



Faculty Executive Committee Meeting
February 2, 2022
11:00am, LSU Union Council Room 312

Present: President Mandi Lopez, Vice President Joan King, Members-at-large Inessa Bazayev, Roger Laine, and Jeffrey Roland.

Absent: Secretary Marwa Hassan; and Past-President Ken McMillin Meeting called to order at 11:01. Roll called.

President Lopez updated on PS-63 (on the death of student or employee), which continues to undergo revision.

First agenda item: consent agenda. Professor Roland raised his objection of approving the minutes with the consent agenda, as it needed discussion. He then detailed a series of discrepancies with the minutes from January 25 agenda. He pointed out that we—as FSEC—have a communication problem with Senators and standing committees. He also underscored the discussion of pending resolutions—there should be some limits on what is considered a legitimate resolution.

Professor Laine pointed out that resolutions should be positive and should better the university. Professor King pointed out that there is nothing in Robert’s Rules to that prevents us from not allowing us to accept anonymous resolutions.

Dean Stanley Wilder (LSU Library) and Professor Gundela Hachmann (Chair of the Library Committee) were welcomed to the meeting.

The committee then went around and introduced themselves, including the two guests— Stanley Wilder, Dean of the Library, and Gundela Hachmann, Chair of the Library Advisory Committee.

Hachmann: Library collections have been heavily underfunded for at least the past decade. She had queried faculty in her college (HSS). She had submitted this report to her dean, the President, and Academic Affairs. This was initially sent out in April 2021 and then again in September 2021. There has been no reaction from the previous or the new administrative personnel.

The Library Committee hasn’t approached media or any other public outlets because they don’t want any bad media focused on LSU. However, there is no way to engage further with higher administration on the serious issue of underfunded library.

[The past Provost Haynie had been very clear that Library finding was not one of her priorities.]

President Lopez thanked Prof. Hachmann for her thorough report and work on this. She suggested that they arrange a meeting in conjunction FSEC and the Board of Supervisors (BoS) Jason Droddy and

chairperson Starns. She explained that the BoS has mistaken the need for more funding for the library in form of a new building. Instead, we need more funding to keep up to date with the library collections.

Professor Bazayev suggested that Profs. Hachmann and Wilder put together a single-page info sheet how our library compares with our peer institutions' libraries (in terms of funding and annual expenditures), including the number of LSU faculty that are increasingly using ILL.

Prof. Roland suggested linking the library to the rankings of the US Report, as well and show that the top-ranking universities have strong library funding.

Stanley Wilder expressed his reservations with Profs. Bazayev's and Roland's suggestions. He thought that his comparison document would turn off the Provost, who would say that he has a lot of other priorities to deal with and the library should take its place at the end of a long line. Dean Wilder, in turn, suggested that a better question for the BoS would be to highlight how the lack of library funding would affect LSU faculty research? (This is a better question, as it delays faculty research.)

Roland: How would you make this point significant for the people who can make a difference?

Lopez suggested Wilder clearly explain the dilemma to BoS. She suggested that the new take on this issue would be to approach BoS directly. Lopez went on to say that Chairperson Starns is receptive to faculty and will listen.

Wilder: Library collections are inadequate. What would it take to fix it? He agreed to a succinct handout (double-sided) with a clear ask.

Hachmann: There is a deep misunderstanding of how libraries are built—they are built over time. This needs to be clearly stated at that BoS meeting.

Roland suggested that Hachmann put together a resolution regarding this to put more force and publicity behind it.

Lopez amplified this suggestion and supported a positive spin on this as President Tate's vision for LSU is "research first" but research cannot be done without up-to-date library collection.

Wilder is concerned about negative publicity.

Lopez concluded that she would work with Council of Faculty Advisors to help the cause and put more pressure on this issue.

Wilder will put together a two-page document, then sent it to FSEC, which will ultimately be forwarded to the Council of Faculty Advisors, and the BoS Chairman Starns.

Lopez added that the ask on the handout should be very specific.

Wilder: The LSU library has absorbed \$300,000 decrease every year (with the exception of one year) for the past 20 years.

Lopez: Something else to think about—statutory dedication—a set amount that is provided in the state budget every year. This could be suggested to Chairperson Starns.

Roland then added that if we are going to go the statutory dedication route then the whole University should get this dedication every year.

Wilder: A bit of good news. The library is ten days away from the grand announcement of a significant acquisition of African American poetry. It's a game-changer for all of us at LSU.

Guest: Professor Roy Heidelberg (College of Business) The FSEC went around the room introducing themselves.

Heidelberg approached Lopez after January meeting to meet with FSEC, asking about resolution 21-11. He wasn't sure what we were voting on—what is considered out of order? What renders the agenda out of order? Heidelberg wanted to also clear up the notion of unnamed-sponsored resolutions by groups, such as the FSEC or Faculty Benefits Committee.

Heidelberg was trying to clear up the process of sponsorship of resolutions: A resolution is in order because it has been cleared up by the FSEC.

Roland addressed Heidelberg's questions: (1) Membership of committees that sponsored two resolutions on January 25 are known—there is no question about their identity; (2) Resolution 21-11 sponsorship was not known and that's why it was a problem.

Heidelberg: If someone reads the resolution, they don't necessarily need to be their sponsor. Lopez: There is lack of clarity on this issue.

Approval of agenda was asked by President Lopez at the beginning of January 25 meeting to put the agenda in order. (It wasn't officially approved by the FSEC prior to the meeting.) President Lopez noted that she had asked for clarity on Robert's Rules from a member of the AG's office, who was at the meeting for the Faculty Senate' December 2021 meeting.

Roland then responded that Robert's Rules have nothing to do with an agenda being in or out of order. He then clarified that Senator Meredith Veldman made a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not the anonymous resolution was in order. President Lopez's ruling that the agenda for the December meeting was in order was then appealed by Senator Bob Man appealed. Then, the FS voted on overruling the President's ruling that the agenda was in order with an anonymous resolution. The FS voted to remove the anonymously sponsored Res 21-11 and it was ultimately removed from the agenda. We were supposed to vote on the motion of Bob's appeal—the agenda was out of order. Heidelberg: Can we vote that the agenda is out of order once it's already on the agenda?

Bazayev clarified the sequence of events around Res 21-11 from November 2021 meeting: The resolution was snuck-in initially after the agenda was approved by FSEC for November meeting; then for the December meeting, Res 21-11 was back on the agenda because the FSEC took vote and it passed 4:2 (Members-at-large Jeff Roland and Inessa Bazayev voted against this anonymous resolution to be put on the agenda).

Lopez: Faculty Senate always has a right to say that they will not consider a resolution, even if it is passed by the FSEC. We have to come back together and not divide ourselves. It leaves a bad impression on administration. If no one had stood up to read the resolution, then it would have died.

Lopez also noted that she cannot be the gatekeeper of resolutions that are submitted, as their topics can be very petty and disrespectful to our government. But it is Senate's role to decide whether or not they should consider a submitted resolution. President Lopez expressed her concern about the divided nature of the Faculty Senate and stated that "we should be positive and come together."

Going back to an anonymous resolution, President Lopez said that the Senate can vote to kill a resolution. If no one takes a responsibility to read it then it doesn't go anywhere.

Professor Bazayev expressed her concern about the absurdity of an anonymous resolution (21- 11) even making it to the Faculty Senate agenda. It should have been discussed and not been entered into the agenda.

Professor King clarified that according to Robert's Rules, all resolutions need to be reported to the Faculty Senate.

Professor Roland raised the questions that "entering into the record" doesn't necessarily mean that anonymous resolutions should be included on an agenda.

Lopez said that one of the main issues at the Faculty Senate is their length. She suggested that FSEC should prioritize resolutions for the Faculty Senate meetings.

Roland added that perhaps we can cut down on guests. Some of FS meetings have been spent on a lot of guest speakers. Suggested that emergency meetings can be implemented to address pressing matters.

President Lopez and Professor King noted that an emergency meeting would be a great undertaking.

Heidelberg: Still, is an anonymous resolution still out of order if it's anonymous? There needs to be a formal recognition of who is sponsoring a resolution.

Roland said that "this body is divided on accepting an anonymous resolution." Alternatively, if a small body of faculty sponsor a resolution and they all can be identified, then it can be included on the agenda.

King: The Faculty Council resolution did not have any sponsors.

Roland: The sponsors of the resolution were not anonymous; it was offered by the FCOG members and we were all present on Zoom at that meeting on May 25, 2021. There was no question of who had authored and submitted it. We all met with President Galligan and Provost Haynie to request the Faculty Council meeting and to plan it.

Heidelberg: Then what happened on Resolution 21-11 was committee operation issue. What would be considered an "anonymous" body and they bring a resolution, then can that body be acknowledged?

Roland: It has to be a body that can be identified in some way (directly or indirectly).

Bazayev: The big problem with the anonymous Resolution 21-11 is that at least two members of the FSEC did not know who had submitted the anonymous resolution, which is dangerous and embarrassing for the committee.

Roland suggested to co-sponsor a resolution to amend the bylaws to add procedure to submitting resolutions. There is only time frame. He then suggested a resolution to change the bylaws to spell out procedures of resolution submission.

Lopez agreed with Roland: A resolution to change the bylaws to identify what goes into a resolution.

Roland: Every resolution should be a corresponding author, which is one of the co-authors of the resolution.

Lopez agreed with the above statement.

Professor Heidelberg thanked the committee for their time and left the meeting. President Lopez then did a quick run of the remaining items on the agenda items.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:35.