising evaluations, information concerning personal qualities and ability to work harmoniously with colleagues and students are examples of material which could be used to support reappointment. Candidates are required to submit, at a minimum, results of the campus-wide student evaluations of teaching and advising for at least the two immediately prior semesters. Teaching evaluations should be from all courses taught in those two semesters. In the event of a first-year faculty member, teaching evaluations from one semester will be sufficient.
- b. These materials will be reviewed and discussed at a meeting, conducted by the Dean/Director and academic unit faculty charged with the responsibility of participating in the evaluation process. Such

a meeting will give appropriate faculty the opportunity to hear any additional information or comments which members of the group may have to contribute. Written notice of the meeting should be given at least ten working days in advance to appropriate faculty members along with a statement of the agenda. The meeting should be conducted so as to afford a reasonable opportunity to discuss the materials presented, to ask questions, and to offer further information and judgments. Confidentiality must be strictly maintained.

- c. The faculty of the academic unit will develop its own system of recording the vote of the appropriate faculty on whether to recommend reappointment of the candidate. Whatever method is chosen, documentation of the recommendation must be kept, and the result made known to the faculty and the candidate.
- d. Following the faculty vote, the Dean/Director will make a separate and independent recommendation and forward it to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, together with the vote and the recommendation of the faculty.
- e. A candidate whose reappointment is not being recommended by the Dean/Director must be verbally informed within ten working days after the decision is made. Within ten working days following verbal notification, the Dean/Director will provide written notification to the candidate. This written notification serves to formalize the Dean/Director's decision and ensures that the unsuccessful candidate is not left in a state of uncertainty. A copy of this written notice is to be sent to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- f. Candidates whose reappointments are recommended by the Dean/Director should be so advised within ten working days. They should be reminded of the review process that still remains before the recommendations become official. The Dean/Director will notify the academic unit faculty of his/her recommendation within ten working days after the individual(s) has been notified.
- g. A candidate who reappointment is recommended by the Dean/Director but subsequently refused by another reviewing official must be so notified by the Dean/Director within ten working days after the Dean/Director has been told of the decision.
- h. Instructors who are reappointed in each of their first three years need not be considered formally for reappointment in either their fourth or fifth year.

## 2. Expiration of Appointment

A term appointment or a series of term appointments carries no assurance of reappointment or promotion. Reappointment is based up the needs of the academic unit and university.

Upon expiration of a term appointment, the employee is a free agent to whom the University System has no obligation. The University System may reappoint the employee to the same or a different position. Non-

reappointment carries no implication whatsoever as to the quality of the employee's work, conduct, or professional competence.

Written notice of the decision not to reappoint will be given to the employee in accordance with the LSU by-Laws and Regulations. This notice is in addition to any routine notice given to individual on their appointment forms. When an employee is not to be reappointed, written notice will be provided no later than March 1 of the academic year.

## VI. PROMOTION

All Instructors considered for promotion shall have contributed to the mission of the university through highly effective teaching, advising, community service, professional activities, participation in the work of university committees, and research or other creative work of high quality. Decisions on promotion are most important; before recommending such a promotion, the Dean/Director must be convinced that the candidate will be a highly valuable and productive member of the faculty.

### A. Criteria

Time in rank in a temporary appointment cannot be counted toward the minimum time in rank requirements for promotion. However, the time in rank need not be continuous. A maximum of one-year interruption due to leave of absence or to part-time service may be permitted. No credit toward years in rank will be earned during the leave of absence or part-time service period.

It should be noted that mere length of service in one rank and competent performance of one's assigned duties do not in themselves constitute cause for promotion to the next academic rank. Promotions are always based upon merit and outstanding achievement. The quality of service is more important than the length of service.

#### 1. Instructor

Instructors who have been at LSUA for eight years may apply in their ninth year for promotion to "Senior Instructor" which would be accompanied by a \$2,500 increase in salary. The process for promotion to Senior Instructor will mirror the process for promotion of tenure-track faculty, with the following qualifications:

- a. Excellence in Teaching
- b. Strength in Service
- c. Strength in Professional Development

Consideration of Senior Instructor promotion will take place in the spring semester and candidates wishing to be considered for promotion will inform their Deans/Directors at the start of the fall semester. Procedures for promotion will follow those outlined for reappointment. Candidate will submit an electronic portfolio providing evidence of excellence in teaching, strength in service, and strength in professional development.

### B. Portfolio

It is the responsibility of the Instructor and the Dean/Director to present a compelling case for promotion including specific, detailed information that will allow reviewing



officials to make an informed evaluation of the recommendation. For example, a statement that the candidate is an effective teacher should be documented by the results of peer evaluation, direct observation by the Dean/Director student evaluations of teaching and advising, letters or comments from former students or other evidence. The presentation should be written so that the merits of the case are fully apparent to academic unit faculty.

Instructors requesting to be considered for promotion must prepare a portfolio. It is expected that the portfolio will be kept to a reasonable size such that the promotion committee are able to consider the contents.

The following list constitutes the expectations for a portfolio which must be submitted to the Dean/Director in a time sufficient to provide for a full review:

1. Current curriculum vitae
2. Statement teaching philosophy (three pages or less)
3. Faculty Plan - last three years only
4. Annual Student Evaluations - last three years only
5. Examples of instruction selected from courses reflective of teaching assignments (lower division as well as upper division, laboratory and/or clinical as well as lecture or online learning activities). Limit this aspect of the portfolio to representative work.
6. University Service - listing of university service with documentation of special services provided (leadership of a subcommittee or task force, for example)
7. Community Service - listing and representative examples
8. Professional Development - listing of professional development with documentation of continuing education, licensure, or advanced certification

## VII. ANNUAL EVALUATION

### A. Purpose

To assist with decisions regarding reappointment, promotion, and merit increases, the Dean/Director annually shall make an evaluation of each faculty member. To make this review meaningful to the university and to the employee, the evaluation will be discussed with the faculty member so that he/she understands how his/her contribution is viewed by the academic unit. The evaluation document shall be prepared annually by the Dean/Director and submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for review documentation.

### B. Criteria

All annual evaluations shall be made according to the criteria, terms, and conditions set forth in this Policy Statement. Performance evaluations are filed in the appropriate administrative office. It is important that the process be inherently fair, systematic, and uniform within the academic unit. The procedure should be without bias, and not consider in any way those attributes of the candidate that are irrelevant to professional performance. Evaluations must be built around an analysis of the tasks involved in the faculty position and must be limited to areas of consideration necessary to perform

the responsibilities of the position. Explicit measurement standards will be utilized by each academic unit.

#### C. Procedure

1. The academic unit will utilize the university evaluation form presented in Appendix A. In the Fall of each academic year faculty will develop a faculty plan. The faculty plan will include a self-assessment of teaching and goals for the year related to teaching, scholarship and service. The Dean/Director will meet with each faculty to discuss the faculty plan.
2. In the Spring semester all full-time faculty will be evaluated by the Dean/Director. Faculty will complete the faculty plan, created in the Fall, and describe progress toward meeting each goal established for the year. The Dean/Director will meet with each faculty to discuss progress towards established goals. The Dean/Director will document comments on strengths, areas for improvement, and goals for the future. In addition, each area will be rated as "Highly Competent", "Competent", or "Needs Improvement". The annual evaluation may also include the assessments of colleagues, the individual, the Dean/Director, students, or others as appropriate. The faculty member can provide a written response to the evaluation. The Dean/Director and faculty member will sign the report.
3. Original copies of the annual evaluation report will be kept in the academic unit. The Dean/Director is responsible for providing the Office of Human Resource Management an electronic-copy.
4. If a faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she may submit a signed statement to that effect and may request and shall receive a review by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Both the statement and the results of the review shall become part of the record. After review by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the evaluations will be filed in the academic unit.

### VIII. TERMINATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

#### A. Dismissal for Cause

Any appointment may be terminated for cause. Adequate cause for dismissal will be related, directly and substantially, to the professional capacities of faculty members as teachers or researchers. Dismissal for cause shall proceed according to the AAUP definition of academic due process in such matters [Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure 5.(c), AAUP Policy Documents & Reports, 1990 edition]. Before consideration of dismissal for cause, a faculty member shall be entitled to have the charges stated in writing and to have a written description of the evidence supporting such charges with a list of witnesses and a brief summary of each witness' testimony, and to have a hearing, with counsel, before a special committee of the faculty appointed by the Chancellor. This committee will be charged to make a recommendation to the Chancellor with respect to dismissal of the faculty member. If the faculty member elects not to have a hearing, the Chancellor may

provide for a hearing before a special committee of the faculty prior to acting. If the Chancellor recommends dismissal for cause, the faculty member may request that the President hear an appeal.

B. Termination for Financial Exigency of Change in University Programs

All appointments are made subject to the continued need and availability of funds for the position. Any appointment may be terminated because of bona fide financial exigency or change in university programs. In such case every reasonable effort will be made to find some appropriate alternate assignment for the individual within the university. Policy Statement 220 (Procedures for Dealing with Financial Exigency) defines the policy and procedures to be followed in case of a financial shortfall so great that it impacts academic programs.

## Appendix B

Date

EXTERNAL REVIEWER'S NAME, TITLE, ADDRESS

Dear Dr. REVIEWER,

The (Name of Academic Unit) at Louisiana State University at Alexandria wishes to thank you in advance for your willingness to contribute an external review for our tenure and promotion process. You have been selected based on your ability and expertise to provide feedback on the quality and significance of (Candidate's Name) scholarship.

Dr. (Candidate's Name) is currently an Assistant Professor in the (Name of Academic Unit). Dr. (Candidate's Name) is beginning her sixth year with the university and is applying for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Included in this material, please find the following:

- a. Curriculum Vita
- b. Summary of Professional Achievements
- c. Samples of scholarly or creative work selected by the (Candidate's Name) that are relevant for the criteria provided.

We are requesting a professional assessment of the quality and significance of the (Candidate's Name) performance in the area of scholarship. Please include a statement indicating that your personal or professional relationship with this candidate does not pose a conflict of interest. Your evaluation will be shared with faculty serving on the tenured committees and be treated as a personnel document

The tenure committees will begin their review of applications for tenure and/or promotion in mid-October, and we will need your completed review on or before DATE. We greatly appreciate your time and commitment to this very important faculty evaluation process. Should you determine that you will be unable to provide a review within the timeline specified, please let me know through e-mail or phone at your earliest convenience. Please do not hesitate to contact my office should you have any questions.

Respectfully,  
(Dean/Director)  
(Contact Information)