

ASH meeting, Oct 19, 2022

Meeting held in person in Caddo Room (rm. 305), LSU Student Union at 3:02 PM

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:02 PM by Chairperson Williams.
2. Attendance
Voting members present: Cathy Williams, Suzanne Stauffer, Kanchan Maiti, John Church, Kimberly Sparr, Maribel Dietz, Bob Mann, Sanaz Aghazadeh, Christopher Gregg, Ipsita Gupta
Not present: Mustajab Mirza, Kristopher Palagi. No proxies
Non-voting members present: Jackie Bach, Michael Blandino, Andrea Jones
Guests: Leonard M. Apcar, Wendell Gray Switzer Endowed Chair in Media Literacy; Manship College Interim Dean Josh Grimm; Josh Archote, Reveille reporter; Inessa Bazayev, Faculty senate president.
3. Minutes of the September 2022 meeting were presented for approval. Motion to approve the minutes made by Mann, seconded by Stauffer. Motion passed unanimously
4. The Chair welcomed new members Christopher Gregg from the College of Science and Ipsita Gupta from the College of Engineering to the committee. Four guests were also welcomed to the meeting.
5. There was a second reading a proposal from the School of Kinesiology to remove GRE requirement for the Master of Science in Athletic Training (MSAT). The proposal from the School of Kinesiology had been slightly revised to include a clarification of the required prerequisite courses. Motion to approve the proposal made by Dietz, seconded by Maiti. Motion passed unanimously.
6. A proposal from the Department of Accounting in the E.J. Ourso College of Business regarding GPA requirement for admission to the program. Currently both the Cumulative GPA and LSU GPA required by Accounting is 3.0. They argue for the change to 2.7 since, with the current use of +/- grading, a B- is now a 2.7. After some discussion, Stauffer moved to suspend the second reading and this was seconded by Church. The committee voted to suspend the second reading. Stauffer then moved to approve the proposal, seconded by Maiti. Motion passed unanimously.
7. A second proposal from the Department of Accounting in the E.J. Ourso College of Business stating the students in the Accounting major may only transfer in one upper-level ACCT course from another institution, if the course is deemed equivalent. There was much discussion and some confusion about this proposal. If the course is on the Tiger Transfer table will the students be confused if it doesn't then transfer. The committee then asked about the Tiger Transfer table and whether or not it could be changed. Back was going to see about this. Others brought up the Board of Regents and their course equivalencies and whether or not we could decide not to accept an "equivalent" course. Stauffer added that maybe the proposal to be positively phrased as "8 out of 9 upper level courses must be taken at LSU" instead of stating one one course could transfer. Others asked for specific examples of courses of courses that were not deemed equivalent and why. The committee suggested that we get in touch with Laura Wiley about sending a representative to the next meeting to answer questions. During the discussion Aghazadeh received an email about some upper division Accounting courses at other institutions were not taught at the same level as ours and were lacking in the areas of data analytics and intensive communication. Blandino was concerned about the coding response to such a proposal and that it would need to be programed at the degree audit level. Discussion of the proposal was deferred to the second reading at our next meeting.

8. The committee then considered a proposal from the Manship School of Mass Communication regarding removal of the 3.0 prioritization language for admission to the school, focusing instead on holistic admission and recruiting high-achieving high school students. Since we had two guests from the Manship School, Interim Dean Grimm and Prof. Apcar, the committee asked them to speak and answer questions. Grimm stated that dropping the requirement on the website would fit what the School is currently doing, admitting students after a holistic review. When asked about what is looked at he stated high school GPA and a B grade in the course on media writing. He fears that some students will see the language on the website and think that they can't get in. Stauffer thought that the language of the proposal was unclear and wondered how the students can express interest without applying. Taking MC 2010 shows interest and entering LSU as a pre-Mass Comm majors does too. There was discussion about a clear expressed interest. Grimm stated that they will be reaching out to high school students and that all students will still have a chance to apply. Bach stated that the entry course can be taken multiple times in an attempt to get the required B. Stauffer asked why not move the GPA requirement to a 2.0 instead. Grimm stated that some of the interested students are coming from pre-med majors or business majors and have rough GPAs. The committee asked that the language be cleaned up.

Prof Apcar spoke against the proposal stated that the vote of the faculty was very divided. The committee stated that this was not the place for a discussion of the voting procedures of the School. The committee had to consider the proposal in front of us. Apcar contradicted the use of high school GPA as opposed to first semester of LSU and he mentioned differences at peer institutions such as the University of Missouri. Stauffer asked why the School couldn't switch to 2.5 instead of 3.0 and Apcar agreed this would be a good idea. Grimm stated that the proposal wants to eliminate the language in favor of a holistic review. Apcar stated that the School is struggling to provide support for their students as it is and this proposal would further stress the current infrastructure. Apcar again brought up the vote and issues of faculty governance. Both the Chair and Stauffer repeated that this was not in the purview of the committee. Stauffer said the proposal should be pulled and redone. Mann mentioned that the Committee never before has asked about the nature of the vote behind the proposals that come to us. There should be a second reading at the November meeting.

Grimm asked to respond to several incorrect statements and that majority of the faculty voted for this proposal.

9. The Chair stated that she was invited to the Oct 6 meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to discuss the committee's approval of the concentrated study period proposal, which was not approved by Faculty Senate Executive Committee. There were two areas of concern – whether or not there was a full discussion of the matter (which there was) and whether we had the full committee. We had a quorum of the membership but there were two positions that were still unfilled (Science and Engineering). We also did not have representation from the students. The Chair stated that we, the committee, want to follow procedure.

10. Stauffer brought up a discussion of Blackbaud Award Management system not as a proposal but as part of our charge over scholarships. The Blackbaud system was selected and implemented without faculty input and it is a very poor system and it wastes the time of faculty. Some of the problems include no distinction between part time and full time students, not removing students after an award is received, and not stating the status of the student (what semester they are in). Stauffer stated that they can no longer determine which students receive awards and their graduate programs haven't been able to give out any awards. The system was imposed on us by the Foundation in 2020. It doesn't work with graduate programs. The committee

agreed to ask in their home programs whether their colleges have experienced the same problems. Blandino stated that you can modify the program with specific criteria and fine tune the qualifications.

11. Motion to adjourn made by Mann, seconded by Maiti. Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.