

MINUTES
AGCENTER FACULTY COUNCIL
February 23, 2007

Members Present: David Blouin, Miles Brashier, Denyse Cummins, Wayne M. Gauthier, James Hendrix, William Hogan, Clayton Hollier, Collins Kimbeng, Joan King, Donna Lee, Donnie Miller, Dale Pollet, Phillip Stouffer, and Jerry Whatley

Members Absent: Mary Grodner, Mike Hebert, Russell Markaye, Kenneth McMillin, Cynthia Stephens, and Rich Vlosky.

Guests Present: Lyda Gatewood, Ann Coulon, Chancellor Richardson and Bobby Soileau.

1. Vice-Chairman (V-C) Whatley called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. on February 23, 2007 and announced that the 14 members present constituted a quorum. Chancellor Richardson was present, announced that he had to attend a meeting with the Director of the Division of Administration, Mr. Jerry "Luke" Leblanc, but that he would return.

2. Dr. Deborah Davis Regarding LSUAC Annual Conference

Dr. Debora Davis from IRR was recognized as the individual whom the Chancellor had selected to chair the 2007 annual conference. Dr. Davis indicated that she wished to solicit input regarding annual conference from the members of this committee and began by saying that there would be an annual conference. She began the process of soliciting information by asking what might be the goals and objectives of annual conference. Immediate replies included providing people with opportunities to reconnect both personally and professionally and to give people a sense of the work and related activities of their colleagues. Subsequent discussion identified the need to provide participants with opportunities for professional improvement and motivation. However, the requirement to participate with specific ACE groups denies some participants the opportunity to participate in both professional and "soft skill" training sessions.

One of the recommendations offered to Dr. Davis was for the members of an ACE group to have the option of deciding whether that ACE group would or would not meet at annual conference. The observation was that active ACE groups don't need to rehash at annual conference what they have been doing at field days and in the course of their activity during the year. It was observed that extension agents see what research people are doing at the field days during the summer and they don't want to hear about planned research in the winter.

It was noted that recipients of the awards given out at annual conference were no longer being selected based on the recommendations of awards committees, but were rather just being named by the two vice chancellors. A motion was made by Brashier,

seconded by King and passed by a unanimous voice vote to recommend that an awards committee make recommendations of awards recipients to the vice chancellors.

Brashier observed that new agent training needed to include more than just “how to do” the paperwork. New agents need training on “how to do” one’s job and they are not receiving that training at annual conferences. Gatewood offered that the Human Resources Management (HRM) now does three day training meetings and it may be that these training meetings should be regional. As an example, Information Technology (IT) training needs to be conducted on the equipment one is using and/or is going to use. Besides, it may be more economical and effective to send a couple of trainers out into the regions for a couple of days than it is to bring all those needing training to a central site. The discussion closed on the note that people need a combination of subject matter and generic training.

Regarding years of service recognition, there appeared to be a consensus to just announce the recipients of the 25-Plus Years of Service as a group and not have them parade across a stage. Committee members observed that the formal recognitions consumed too much time. In the interest of conserving time, members of the committee thought it sufficient to have the Chancellor greet the attendees and make significant announcements impacting their lives. Being greeted by dignitaries and lesser lights with messages of little substance just takes up time and fosters cynicism. The time issue is critical in that conference participants want substance and an opportunity to be released early enough to return home in the daylight. In December, early releases are particularly important to attendees from North Louisiana and places close to the state line.

The Chancellor’s reception is an okay event as is the LSUAC Market. People like the lunch that is paid for by the Vice-Chancellors. It not only conveys appreciation, but it facilitates keeping people together.

It was observed that the various association meetings could be started earlier. The possibility of a Sunday afternoon meeting was mentioned but no specific recommendation was forthcoming.

Dr. Davis requested input regarding the registration website and noted that there were 127 late registrations. Comments were made regarding the choices available for the breakout sessions and the need to add an open option for “networking”. Participation in the cyber café increased in 2006.

The Chancellor wants to make the chairpersonship of the annual conference a two year appointment. Prior to service as chairperson, the incoming chairperson would have had a prior year of service as vice-chairperson.

Following Dr. Davis’ departure and during the course of the meeting, a question was raised as to whether any technical training occurs at annual conference. The point was that technical training needs to be provided at some time. It was observed that a

request be made of Dr. Debora Davis to provide a copy of her notes as to what this LSUAC Faculty Policy Council's thoughts were regarding annual conference.

3. Approval of January 12, 2007 Minutes

Following Dr. Davis' departure, the minutes of the January 12, 2007 meeting were distributed and subsequently approved. As secretary, Gauthier is to make them available to IT for posting on the intranet.

4. Lyda Gatewood, Sponsored Programs and Intellectual Property

Lyda Gatewood, the Director of Sponsored Program and Intellectual Property, was recognized and invited to speak. She began by observing that the Office of Sponsored Programs and Intellectual Property (OSP & IP) is primarily regulatory because of its relatively small staff of six and large numbers of people needing to be served. Larger and/or more established institutions against which LSUAC faculty compete seem to be able to provide their faculty with more support. The issue and challenge is that faculty are required to compete for outside funds to support their research and extension programs with little or no support forthcoming from the OSP & IP. The OSP&IP has the primary responsibility of insuring that the Chancellor and/or other individuals authorized to commit the institutional resources of the LSU Agricultural Center are doing so in full faith and confidence that all commitments are being handled in accordance with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations.

Lyda identified the people who staff the OSP&IP and their primary areas of responsibility. Two people work proposals and two people work contracts. Janet Lingo works with contracts full time. Lyda handles primarily private company contracts. Earlier, the computer person position was lost. The imminent departure of Linda Mumphries will entail changes in responsibilities along with some new hires. New hires will be unclassified as contrasted to civil service positions so that the OSP&IP can be more competitive in securing the human talents necessary to fill its vacant positions. All unclassified positions require the incumbent to have a BS degree.

Requests for Proposals (RFPs) are forwarded to applicable offices of the LSUAC as quickly as they come into the OSP&IP. A faculty member seeking to pursue a grant application is asked to advise the OSP&IP office as soon as possible so that they can have as much lead time as possible to provide the support critical to submission of a sound proposal. Because of the reduced staff, the only thing being looked at now is budgets and budget allocations. The OSP&IP is charged with insuring that when the Chancellor signs an application, there are assurances that all implicit and explicit commitments associated with that application will be handled in accordance with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations. Lyda noted that the federal government can audit the OSP&IP at any time. If there is just one negative finding against any one of the contracts awarded to the LSUAC, then every person associated with the LSUAC submitting proposals will have to check the "scarlet letter" box on the applicable submission form. This is one of

the reasons why the OSP&IP is so vigilant in its work. DEQ is particularly difficult to work with.

Block grants are questionable because of “earmarks”. No one is happy with electronic submissions. NSF.fastlane is a great system compared to the grants.gov system for making submissions. The NSF.fastlane system just works for the National Science Foundation. The grants.gov system must be used for submissions to any federal agency. Part of the difficulty is that different agencies have different requirements that must be satisfied within the grants.gov system. The good news is that one finds out quicker that there is a problem with their submission. The bad news is that once the submission is made, it cannot be retrieved for any purpose even if it was submitted ahead of the deadline and the deadline for the submission has not yet passed. The OSP&IP has responded to the suggestion to develop a checklist. One can also lodge complaints with the OSP&IP.

The current checklist provides for a process that consists of the following elements. Once the OSP&IP receives a note that the proposal is being developed, an internal routing form is sent to the faculty member and regional director or department head for them to acknowledge involvement in a project. Then, there is a requirement, in law, for the institutional screening committee to “sign off” on the proposal. The routing form gets saved in a notebook. The routing form should not keep the proposal from being developed.

Once the proposal goes to the OSP&IP, Wilmer tapes and reviews line item numbers in the budget. Items of particular interest include faculty salaries. A salary reported on the grant application must be consistent with the salary being paid by the LSUAC. A current salary cannot be raised through a grant. Checks are also made to determine if items included in the budget request are allowed to be purchased under the terms of the proposal. Budget justification is reviewed to determine whether something is an allowable expense and/or whether costs are reimbursable. If there are persons named in the proposal who work with other institutions, the OSP&IP needs to see the budgets from the other institutions.

All contracts, whether with public agencies or private entities, need to be routed through the OSP&IP. None of these contracts can have an individual in a post doctorate position identified as the principal investigator as a matter of university policy. The OSP&IP will not edit the proposals, but they will provide as much advice and counsel as their resources and lead time permits. Their bottom line is to establish what is being committed as institutional resources in the proposal and to establish what the researcher is doing with these resources.

If a proposal is accepted and the monies forthcoming, there is a split between the principal investigator (PI), the PI’s department and the PI’s respective vice-chancellor’s office. The PI portion ranges between 27-40% with the remaining portion being split between the department or regional office and the vice-chancellor’s offices.

The expectation is that a faculty member with a research appointment will seek out funding for their work. Every person with a research appointment needs to have a CRIS project. The success rate in securing grant funding in federal programs is low. The faculty is now bringing in more federal dollars in more different areas than ever before. Federal agencies with relatively large grant awards include the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Homeland Security, and Department of Defense (DOD). Lyda reiterated that she doesn't know how much more support her office can provide beyond their current contributions and that the OSP&IP needs to protect the institution.

With respect to Intellectual Property (IP), that office has grown over time and is staffed by Dr. Baumgartner, an accounting person, a marketing Intern and with 50% of Lyda's time. Their primary work is with research on patents and with the Cooperative Extension Service on trademarks. A US patent has to be applied for at least one year in advance of the time it is made publicly available via publications and presentations. The information regarding patents is considered confidential. On overseas patents, the clock on application starts immediately.

The patent decision depends upon whether it (the patent) is a formulation or whether it is something tangible. Once patented, it is in the public domain. Sometimes it is better to go the trade secret route than to go for a patent as a patent without a license is simply an expensive plaque. Forty percent (40%) of the royalties go to the inventor of the patent. The decision on whether to patent a creation of an LSUAC employee is made by two members of the legal counsel of Taylor, Porter, Brooks and Phillips, Lyda and the vice-chancellor for research, Dr. David Boethel.

5. Comments from Chancellor Richardson

As promised, Chancellor Richardson returned from his meeting with the Director of Administration and provided members of the LSUAC Faculty Policy Committee with the following sets of updates.

The federal budget is reflecting the shift in the balance of power that occurred with the 2007 congressional elections. Changes in the farm bill are part of that shift. The Congress wants to do away with 12,000 earmarks. For U.S. agriculture, this translates into 180 million dollars that instead of being earmarked to specific states for specific purposes will now be allocated to USDA CSREES who will provide for its distribution through competitive grants. The sum of money provided to CSREES is slightly greater than the sum of the earmarked money. In effect, the LSUAC is starting from scratch with respect to the federal portion of its 2008 budget. What Louisiana and the LSUAC really need is to have its congressional representatives on the key committees that impact budget allocations. At this time, the 2008 federal budget is not looking too promising for the LSUAC. The reality is that the budget is a political issue, not an agricultural issue. Of the \$180 million, about \$6 million was for the LSUAC. Chancellor Richardson noted that Hatch funds are formula funds and are different than McIntire-Stennis. USDA is being reorganized.

Regarding the budget for the state of Louisiana, it looks good with its \$3 billion dollar projected surplus. Unfunded items remain in the state's budget. Provisions for increases in retirement, insurance, and other costs are still in the budget. Five percent (5%) or a \$30 million dollar increase for college faculty raises is not in the budget. Chancellor Richardson expects the legislative session to be unique because of term limited legislators who will not be returning, a first term governor seeking reelection, but facing strong opposition, a number of legislators whose movements from house to senate seats creates new constituent groups to be satisfied, a heavy focus on insurance issues and an election year that compels lawmakers to provide something for everybody. Additional monies are available, but the demands for those monies continue to exceed its supply. Some of the major LSUAC capital outlay requests should be okay.

The LSUAC is getting a hurricane evacuation shelter on its property at LSU-Alexandria. It will be designed as a climate controlled multi-use facility. Chancellor Richardson wants to be sure that the state will pay for both the building and its associated costs of operation and maintenance.

The LSUAC is waiting on FEMA checks for repairs to the land sites and facilities that were made available during and after Hurricane Katrina.

Chancellor Richardson indicated that support for the ombudsperson position will be provided. He requests the LSUAC Faculty Policy Committee (FPC) provide a set of recommendations regarding establishment and level of support for the position.

Chancellor Richardson wants the FPC to have more input into membership of the LSUAC advisory committees. He doesn't want to be in the position of appointing all advisory council members.

Chancellor Richardson recognizes that the Annual Conference provides the people with an opportunity to get together once a year and get to know what other people work on during the year. He also likes to recognize people and their work. However, he remains open to suggestions ranging from minor modifications to elimination of the annual conference.

Whatley raised a question regarding the on-going rumor of returning the administration of the LSUAC back to the LSU-BR campus. Chancellor Richardson traced the source of that rumor back to the time when the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) was selected by the LSU Board of Supervisors to identify characteristics of LSU's next president. At that time, there was a concurrent concern with identifying the roles, scopes and missions of some of the units in the LSU system given that there was and is a tremendous emphasis on the flagship agenda at LSU-BR. It primarily had to do with assessing the roles, scopes and missions of LSU-A, LSU-Shreveport, and LSU-Eunice rather than the LSUAC and the LSU Law Center. While there may be a question as to whether LSU-A would be better served in a University of Louisiana (ULL) System than in the LSU system, that question is not likely to be answered for some time and that may not be the question. The question of the amalgamation of the LSUAC and Law

Center into LSU-BR versus the retention of their autonomy is not likely to occur in the near future. Chancellor Richardson is convinced that the traditional agricultural community will lead the fight for retention of the autonomy of the LSUAC. These questions don't keep LSU-BR from pursuing its flagship agenda.

6. Ann Coulon and Bobby Soileau, HRM

Ann Coulon, head of HRM for the LSUAC, was recognized and she introduced Mr. Bobby Soileau who has been working with Mike Futrell in directing the LSUAC Agriculture Leadership Program for the past two years. Mr. Soileau will be assuming full responsibility for that program when Futrell retires. In addition, Mr. Soileau has been vested with the responsibility for creating the yet unannounced LSUAC Faculty Internal Leadership Program (FILP).

As presently conceptualized, faculty members will have to apply for participation in FILP. The application process will entail interviews, but the application itself will be heavily weighted in the selection process. A prerequisite for application is five years of service in the LSUAC system. As presented, FILP will be a one year program during which participants will participate in six seminars. The sixth seminar will entail travel to Washington, D.C. for the purpose of meeting with legislators and presumably others influential in shaping the future of agriculture. The objective of FILP is to make people committed to the LSUAC more aware of how it functions so that they can become more effective internal and external communicators for the LSUAC and leaders within their own scientific communities. To that end, participants will be provided with opportunities to enhance their communications and leadership skills. It was observed that legislators are open to ideas and, as a consequence of going through FILP, participants should be well-prepared to provide them with ideas grounded in sound science as contrasted to ideas motivated by political objectives. Because of the diffusion effects of education, FILP participation should prepare its participants to be more effective in a multi-media environment. In response to a question, FILP is not modeled after programs specifically designed to identify and cultivate future leaders for an organization. Although FILP's creation is still in the oversight process, it is slated to commence in August, 2007. Donnie Miller and Cynthia Stephens serve on the FILP committee. A request was made to publicize FILP by e-mail as well as through the intranet.

Ann Coulon reported that HRM was on-track with the implementation of an expanded orientation program. Plans call for providing new employees 2.5 days of orientation training within the first six months of their employment. The first session will be a "catch-up" session for all employees plus other employees whose responsibilities include property.

The LSUAC is assigning new numbers to its employees to replace the social security account number (SSAN) for purposes of minimizing the incidences of identity theft. There is a requirement to either remove or secure all references bearing people's SSANs from LSUAC offices and forms. Hendrix expressed a concern about historical records that need to be secured, but are in insecure offices where even janitors have daily

access. In response to a question, records of livestock show participants bearing SSANs will have to be destroyed or secured.

7. James Hendrix, Allen Hogan and Donnie Miller responded to Whatley's request for three people to serve as a committee to develop recommendations for selecting members for the LSUAC's Service Unit Advisory Committees. Whatley wants recommendations for sets of turn-key procedures to be presented at the March 23, 2007 meeting. Currently, about 10 people now serve on each committee. Whatley suggestion was for committees with 9 to 12 members serving staggered three year rotations.

8. Gauthier accepted the request to check the old minutes to determine if the 2006 FAC had passed a resolution requesting its chairman, Hollier, to request from Chancellor Richardson a written statement that the responses to the diversity survey could not be found, were presumed lost and thus there would be no diversity survey report.

9. Whatley made comments about the membership status of Sponsored Programs, HRM, Communications and Accounting.

10. Hogan moved that a committee be formed to create a set of recommendations for the ombudsperson position. Recommendations need to include where the selected ombudsperson would be physically located and whether the position would be full or part time. The motion was seconded by Brashier. Gauthier, King and Pollet agreed to serve on the committee.

11. There was a discussion regarding the removal of a designated link on the LSUAC's intranet for council members. The consensus was to retain that link.

12. Committee Assignments

V-C Whatley identified people who were no longer serving on the various committees and thus needed to be replaced. To that end, the following changes were made:

- (1) Miles Brashier and Donna Lee volunteered for the Communications committee;
- (2) Rich Vlosky will replace Paul Wilson on the Information Technology Committee;
- (3) Joan King volunteered for the Sponsored Programs Committee;
- (4) Wayne Gauthier and Ken McMillian will serve on the Accounting Services committee;
- (5) Collins will serve on the International Programs Committee. King observed that the FAC needed to get Velupia to come to talk at the next (March) meeting; and
- (6) Joan King and Donnie Miller will serve on the Facility Planning committee.

13. Whatley's Observations Regarding Board of Supervisor Matters

V-C Whatley made the following observations about the LSU Board of Supervisors meeting. The LSU Faculty Council has concerns about the procedures and the processes for addressing financial exigency situations on LSU campuses. To that end, the LSU Faculty Council is requesting the support of the LSUAC Faculty Policy Council for their “Recommended Revised Version of the Regulations of the Board of Supervisors of the LSU System Concerning Financial Exigency”. V-C Whatley observed that this was to be discussed at the next meeting. It was noted that the LSUAC request for financial exigency followed AAUP guidelines.

V-C Whatley observed the retirement of Bill Silvia as the Chief Financial Officer of the LSU System. He also observed that there was upset between the LSU Board of Supervisors and the Louisiana Board of Regents. Whatley expects the search for LSU’s next president to speed up. He observed that the search committee was interested in outside candidates.

14. There is a need to check out old minutes regarding the loyalty oath.
15. The motion to adjourn the meeting was made, seconded and accepted by voice vote at 1:30 p.m. on February 22, 2007.

Respectfully Submitted,

Wayne M. Gauthier, Secretary
AgCenter Faculty Council