

Faculty Senate

Meeting began at 2: 05 pm

Absent: Julie Bergeron, Emre Celebi

Present: Amy Anne Erickson, Matyas Buzgo, LaWanda Blakeney, Raymond Taylor, Carl Smolinski, Mary Jarzabek, Harvey Rubin, Mary Hawkins, Lonnie McCray, Chris Hale, Kevin Krug, Robert Leitz

December 2, 2011 2pm Webster Room

1. Approval of Minutes of November 3, 2011- **Senator Harvey Rubin** made the Motion. Seconded by **Senator Raymond Taylor**. Voted and approved by senate.
2. President's Report:

President's Report to the LSUS Faculty Senate – Dec. 2, 2011

A significant issue before this body today is the on-going discussion of a possible merger between LSU Shreveport and Louisiana Tech. This discussion came into the limelight following the Eva Klein Study Group conducting its focus groups last month which included discussions with administration and faculty as well as a session with Twin City business leaders. While faculty concerns about such a merger were voiced in the hallways, your Executive Committee decided to try and get some answers from LSU system President, Dr. John Lombardi. Two days ago, a frank and unreserved system President spoke with the Executive Committee in a conference call. I have distributed a recap of the information shared by Dr. Lombardi for your perusal, but I will, here, offer a brief summary and point out some significant statements.

First – Dr. Lombardi was quick to speak with us and set up this conference. He has also agreed to come to our campus in early January to speak with the Faculty Senate or, if desired, the Faculty Council to answer questions and offer comments.

Second – the key points Dr. Lombardi made are as follow:

- 1) There is little enthusiasm for this merger in either the Board of Supervisors or the Board of Regents – UL system doesn't want to lose Tech and LSU System does not want to lose LSUS (there also would be significant community and legislative opposition).
- 2) LSUS would likely not grow into the "new La. Tech campus" even if we became its satellite because of business opposition from the Ruston leadership.
- 3) The "merger commotion" should be harnessed by LSUS to grow our campus.
- 4) The need for any new programs must be proven to Board of Regents
 - a)One way to do this is through collaboration with LSU-BR programs offered here as a LSU degree.
 - b) Once need/enrollment is shown then the degree program could be moved into the LSU Shreveport program offering.
 - c)Sounds a bit "too good" to be true, but that is Dr. Lombardi's suggestion.

- d) His strong recommendation is to develop programs that tie into the health care system and partner more closely with LSU HSC. He sees this as a “power” move that can be used to more readily prove to the Regents the need for programs that are community based and “job ready.”
- 5) A discouraging note was Dr. Lombardi’s comments that higher education requirements in this area are “overestimated.” He believes the status quo is adequately serving this community.

Third, in order to get the administration’s take on these comments, I spoke with Dr. Marsala briefly this morning. He let me know that all of these comments are consistent with statements made by Dr. Lombardi in the recent past. He told me that Lombardi’s idea of the Baton Rouge campus offering programs through this campus would likely be a temporary situation and MAY bring new degrees to this campus. We both remain cautiously optimistic in this matter.

Overall, the Exec. Cmte. had a positive response to this call. We were impressed with Dr. Lombardi’s clear and unreserved remarks. We invite further questions that might be posed to our System President and will field your requests to have Dr. Lombardi come to visit our campus.

Additional topics presented by **Faculty Senate President Mary Jarzabek** – Ad Hoc Committee on Promise programs is moving forward and the next meeting is at the beginning of January. **Senator Buzco** suggested that if we can make business leaders really believe a bachelor’s degree has real value, their attitudes may change toward LSUS and the bachelors degrees that are awarded here. There was a discussion about how faculty and LSUS were underrepresented on the committee that originated the study for the proposed LA Tech and LSUS merger. A suggestion to invite Dr. Rozeman to the visit when Dr. Lombardi is visiting was made.

3. Administrators’ Report:

- a. Chancellor not present.
- b. **Provost Sisson** indicated that **Faculty Senate President Jarzabek** did a great job of summarizing the Klein report. He also indicated that a lot of political pressure was being applied to the outcome. The new Masters of Biology has passed and is now at the Board of Regents on the January agenda. LSUS also wants to offer an EdD. SACS must be notified if we want to offer that program and they must be notified a year in advance. We want to offer the program a year from this Spring. Course evaluations appeared to go well this semester. Changing the time appeared to work to our advantage. We got 5,138 student responses which is comparable to the numbers we got with the paper copies. Almost every class was evaluated if their number was greater than 1 or 2 students. Tammy Knott’s marketing class completed the evaluations at a good response rate and she offered extra points if she got 85% completion for the entire class. That may be a solution for those wanting higher completion rates. There are no official statements regarding any budget cuts.
- c. Business Affairs . No report given.
- d. Student Affairs. No report given.

e. LSUS Foundation. No report officially given. Discussion about the fact that the new guaranteed scholarship programs are getting a lot of press. An ACT score of 24 with a gpa of 3.0 is guaranteed a scholarship and is only for entering freshman. LSUS is funding the scholarships.

4. Old Business

a. Constitutional changes

Motion suggested to accept 3 constitutional changes so we can then go to Faculty Council. Motion made by **Senator Harvey Rubin** and seconded by **Senator Carl Smolinski**. The motion was adopted by a vote of faculty senate. Will set dates for pushing this to faculty in the Spring.

b. FPR Review Committee: Faculty Senate representative –**Senator Amy Erickson** – The committee has created a list of questions to give to chairs to give to faculty and will address how advising, teaching, and other concerns should factor into the FPR. Main concerns are teaching and advising, but they welcome any other insight.

c. Resolution of Support for Southern University. The executive committee did not think it was within our purview to censor Southern University in a different system so we did not think it was to our advantage to put up any barriers. Those items were dropped from the original resolution. We need a motion to adopt this resolution. **Senator Lietz** made the motion and **Senator Raymond Taylor** seconded. Discussion ensued. Resolution was passed. Matyas Buzgo abstained.

5. New Business:

a. SRTE

- i. Invite professors with high response rate in student evals to share their “secrets for success” with the faculty
- ii. Examine validity of SRTE for inclusion in FPR Reviews. There has been some questions about the validity of the SRTE. Response rates are still a question. We could put limitations and not compute any numerical data for fewer than 5 but comments could still be sent. That was the standard for the SIR II.
- iii. This information was reviewed in the Provost’s report. Any faculty with a good response rate is invited to share their tips with the senate at any time. Discussion of the value of the homegrown student evaluation ensued.

6. Observations and Concerns

a. Executive committee comments on Eva Klein Study questions. These were actually summarized in the President’s report and discussed.

b. Some faculty were concerned about advising correctly and credit hour totals that determine student classification (Fr-Sr.) Shelby: As far as registration is concerned, the registrar has a table where they put in the number of hours a person must have to register at a certain time. Pre-registration for the future term is done early on in the current term. IT is based on how many hours plus the number of hours that I am enrolled in. Anyone who does not pass with the final grade, then should not be able to take the next class.

c. Move to adjourn Adjourned at 3:03.