

Review of the Administrative Structure of Louisiana State University

SUBMITTED BY

Carol Cartwright, AGB Senior Fellow and Senior Consultant

Rich Novak, AGB Senior Fellow and Senior Consultant

George Pernsteiner, AGB Senior Consultant

Lynn Sommerville, Assistant Director, AGB Consulting

PREPARED FOR

The Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors

SUBMITTED MAY 14, 2020

Table of Contents

A. Background and Methodology	3
B. COVID-19 Note.....	3
C. Introduction.....	4
D. Interview Findings.....	5
E. Other Considerations	9
F. Principles and Best Practices for the Board of Supervisors.....	10
G. Structural and Other Options	14
H. The Fundamental Question	22
I. Guiding the Decision	24
J. The Importance of Clarity.....	25
Appendix A: List of Interviewees	26
Appendix B: Southeastern Conference Comparison	28

A. Background and Methodology

In preparation for recruiting a new president, the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University (LSU) engaged the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) to consider aspects of the University's organization and structure. Specifically, the Supervisors wish to understand whether the University would be well served by retaining a single, unified executive—a president—with University-wide leadership responsibilities including those of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College (LSU A&M) in Baton Rouge (the flagship institution of the University, itself the flagship University for the State of Louisiana) or whether the University would be better served by re-establishing the position of chancellor at LSU A&M separate from and reporting to the University president.

The AGB consulting team of Lynn Sommerville, Richard Novak, Carol Cartwright, and George Pernsteiner conducted interviews of the Supervisors; of administrators of the University and all of its campuses and Health Science Centers; of faculty, students, and staff; and of affiliated foundation leaders and donors with the aim of understanding perspectives on how well the University was functioning and what might be improved. The issue of structure was central to each of the conversations. The team interviewed more than 100 individuals associated in some fashion with LSU.

The AGB team also interviewed current and former leaders of other university systems and flagship institutions with similarities to Louisiana State University, as well as other individuals with intimate knowledge of those systems and universities, to gain insights into what works well and how their leadership structures contribute to success.

B. COVID-19 Note

The work on this engagement began before the widespread effects of COVID-19 on the United States, Louisiana, and its residents became known. For that reason, much of what is written in this report may seem to some to no longer be pertinent due to the magnitude of changes the University, the State, and American society are undergoing due to the virus. However, many of the interviews conducted with LSU faculty, staff, students, and supporters occurred after the impact of the virus became more obvious. Their observations were very similar to comments made by people interviewed before the impact of COVID-19 became well known. That points to the fact that the University, while it may be changed in many ways by the effects of COVID-19, will continue and will be expected to fulfill its mission as Louisiana's flagship university—educating students, conducting research, offering high quality health care, and engaging effectively with agriculture, industry, and communities throughout Louisiana. LSU is about the future of Louisiana and the nation and will find the means to thrive in a post-COVID-19 world.

The COVID-19 outbreak argues both for strong leadership for the University and perhaps for as little immediate structural disruption as possible. Significant changes in enrollment, in

operations, in human resources, in medical care, and in opportunities will accompany LSU's response to the pandemic. LSU's interim president may be called upon to provide both stability and creativity in the coming months.

For the AGB team, COVID-19 does not change findings and options. But we recognize that the timing of decisions and searches may be affected. Hiring a new president during a crisis such as COVID-19 and, especially, making a simultaneous organizational change (which always will be disruptive) may not be ideal. If the Board engages effectively with the interim president to advance the University and its mission during the next several months, the University will be well served. The Board and the University can use that time to define and adjust to the new realities the University faces and better understand how LSU has fared under stress and what qualities the Board believes it should seek in a new president, regardless of structure. Before searching for a new president, the Supervisors should define clearly what they need in a single leader or in multiple leaders. The Supervisors also might consider whether and when to implement some suggestions, not related to structure, that emerged during the interviews conducted by the AGB team. However, the possible financial impacts of COVID-19 on the University's state appropriations may make new investments, however much needed, difficult to realize in the short term without reallocating funds from other functions.

C. Introduction

In 2012, the LSU Board of Supervisors began its pursuit of a concept that became known as One LSU—essentially, a re-thinking of the LSU System as a single, cohesive, statewide branded flagship university comprised of the main campus in Baton Rouge; Health Science Centers in New Orleans and Shreveport; regional campuses in Eunice, Alexandria, and Shreveport; the Pennington Biological Research Center (also in Baton Rouge); and LSU Ag Center (also in Baton Rouge and with locations in all 64 Louisiana parishes). Although greater integration of academic programs and administrative services was (and remains) a major goal, the combining of the president's and chancellor's positions, and that of other senior leaders in the president's office and at the Baton Rouge campus, remains the effort's most obvious change.

Louisiana State University has endured a tumultuous decade due largely to significant budget reductions from the State. Combining the president's and chancellor's roles and responsibilities in 2013, when both the president and chancellor positions were vacant, should be understood against the backdrop of those cuts. The staffing of the president's office was reduced from about 75 positions to, at one point, fewer than 20, with the Baton Rouge campus staff taking on greater support responsibilities with respect to the University generally and on behalf of elements of the University beyond Baton Rouge (particularly the campuses in Alexandria, Eunice, and Shreveport). The president became the leader of the Baton Rouge campus, the executive vice president began to oversee both the University's finances and those of the Baton Rouge campus, and the provost of the Baton Rouge campus began to function also as the vice president for academic affairs for the University. Those joint roles continue.

Dr. F. King Alexander was hired by the Supervisors in 2013 to be the president of the University and to lead the flagship A & M campus in Baton Rouge. He recently left the position to assume a presidency at a university in another state. During Dr. Alexander's presidency, LSU saw significantly improved student success, as measured by total enrollment, diversity of the students, retention, and graduation. LSU also has launched an online instructional effort, drawing on the faculty of all campuses.

The Board of Supervisors is now taking stock of what has happened during the past several years and assessing whether a structure which combines the presidency of the University and the chancellorship of the flagship campus in one person remains the leadership model best suited for LSU's future. Before the Board recruits a new leader for the University it must define clearly what the responsibilities of that leader will be.

But a more fundamental question arises before the Board of Supervisors assesses the best administrative structure suited for LSU's future. The question is this: Is LSU a single institution with a unified identity, or is LSU a system of eight different institutions with a common name? Pondering this question has direct bearing on the question of administrative structure. This report will touch on this fundamental question and how it relates to administrative structure throughout, with a fuller discussion in Section H.

D. Interview Findings

The AGB team interviewed over 100 persons in individual and group meetings, both in person and via telephone. In-person meetings were conducted in early March in Baton Rouge, and telephone meetings were conducted in late March and early April, mostly with interviewees from Shreveport as COVID-19 prevented planned travel to Shreveport for in-person meetings.

Many of those interviewed spoke of a dysfunctional relationship between the University president and the Baton Rouge chancellor in the time period just before the two positions were combined. However, many also believe that the problem was not structural but related to the personalities of the two then incumbents, to lack of clarity about responsibilities for the president and the chancellor, and to the willingness of the Supervisors and other State leaders to allow the president and chancellor both to advocate (often against the other) with the legislature and the Governor. End-runs to Supervisors and elected officials were tolerated and, some said, even rewarded.

When the current structure was adopted and Dr. Alexander was hired, several changes were made in how the University operated. First, the leadership for finance and administration that had been divided between the LSU system office and the Baton Rouge campus was combined. Those interviewed all noted the improvement that came from those offices not fighting with one another. Similar comments were voiced about the consolidation of the system academic affairs office with the Baton Rouge provost's office. Simultaneous with these consolidations

were the streamlining of many administrative processes and a change in attitude in both the provost's office and in the legal affairs office to be more facilitative of what campuses wanted to do in comparison with what was viewed as a gatekeeper role for the president's office under the prior structure.

For those interviewed who favor re-establishing a chancellor position for the Baton Rouge flagship, many opine that the combined role is too big and filled with inherent conflicts for any one individual to perform well. Further, they state that the Baton Rouge campus needs its own advocate and leader. Several individuals from other campuses feel the president is too much the head of the A&M (Baton Rouge) campus and does not take their interests into full account.

However, there are concerns, especially among faculty at the A&M campus and some Supervisors, about higher costs if the chancellor position is re-established. In part, this is due to the position itself but also because other positions might have to be established in the finance and academic affairs areas in order to provide both proper leadership to the campus and for the University. After a decade of budget reductions, there is reluctance to add administrative costs—especially when there is a general recognition that faculty, facilities, and technology needs are acute. Some of those interviewed, however, say that cost should not be a paramount driver of decisions. These people hold that the Supervisors should define the purposes and goals they are trying to achieve and then determine the structure and investments most likely to lead to success. After that, they should figure out how to pay for the changes.

A roughly equal number of those interviewed favor keeping the structure as it is. Part of the reason is cost. Part, too, is fear of a repetition of the conflict and competition between the president and the chancellor that had prevailed under the older structure. A few spoke of the stature the combined position provides at both the national level and in Louisiana, while others believe the current combined structure has not been in place long enough to see whether it could work well. Some pondered whether perceived problems are more the result of the single incumbent who served in the combined position rather than of the structure itself. It must be said that all respondents who expressed an opinion about Dr. Alexander mentioned the successes LSU enjoyed during his presidency as well as concerns about opportunities that were not seized.

Most of those interviewed, particularly faculty and staff at the A&M campus in Baton Rouge, believe that an open, nationwide search is needed for the president's position and for a chancellor's position if the Supervisors re-establish that job. Many of those interviewed believe that both positions should be held by "academics," although some acknowledge that the president's position need not be if the chancellor's position is. If the roles remain combined, virtually everyone agrees that the president must have a strong academic record. There were several interviewees who believe that a Louisiana connection is essential for the president to be successful. Local knowledge and connections are seen as being very important by these people. Others worry that hiring someone from Louisiana would send a message of insularity and patronage.

A final suggestion was that the Board of Supervisors first hire a new president and then work with that president to determine how the University should be structured and whether a chancellor's position for the A&M campus should be created.

In the course of the interviews, it became apparent that there are challenges and opportunities that Louisiana State University faces that are not directly related to the question of whether a chancellor position should be established for the A&M campus. In fact, many stated that confronting LSU's challenges and taking advantage of its opportunities depends much more on having the right persons in positions of leadership than it does on structure.

A frequent lament was that research productivity stagnated during the time that Dr. Alexander was president. This was tied, in part, to a reduced number of faculty occasioned by budget cuts. However, it also was ascribed to a lack of vision, a lack of leadership, and a lack of collaboration. Although many at LSU see the possibility of getting federal designation as a Cancer Center of the National Institutes of Health's National Cancer Institute, it was recognized that this is a "test case" on collaboration and will take the joint efforts of both of the Health Science Centers, Pennington, and perhaps the science departments at the A&M campus. The interim president is taking the lead to energize such efforts. But sustaining that work will require vision, leadership, persistence, and expertise, according to many who spoke about this opportunity—an opportunity that could take years to come to fruition even if successful.

The pursuit of a cancer center designation by the National Cancer Institute notwithstanding, there are common complaints that the University does not have the vision and leadership to develop an effective collaborative research strategy, and complaints that the president's office has not had the right resources to lead and energize research. Part of this may be due to Dr. Alexander's focus on undergraduate education. But part is attributed to a lack of key staff in the president's office with the knowledge, expertise, and authority to engage the two Health Science Centers, Pennington, and the A&M campus in this cause, or in other collaborative efforts. This belief was amplified by a perception that the University's vice president for research functions as the research administrator for the A&M campus only, and that the University is unwilling even to address relatively inexpensive faculty desires for seed and bridge funding and adequate stipends for graduate student research assistants.

Opinions varied about the willingness of the Health Science Centers, Pennington, and the A&M campus to work together collaboratively and, more particularly, to accept orchestration of their efforts by the president or senior staff in the president's office. Part of the division of opinion mirrored views about Louisiana's north-south divide and how that manifests itself within the University.

Louisiana State University is Louisiana's flagship university but many of those from campuses stressed that the University suffers from a poverty mentality (perhaps as a result of years of budget reductions) and not the spirit of abundance that an ever-expanding and ever-questing

research institution needs. The culture of the University, according to these people, needs to change to become more aspirational.

To do so will require dynamic, optimistic, visionary, and sustained leadership from a president—a president, furthermore, who embraces not only the University’s important instructional role, but its broader mission including research and public service, as being critical to the success of the University and the success of Louisiana.

Many of those interviewed spoke of the need for transparency, especially with respect to the budget and finances of the University. There seems to be limited knowledge about how or why funds are allocated by the executive vice president, and there is a strong belief by some that the Baton Rouge campus is subsidizing the other entities within LSU. A countervailing view holds that the campuses, with increasing enrollment, are getting new funding and that other entities within LSU (the Health Science Centers, Pennington, and the Ag Center) are seeing budgets slashed continuously. Further, few seem to understand or accept as valid the allocation formula used by the Louisiana Board of Regents to distribute state funds to LSU and to the other three higher education systems within Louisiana. A different view is held by finance leaders at both the University and campus levels. These people affirm that they understand how allocations are made and that the Board of Regents formula dictates those allocations. This difference of understanding suggests an internal communications issue regarding budget and finances, both about how the Board of Regents formula would allocate funds and with respect to any reallocation decisions made by the Board of Supervisors.

Issues of inadequate facilities and outdated and vulnerable information technology (IT) systems were raised repeatedly and often graphically. Particularly with respect to information technology, these issues were conflated with statements about whether the president’s office understood the urgency of the problems and risks that attend IT system failure.

Many realize the financial challenges facing LSU require a new business model—one that, foremost, takes into account that the University receives only 20 percent of its total revenues from the State, whose funding focuses mostly on student enrollment, while enrollment declines are likely at Louisiana colleges and universities in as early as five years even without any lasting effects from COVID-19. The COVID-19 pandemic may hasten the expected enrollment decline and lead to the need for greater on-line enrollment and remotely delivered services to students and to other clients of the University. Obviously, possible reductions in state appropriations resulting from the effects of COVID-19 could have significant effects, at least during 2020. Such changes also would likely demand alternatives in the pricing and cost structure of education and, perhaps, of health care. It should be noted that Louisiana has a statewide strategy to re-engage adults with some college and no degree. This effort has been embraced eagerly by other public postsecondary systems within Louisiana and may be an area for more active engagement by LSU, as well.

Repeatedly, those interviewed, almost regardless of their own roles, believed more staffing, and especially more senior level staffing, was needed at the president's office. Dr. Alexander was faulted for being unwilling to add positions that could have helped LSU be more effective operationally and, especially, in collaborative medical research.

There also is a sense among several interviewed that LSU is better integrated and less of a loose "confederation" of campuses than it was previously, but that much more needs to happen to make LSU even more cohesive and greater than the sum of its component parts. Despite some concerns voiced about the lack of sufficient flexibility, time delays in approvals, and "one size fits all" business practices, many point to the value of administrative and academic cooperation and integration. They feel whatever executive leadership structure is determined best and whatever the Board of Supervisors decides to call LSU—a single statewide flagship institution or a university system—the progress toward greater integration should continue.

Finally, there was a common complaint that the recent strategic planning process was too centered on the A&M campus, was not really inclusive of all LSU entities, and did not lead to an overall plan that could guide the development of campus or entity plans aligned with it. As a result, a compelling strategic plan that could address many of the issues faced by the entire University and all its entities (an enterprise strategy, in the words of some) did not materialize. One will be sorely needed once LSU is defined as either a single university or as a system of institutions striving to achieve complementary goals, and once a permanent president is selected who can lead the plan's development.

When the AGB team discusses LSU either as a single university or as a system of institutions, it is mindful of the language of the Louisiana Constitution which states that the Board of Supervisors shall "supervise and manage the institutions, statewide agricultural programs, and other programs administered through its system." Nothing in this report suggests that any of the current eight entities that comprise LSU would not be treated as an entity or program of the University. Rather, the approach of a single university refers to how the institutions are administered and not to whether they are institutions.

E. Other Considerations

Although not often raised during interviews, the issues of private fund-raising and engaging with philanthropy, are important roles for university leaders. This is likely to increase in importance in the future as state funding and student enrollment may diminish, but the expectations for the University to serve the needs of the State in research, knowledge generation, and economic development, nonetheless, expand. Philanthropy will be needed to support and extend the work of every component part of the University: the A&M campus in Baton Rouge, the three other campuses, the Health Science Centers, Pennington, and the Ag Center.

The few mentions of fund-raising made during the interviews dealt with the need for the president to lead it. But little was said about how that should happen. Dr. Alexander was given great credit for getting all the many LSU foundations (especially those in Baton Rouge) to work together. Each had operated very independently in prior years, often tapping the same donors in an uncoordinated fashion or not pooling endowment assets to achieve higher investment gains.

There was some criticism from interviewees from outside the Baton Rouge A&M campus that the combined position sends mixed signals to donors about where philanthropic donations might go because the president now also is the head of that campus. This may be a limited issue since donations very often are made for specific purposes. Where the question may arise regards relatively small, unrestricted donations to the University.

The role of campus leadership in fund-raising deserves mention. Two members of the AGB team have served in the roles of president and chancellor. Their experience, and the norm among universities in the United States, is that the campus leader is the chief fund-raiser for that campus.

Obviously, if the LSU president and chancellor positions remain combined, the leader holding the position will be the chief fund-raiser for the Baton Rouge campus. However, if the position is divided, the chancellor would be the head fund-raiser for A&M's needs, and fund-raising for A&M should not be an expectation of the president. This is counter to what some of those interviewed expressed as the desired approach for LSU. Those interviewees maintain that the president in a divided structure should still be the leader of fund-raising for the Baton Rouge campus. From the experience of the AGB team members, relegating the campus chancellor to a lesser role in fund-raising would be confusing to potential donors and a mistake. The experience of the AGB team members leads us to believe that donors identify with campuses and expect that the head of that campus is the person with whom they will work.

In a similar vein, the more typical approach taken in university systems in the United States is for the chancellor of the campus, not the president of the system, to be responsible to oversee intercollegiate athletics. That, too, is counter to the desires expressed by several of those interviewed, who believe that even under a divided administrative structure, the president should oversee intercollegiate athletics at the A&M campus. The student athletes are students enrolled at the A&M campus, a campus that, if the positions are divided, would be led by a chancellor who should be responsible for intercollegiate athletics.

F. Principles and Best Practices for the Board of Supervisors

Before considering options for LSU's administrative structure and deciding upon a course of action, the Board of Supervisors would be well served to establish a set of principles and best

practices to guide its deliberations and decisions. These would include principles and practices about what should be achieved and about how the Board will undertake its efforts.

The first seven of these principles and best practices directly affect how the Board might consider the decision about a single university or a system, about what purposes it wants to achieve through all of the assets of LSU, the administrative structure it believes will best facilitate those achievements, the roles and responsibilities of the president and other key administrators, and the qualities it will seek in a new president. The others will help guide the Board of Supervisors in its role as an engaged fiduciary for the University.

Keep in mind the primary stakeholders. Louisiana’s citizens are the prime beneficiaries of LSU’s many successful educational programs, its high caliber research and knowledge generation, and the range of its many services. As it considers its pending decision on administrative structure, the Board of Supervisors needs to: 1) promise that there will be no diminishment of LSU’s capacity to meet the needs of the State and its citizens, and 2) be cognizant that no matter what decision it makes, how the decision is communicated will either build or erode citizens’ trust and collective pride in their flagship university. The welfare of students, faculty, and staff also must remain a primary concern of the Board of Supervisors. Although students are often unaffected by changes in administrative structures and executive leaders, perceived structural instability can affect faculty and staff morale and the retention of faculty, deans, and other academic administrators and staff on the campuses and in the president’s office.

The whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Regardless of the administrative structure that is determined by the Board of Supervisors and despite the mission diversity of LSU’s campuses and entities, progress should continue making LSU’s campuses and entities less siloed organizations. The Board needs to encourage, if not demand, administrative and academic integration and coordination, such as enhanced shared services, ease of student transfer, and greater faculty collaboration in research. Such efforts need not infringe on local flexibility. A mindset that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts also communicates that a synergy exists among LSU campuses and centers—that they complement each other’s strengths and can accomplish much more by working together than by competing or working in isolation.

Ensure the independence of the board. The independence of the Board of Supervisors should be viewed as sacrosanct, given legally in Louisiana law. Governing boards must maintain their independent policymaking authority from any outsized role exercised by external or internal stakeholders, be they political leaders, appointing authorities, donors, or faculty, students, and staff. The input of stakeholders should be welcomed and sought. But no single group or individual should be given undue influence in the Board of Supervisors’ policy decisions (a SACS accrediting standard), nor should the Board inadvertently invite intrusion into the boardroom that infringes on its legal policy independence.

People matter more than structure. What has long been observed to be true throughout higher education also is true in Louisiana and for LSU: no administrative structure can guarantee desired results. Although an administrative structure with conflicting or overlapping responsibilities can negatively affect performance and even lead to dysfunction, good leaders working in good faith for common purposes, with clear goals and clear accountability expectations, can be successful within any reasonable structure.

Unite behind the ultimate decision. Whatever the final decision regarding the leadership structure of LSU, all members of the Board of Supervisors must unite behind that decision and not question or undermine it overtly or inadvertently through comments to the press or to LSU stakeholders. The Board Chair should be the sole voice to discuss the Board's decision. The sign of an effective, cohesive governing board is one in which policy decisions, especially ones difficult or controversial, are fully and fairly debated. But once the board makes a decision, the result is accepted by all its members.

Ensure absolute clarity between the responsibilities of the president and those of chancellors and other entity heads. The members of the Board of Supervisors must maintain a level of self-discipline to enable any adopted administrative structure to be successful. The Board of Supervisors must make clear that chancellors and other entity heads report directly to and are evaluated by the president. The Board must make it understood that end-runs by chancellors and center heads around the president to the Board, to elected officials, or to the media will not be tolerated. This understanding must work in both directions—the members of the Board must also maintain a level of self-discipline in their interactions with chancellors, elected officials, and the media to enable the president in any adopted structure to be successful.

Support the president, set clear expectations, and hold him/her accountable. The Board of Supervisors must support the president as the head of the University or as the system chief executive. An annual set of written, mutually agreed-upon goals and expectations should be developed jointly by the Board and the president defining what the Board expects of the president and what the president expects of the Board. All executive session discussions between the president and the Board, performance evaluations, and the like must be held in strict confidence to the extent allowed by Louisiana law.

Know and support the work of all LSU campuses and centers and their executive leaders. With clear executive authority vested in the president, Board members should be encouraged to get to know each chancellor and center head (including those outside their geographical region), and be reasonably knowledgeable about the programs, student profiles, faculty, research capacity, public services, and other notable aspects of each campus or center. Rotating board meetings among the campuses, the Health Science Centers, and the Pennington Center could help to facilitate broad understanding of all parts of the University.

Initiate a new strategic planning process. Once the permanent president has been in office for a suitable period, the Board of Supervisors should charge him/her with developing an LSU

strategic plan through an inclusive, comprehensive planning process. The Board should have an appropriate level of engagement with and oversight of the process, ensuring: that there is stakeholder buy-in; that the resulting plan serves as a guide for the alignment and development of individual plans for each of the major entities of LSU (campuses, Health Science Centers, Pennington, and the Ag Center); that the plan is realistic, truly strategic and aspirational, and not divorced from the LSU budgeting process; that metrics are insisted upon to measure the plan's implementation and progress; and that Board meeting time is devoted to monitoring implementation and progress.

Resist any inclination or temptation to get involved in LSU administrative affairs or day-to-day operations. Policymaking and administration are not always as distinct and complementary as many would like. Nevertheless, the members of the Board of Supervisors must refrain from intruding into management decisions that are the responsibility of the president, chancellors, and other administrative heads. This might mean taking a look at state law and board by-laws and policies to determine whether there is clarity and agreement regarding the decisions the Board wishes to delegate to the president and those it wishes to reserve for itself.

Encourage and incentivize innovation and collaboration. The Board of Supervisors should consider holding back a small portion of the LSU budget each fiscal year for faculty grants to fund innovative projects in education and research, including collaborations within campuses and between campuses and centers. The application process should be competitive, with monies distributed across all LSU entities. Project priorities should be determined each year with the president and award decisions made by the president and the Board (or Board committee). Such “seed” grants could pay big dividends down the line, in terms of discoveries, advancement of knowledge, and, most probably, additional external funding.

Embrace board orientation and education. The Board of Supervisors should commit to orientation of new members and to the continuing education of all members. Foremost, orientation and education programs should focus on the fiduciary responsibilities of the Board and on developing an understanding of higher education, generally. Additionally, the Board should devote fixed periods of time at most of its meetings for educating members on issues of salience to the Board and LSU, but on which no decision is imminent. The Board should consider creating a Governance Committee to plan the orientation and education programs.

Assess the Board's performance annually. The Board of Supervisors should conduct an annual retreat for a candid and full discussion of the Board's performance for the previous year. Preparation for retreats should begin with members' own assessment of the Board. If allowable under Louisiana open meetings laws, retreats should be done in closed session. The president should be a full participant. If desired, an outside third party can facilitate retreats. SACS accrediting guidelines state that boards should “regularly evaluate (their) responsibilities,” but the Board of Supervisors should exceed the guidelines with a goal of creating a positive board culture—one that can be sustained as members rotate on and off the Board.

These principles and best practices should guide the Board of Supervisors in their consideration of, deliberations about, and decisions concerning the following structural and other options.

G. Structural and Other Options

Five structural and improvement options (or scenarios) are explored in the following section. These are: 1) maintaining the current structure as it is; 2) maintaining the current structure but adding resources for leadership for collaboration and other critical functions; 3) maintaining the current structure and invigorating the provost position at the A&M campus to provide visible leadership for that campus; 4) establishing a chancellor position, reporting to the President, to lead the A&M campus; and 5) establishing a chancellor position, reporting to the President, to lead the A&M campus and adding resources to the president's office for leadership regarding collaboration and other critical functions.

Each of these options will be discussed in turn. But **clarity of roles and responsibilities will be essential** if success is to be achieved, no matter which alternative is adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

The Board should bear in mind that leadership matters more than does structure and that structure's role is to add clarity regarding responsibilities. Further, under every option, the AGB team assumes that LSU will build upon its progress in advancing student success and will permit each of its campuses and other entities enough flexibility to fulfill their individual missions and meet the needs of their students, patients, and communities.

Regardless of the option chosen by the Board of Supervisors, the AGB team believes there are important actions that the Board of Supervisors should consider. They are as follows:

- Consider a search process for the president (we suggest a national search) that engages faculty, staff, and students from all institutions within the University;
- Set clear expectations from the Board as to what it wishes the president to achieve in all major areas (student success, research, engagement with the state, collaboration among all entities within the University);
- Demystify the resource allocation/budget process through greater transparency;
- Issue a firm statement that the procedural changes and efficiencies that accompanied the switch to the current structure will be continued; and
- Empower staff in the president's office to take a more active leadership role in collaborative research involving the Health Science Centers and Pennington, as well as the A&M campus and the Ag Center.

Additional specific considerations apply to each option and are described in the following sections.

An important consideration is what many told us during interviews: “Don’t return to the old ways,” meaning that LSU must continue the improvements in processes and spirit of facilitation that have been undertaken since 2013. Whatever structure is decided upon, the Supervisors must ensure that the old battle lines are not redrawn and that old bureaucratic procedures are not reinstated.

While this engagement did not include a request for the AGB team to prepare specific details for a path forward for the Board of Supervisors, we have included with each option a list of important considerations and decisions that the Board would need to make to implement the option. Together with the considerations described on page 14, these decisions provide a guide to implementing whichever option is chosen by the Board.

G.1. Maintaining Current Structure as It Is

This option is the easiest to understand in that there would be neither structural changes nor changes in procedures or in resources and resource allocation. This option fulfills the desire of some to give the relatively new structure that combined the president and chancellor positions more time to mature so that its real advantages and disadvantages become clearer. The current structure, after all, has been in place during the tenure of just one president and many believe it is not possible to disentangle the virtues and faults of that single incumbent from any advantages and disadvantages the structure itself has. It is obvious that student success was not only the top priority of Dr. Alexander but that such success was demonstrated and improved during his time in office. Would a new and different president be able to maintain and build upon that success while also providing the kind of leadership for research, for example, that many interviewees believe has been lacking?

This option has some inherent advantages. First, the disruption inevitably caused by structural change would be avoided. This would help ensure a smoother transition to a new leader and could make it more likely that the current student success momentum could be maintained.

This statement is made without reference to the disruptions caused by campus closures due to COVID-19. Dealing with a pandemic and the actions that the University takes in order to address it causes significant disruption. Adding a structural change to the mix (and the attendant “who’s in charge” question that it would raise for at least a time) could add uncertainty to the University and its community, depending on how sustained the pandemic and its effects are.

Second, this option does not cost any more money.

But the option has some disadvantages, too. First, it does not address the perceptions that the A&M campus in Baton Rouge feels abandoned without a chancellor, or conversely, that the A&M campus is favored inordinately by a president with direct responsibilities for that campus.

Second, it does not provide additional resources to areas that are commonly viewed as needing more investment (e.g., research, deferred maintenance, information technology), nor does it provide additional staff resources in the president's office to support those areas and others needing attention.

If the no change alternative is to work well to serve the university's mission and to have more credibility than it currently enjoys, the Board of Supervisors should consider the following in addition to the actions described on page 14 in the introduction to all the options.

1. Understand that the expectations from the Board of Supervisors regarding presidential achievements are to occur with current-level staffing and resources.
2. Ensure that the statement about continuing the changes and efficiencies that accompanied the switch to the current structure will be continued with current-level staffing and resources.
3. Define clearly the Board's expectations for the president in terms of the leadership of the A&M campus with regard to enrollment, student success, research productivity, external relations, fund-raising, engagement with faculty, and effective campus operations.

G.2. Maintaining the Current Structure but Adding Resources for Leadership for Collaboration and Other Critical Functions

Although some see the need for visionary and vocal leadership within the president's office for continued and enhanced shared services, research collaboration, growth and collaboration in on-line education, and other central office activities as independent of resources, most think that at least some additional positions are needed to provide the support necessary to make that leadership effective.

This is seen as especially true for research, where there is clear dissatisfaction with what is viewed as the University's stagnation in research funding. Many believe that the University has not appropriately and aggressively pursued the research opportunities and funding so essential to its role and identity as the State's flagship university. This became particularly evident in conversations about a possible National Cancer Institute designation (which, because it would likely require collaboration among several of LSU's entities, would need presidential leadership to achieve). Additional expertise in the health sciences may be needed in the president's office, perhaps in the form of an executive vice president for health sciences who would provide expertise and leadership in that critical field, particularly for leadership for collaborative research.

Concerns regarding sufficient expertise for research and research collaboration are real, but concerns about expertise reach into other areas of the president's office, as well. As some suggest, the need for a chief operating officer could free the president from day-to-day

activities in order to permit her or him to focus more on high priority areas and external relations.

Other areas where those interviewed believed the University did not invest enough were in replacing aging information technology systems and in repairing facilities.

An advantage of this option, as was the case with Option G.1., is that no disruption would be occasioned by structural change. Another advantage is that the University could make targeted investments in areas it believed were important to fulfilling the mission of the University.

A disadvantage is that more money would be required for enhanced staffing in the president's office, be it a chief operating officer or a position for collaborative research (or both). Added resources could also be used to replace aging information technology systems and to repair facilities, and for targeted investments, such as a pool for research match/startup/bridge/seed money of whatever amount the Supervisors determined.

If this is the alternative chosen by the Supervisors, they should adopt the actions described on page 14 and, in addition, consider these recommendations:

1. Determine priorities for the University in terms of goals for research and other critical aspects of the flagship and land grant mission. This would require a more comprehensive analysis into what the University should and could achieve for the State than the AGB engagement currently permits. However, the decision must be that of the Supervisors.
2. Determine whether the executive vice president for health services position, if established, would have any direct authority over the Health Science Centers or research or would serve to orchestrate the efforts of LSU entities. A variant on this option would be to designate the heads of the Health Science Centers and Pennington as vice presidents of the University and designate the executive vice president for health sciences (or another position) to coordinate their efforts. All these leaders could report to the president.
3. Determine whether the chief operating officer position, if established, would have any direct authority over any of the entities or whether each chancellor would continue to report directly to the president, while the COO would be the most senior deputy with authority to act in the president's absence or within a certain scope of responsibilities.
4. Define clearly the Board's expectations for the president in terms of the leadership of the A&M campus with regard to enrollment, student success, research productivity, external relations, fund-raising, engagement with faculty, and effective campus operations.

G.3. Maintaining the Current Structure and Invigorating the Provost Position at the A&M Campus to Provide Leadership

This is essentially the model that the University of Hawai'i adopted in 2019 (although they had operated in this fashion on an acting basis for a few years). It is based on the approach taken by flagships such as the University of Washington, Indiana University, and the University of Minnesota. In this model, the provost of the flagship research campus is an officer of the university and is part of the President's Council on an equal basis with the chancellors of the other campuses.

Even though provost is used in this title, this is a very different position from that of executive vice president and provost currently in use at LSU. The possible new position at the A&M campus would be the titular leader of that campus and would be responsible for all direct academic functions—the core of the institution. It would bear University-wide responsibilities to the same extent as the chancellors of the other campuses and Health Science Centers currently bear such responsibilities.

Functions that support the A&M campus and the entire University (e.g., finance and facilities) would continue to report to the executive vice president.

An advantage of this approach is that the A&M campus would have a clear leader dedicated to its interests, responsible for all matters dealing with the education, research, and service of the campus and well-being of faculty, staff, and students. In addition, for audiences external to the campus (donors, legislature, governor, etc.), there would be no confusion of responsibilities with the president of the University, since the president would be its unchallenged external facing executive. Responsibility for intercollegiate athletics would also remain with the president.

It would be incumbent upon the president to ensure that the A&M provost is a member of the President's Council, a full participant in the University on a par with the chancellors of the other campuses, and that collaboration occurs among all the elements of LSU.

In order to maintain appropriate autonomy for A&M, it would be necessary to have a well-functioning academic affairs unit in the president's office, separate from that of A&M, and which serves all campuses. A downside is that this would require additional resources to re-energize that office and to ensure that academic planning and new program approvals are handled efficiently and effectively. Although there may be some positions that could be transferred from the A&M campus to help effect that, it is likely that at least some additional positions would be needed.

Another downside to this option is that the other issues raised during interviews (e.g., lack of investment in research, the need for greater collaboration across campuses) would not be

addressed. However, the introduction of other resources for those purposes is not precluded by the strong provost option.

If this is the alternative chosen by the Supervisors, they should adopt the actions described on page 14 and, in addition, consider these recommendations:

1. Be very clear about the responsibilities of the provost, the president, and the new academic affairs leader in the president's office so that expectations are well known to those in the roles and to the entire University community. This is especially salient with respect to those functions of the A&M campus not under the purview of the provost and to the role the provost plays in relation to the chancellors and heads of the other major LSU entities.
2. Make clear that the provost reports to and is evaluated by the president.

G.4. Establishing a Chancellor Position, Reporting to the President, to Lead the A&M Campus

The structure of Louisiana State University in the years before 2013 included a president for the LSU system and a chancellor for the A&M campus in Baton Rouge. The president oversaw all eight entities within LSU while the chancellor presided over the operations of the campus and represented the campus in dealings with the president/system and external audiences. The positions were combined to facilitate the vision of One LSU, and to end competition between the president and the chancellor.

Reinstating the chancellor position would provide clear operational leadership for the A&M campus and clear representation of the campus in the cabinet of the University. However, to avoid the conflicts and dysfunction that characterized the president-chancellor relationship under the pre-2013 model, the Board of Supervisors would have to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each of the positions and would need to delineate the working relationship between the two positions. The chancellor would report to the president and that relationship must be made especially clear and unambiguous.

The advantages of this option include clear and visible leadership for the A&M campus, clear high-level attention for that campus and its needs, and a voice for that campus in University-wide discussions that is not conflated with the voice of the University's chief executive officer. This would deal with issues expressed by some at the A&M campus that they are disadvantaged by not having their own campus chancellor and by some at other institutions that the president, perforce, favors the A&M campus since the president now heads that campus. The AGB team anticipates any new A&M chancellor also would spearhead fund-raising efforts for the campus in Baton Rouge, providing undiluted leadership of that function for the campus. The A&M chancellor also would oversee intercollegiate athletic programs for students at that campus.

Disadvantages include increased cost and the potential for conflict between two high level and highly visible executives. Further, this option may make it more difficult for the University to sustain the more streamlined processes that accompanied the 2013 structural change. In addition, this option does not address the generally perceived need for additional resources in areas such as research, deferred maintenance, or information technology. Nor does it deal with the view of those who feel that unified presidential leadership is needed to lead and facilitate collaborative research among the campuses, the Health Science Centers, the Ag Center, and the Pennington Biomedical Research Center. These matters, of course, could be addressed by the Supervisors by the addition of resources to the President's Office and clear statements about the president's authority (see Option G.5).

Although it is difficult to estimate the increased costs attendant to adopting this option, it would require the addition of a chancellor and an executive assistant at the very least with corresponding salaries, benefits, and associated costs. There would also most likely be a need to consider adding positions at either or both the Baton Rouge campus and the president's office to deal with the separation of the academic affairs and finance and administration leadership functions. The president of one university system that divided the positions (and later reunited them) estimates that the annual cost of the initial division ultimately was several million dollars. Louisiana State University may have a different experience, but only if responsibilities and costs are clearly understood at the onset and changes are not made thereafter that increase cost.

Finally, there is the possible loss of momentum toward the One LSU initiative. The decision of the Board of Supervisors about what kind of University they wish to see (one unified university or a system of eight related, yet different, components) will determine whether this is seen as a disadvantage or as a logical result of a decision to adopt a model that makes LSU a system of universities. But the reestablishment of the A&M chancellor position could be seen as a signal that the integration called for by One LSU no longer is as important as it once was viewed.

If this option is to work well to serve the University's mission, the Board of Supervisors must ensure that the responsibilities of the president and the chancellor do not overlap and that the expectations of the chancellor in terms of the leadership of the A&M campus are clear. As stated above, the Board needs to make certain that the chancellor, in rule and in fact, reports to the president. And the Board must also ensure that they hold themselves, the president, and the chancellor accountable for fulfilling those responsibilities in the fashion defined by the Board. In other words, the Board bears the responsibility for both clarity of responsibilities for these executives but also for ensuring that the Board takes action to ensure that clarity is maintained. The Board may wish the president and the chancellors to develop and abide by a set of guiding principles and mutual expectations for how they will work together under the president to lead effectively the University and all its component entities. The University of Wisconsin System has developed such documents.

If this is the alternative chosen by the Supervisors, they should adopt the actions described on page 14 and, in addition, consider these recommendations:

1. Determine whether the president will be authorized to hire the chancellor for the A&M campus, with or without Board oversight, and evaluate the chancellor's performance.
2. Develop a clear delineation of the responsibilities and authority of the provost and vice president for finance and administration of the A&M campus in comparison with the roles and functions of the academic affairs and finance and administration units within the president's office.

G.5. Establishing a Chancellor Position, Reporting to the President, to Lead the A&M Campus and Adding Resources to the President's Office for Leadership for Collaborative Research and Other Critical Functions

This alternative would address perceived needs for clear and undiluted campus leadership for the A&M campus in Baton Rouge while also addressing the many concerns about lack of appropriate resources in the president's office to provide needed leadership for the University more generally and for collaborative research, in particular. Obviously, as in Option G.4, it would be made clear to everyone that the chancellor of the A&M campus would report to the president of the University.

The advantages of this option would be providing clear and undiluted leadership for the A&M campus and providing leadership at the president's office for collaborative research and other high priority areas.

The disadvantages include higher cost (for the chancellor, for possible additional academic affairs and finance staff to permit the clean separation of the A&M and president's office functions, and for new positions in the president's office (an executive vice president for health sciences and a chief operating officer were among the high level positions cited by respondents as needed if LSU is to seize opportunities to lead)). Another disadvantage could be the possible competition between the president and A&M chancellor that characterized LSU in the years immediately prior to 2013. Finally, as noted in Option G.4, there is the possible loss of the One LSU initiative. Also, as in the prior option, the Board may wish that the president and the chancellors develop guiding principles and mutual expectations to foster clear and collaborative working relationships.

As in the prior option, the Board of Supervisors must define clearly the responsibilities of the president and the chancellor and determine the reporting and working relationships that they will have with one another, with the Board, with state government, and with the other elements of the LSU system. The president must be, and must be seen to be, the supervisor of the chancellor. Further, the president, with the full and public support of the Board of Supervisors, must define the authority of any senior positions created in the president's office

with responsibilities for operations, policy, and collaboration across the various elements of the LSU system.

If this is the alternative chosen by the Supervisors, they should adopt the actions described on page 14 and, in addition, consider these recommendations:

1. Determine whether the president will be authorized to hire the chancellor for the A&M campus, with or without Board oversight, and evaluate the chancellor's performance.
2. Clearly delineate the roles, responsibilities, and authority of any additional A&M campus staff for academic affairs and finance and administration, and of the provost and vice president for finance and administration units of the president's office.
3. Regarding the expectation for the Board to set clear goals about presidential achievements, this should include Board recognition of the purposes for which investment in new senior staff in the president's office are being made and Board defense of the president for those investments.

H. A Fundamental Question

In 2012, the Board of Supervisors did more than decide to recruit a president for the University who also would serve as the chancellor of the A&M campus. It elected to try to establish One LSU, a concept of a unified institution with a single identity and a mission to serve Louisiana as one university. Progress toward that vision was made on several fronts: consolidated offices between the president and the A&M campus for academic affairs and finance and administration, shared services, streamlined processes, an attitude of facilitation, progress toward a university-wide online education platform, and the adoption of the same school colors by all campuses. A focus on student enrollment, student diversity, and student success infused the efforts of all the campuses. Nearly everyone who spoke about the differences between LSU prior to 2013 emphasize that most of these changes are positive and that they do not want a return to the bureaucratic and oppositional atmosphere that had characterized the University prior to its structural change.

But progress was not made in all areas, most notably in research and multi-entity collaboration. Further, there was a general feeling that opportunities were not seized, and the University was not able to achieve all that it could have accomplished over the past several years.

Although much of the criticism might have been influenced by the budget reductions the University had endured, some of it was aimed at the president. In part, that criticism was directed at his almost singular focus on student success rather than on all aspects of what makes a university great as well as on his seeming lack of visibility at the various campuses (all of them). Often, these comments were accompanied by a direct statement that the president tried to do too much himself and did not have (and would not hire) senior staff to share the load.

Before deciding whether to maintain or change the University's administrative structure, the Board of Supervisors is advised to think again about the decision it made eight years ago to pursue a vision of a unified university.

Perhaps the easiest way to frame such a pursuit is by posing a fundamental question: Should LSU be a single university led by a strong president and united by a Board of Supervisors, a common identity, and an integrated plan and strategy, OR should LSU be a system of eight institutions, each striving to be the best at fulfilling its specific mission, and united by a Board of Supervisors and a common name, and orchestrated and served by a president?

It is not the purpose of this AGB engagement to undertake a detailed investigation about what the Supervisors may choose LSU to be. However, some suggestions can be made regarding what structures might be most related to one or the other of these paradigms. Further, nothing in the following discussion should be taken to mean that any entity within LSU should not fulfill its mission or serve its region and its students.

If, for example, the Board decides LSU should be a system of eight related, yet different entities, each seeking to be its best, it is likely that the Supervisors will wish the A&M campus to have a chancellor dedicated solely to advancing that campus and fulfilling its mission. Care must be taken to ensure that the chancellor recognizes the primacy and authority of the LSU president. Consideration also must be given to how much of the consolidation of functions and responsibilities that occurred when the current structure was implemented will be continued and how that will occur.

In the case of a decision to view LSU as a system of eight different entities, attention must be paid to how statewide and systemwide initiatives are to be determined, launched, and sustained as well as to how collaborative efforts from student transfer to cooperative research are to be conducted and rewarded. The direction of a president probably will have less puissance in a system than is likely in a unitary university.

If the Board of Supervisors chooses to continue to pursue a single unified university, three structural options in Section G remain open to it. Obviously, LSU could maintain its current structure under this alternative. After all, that has been the structure in place for the pursuit of One LSU during the past several years. But the concern remains about the ability of a single president to focus attention effectively on all aspects of a flagship mission, including both education and research, while leading the University in collaborative efforts and in governmental relations and private fund-raising. The addition of senior level positions in the president's office could go far toward ameliorating that concern.

However, the other issue about visible and focused leadership for the A&M campus would remain. This could be addressed by establishing a strong provost position to lead the A&M campus. If a strong provost position were established and the provost became a member of the President's Council on par with other chancellors, clarity would be needed about which

responsibilities at the A&M campus would be held by the provost (most likely all matters dealing with education, research, faculty, and the recruitment, care, and advising of students) and which would remain with the president (most likely fund-raising, intercollegiate athletics, and certain support functions). The support functions (finance, physical plant, etc.), could be delegated to the executive vice president, as at present. Areas open for discussion, but regarding which decisions must be made, could include information technology and student financial aid.

The strong provost option addresses the issue of visible leadership for the A&M campus and deals with the concern that the president's job, as currently constituted, is too big for any one person. However, it might not provide enough resources, by itself, for the president to give the needed attention to research and collaboration among all entities. Hence, the Board of Supervisors might consider adding some senior positions to the president's office in the future.

The injunction of so many respondents that the University not return to the policies, practices, and processes that prevailed under its pre-2013 structure should be borne in mind. But clarity of roles and responsibilities should not be sacrificed for expediency. These decisions are important to the proper functioning not only of the A&M campus but also of the University as a whole, so they must be considered carefully.

A final thought on the fundamental question. Despite its many immediate and future challenges, the COVID-19 pandemic can also be seen as an opportunity in one major respect. As noted earlier in this report, many interviewees expressed an opinion that no matter what administrative structure is determined best for LSU, efforts toward greater academic and administrative collaboration, cooperation and integration among LSU campuses and centers should continue. Because of COVID-19's likely effects, enhanced collaboration, coordination and integration will be especially important for the provision of health care and the preparation of health care providers, for potentially impactful research on the virus, for the likely need to develop large numbers of effectively taught and delivered on-line courses, and for the need to maximize the financial benefits of shared services, among other areas. Although the answers to the fundamental question and administrative structure may affect the strategies to achieve greater collaboration, coordination, and integration, the Board of Supervisors must encourage and incentivize all LSU entities to work together productively for the benefit of all of LSU's stakeholders, during this crisis and as an expectation well beyond its passage.

I. Guiding the Decision

Determining the administrative structure for the University, defining the roles and responsibilities of its key administrators, and then recruiting a president to lead it are crucial to the success of Louisiana State University. Deciding first whether LSU is a unified university or a system is key.

To help the Board make that decision and then to decide about structure, AGB again offers some guiding principles and best practices (first included in this report in Section F). They should help guide the Board in the short term as it moves forward with its important decisions, but also help in the longer term to enable the Board to become and remain cohesive, strategic, and high performing.

1. Keep primary stakeholders in mind;
2. The whole is greater than the sum of its parts;
3. Ensure the independence of the Board;
4. People (leaders) matter more than structure;
5. Unite behind the ultimate decision;
6. Ensure clarity about the responsibilities of the president and the chancellors;
7. Support the president, set expectations, and hold her or him accountable;
8. Know and support the work of all the LSU campuses and centers and their leaders;
9. Initiate a new president-led strategic planning process that includes all elements of LSU;
10. Don't get involved in administration and day-to-day operations;
11. Encourage and incentivize innovation and collaboration;
12. Embrace Board orientation and education; and
13. Assess Board performance annually.

J. The Importance of Clarity

No matter which decision the Board of Supervisors makes regarding whether Louisiana State University is a unified university or a system of eight related yet distinct components and regardless of whether the Board re-establishes the chancellor position or invigorates the provost position or leaves the structure as it is, absolute clarity about roles and responsibilities is the sine qua non of success. The president, other key leaders, and every Board member must understand and embrace the roles and responsibilities as they are negotiated and ultimately defined. Ambiguity will lead to confusion and confusion to dissatisfaction with results—without a clear understanding of why. **Be clear, be concise, be understood.**

Appendix A: List of Interviewees

- Members of the Board of Supervisors (14)
- LSU President's Office:
 - Interim President
 - Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration/CFO
 - Academic Affairs Executive Vice President and Provost
 - Chief of Staff
 - Chief Internal Auditor
 - Associate Vice President for the Board
 - Director of Health Care Policy
 - Vice Provost for Diversity (A&M campus) and Chief Diversity Officer
 - Assistant Vice President for Strategic IT Services (A&M Campus), Deputy Chief Information Officer, Interim Chief Technology Officer
- LSU Chancellors:
 - Chancellor of LSU Alexandria
 - Chancellor of LSU Eunice
 - Chancellor of LSU Shreveport
 - LSU Agricultural Center Vice President for Agriculture and Dean
 - Executive Director of LSU's Pennington Biomedical Research Center
 - Chancellor of LSU Health Shreveport
- LSU A&M:
 - Athletic Director
 - Vice President for Enrollment Management
 - Vice President for Student Affairs
 - Vice Provost of Digital and Continuing Education
 - Members of the LSU A&M Staff Senate (2)
 - Members of the LSU A&M Faculty Executive Committee (6)
 - Director, Community and Education Partnerships
 - President of the Black Faculty and Staff Caucus
 - Associate Vice President of Budget and Planning and Vice Provost for Finance
 - Associate Vice President for Accounting Services
- LSU Health New Orleans:
 - Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance
 - Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance
 - Dean, LSUHSC School of Medicine
- LSU Health Shreveport:
 - Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance
- LSU AgCenter:
 - Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs and Intellectual Property
 - Associate Vice President for Governmental Relations

- LSU Shreveport:
 - Vice Chancellor of Strategic Initiatives
 - Vice Chancellor for Research
 - Vice Chancellor of Rural Initiatives
 - Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - Vice Chancellor of Business Affairs and Chief Financial Officer
- LSU Eunice:
 - Director of University Advancement
- LSU Alexandria:
 - Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement
 - Vice Chancellor for Student Engagement
 - Department Chair for the College of Allied Health
 - Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration
- Affiliated Foundations:
 - Executive Director of LSU Eunice Foundation
 - Executive Director of the LSU Alexandria Foundation
 - Members of the LSU Foundation Board of Directors
 - President and CEO of LSU Health Foundation New Orleans
 - Interim President and CEO of the LSU Alumni Association
 - President and CEO of the LSU Foundation
 - President and CEO of the Tiger Athletic Foundation
 - Executive Director of the LSU Shreveport Foundation
 - President and CEO at LSU Health Sciences Shreveport
- Pennington Biomedical Research Foundation:
 - Senior Vice President/Chief Financial and Operating Officer
 - Former Executive Director and Current Faculty Member
 - Assoc Executive Director for Operations and Chief of Staff.
- LSU Staff Advisors (7)
- LSU Student Leaders (4)
- LSU Faculty Advisors (10)
- University Academic Officers (7)
- LSU Boyd Professors (5)
- Other Individuals Connected to LSU
 - Former President of Louisiana State University
 - Former Member of the LSU Board of Supervisors

Appendix B: Southeastern Conference Comparison

<u>Unified Universities</u>	<u>Campus Leader</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Federal Research</u>
Louisiana State University	University President	31,000*	\$266,000,000*
Auburn University	University President	30,000*	\$190,000,000*
U of South Carolina	University President	35,000*	\$209,000,000*
<u>System Campuses</u>			
U of Florida, Gainesville	President (reports to system chancellor)	52,000	\$801,000,000
U of Georgia	President (reports to system chancellor)	37,000	\$455,000,000
U of Missouri, Columbia	Chancellor (reports to system president)	30,000	\$254,000,000
U of Tennessee, Knoxville	Chancellor (reports to system president)	29,000	\$204,000,000
U of Alabama, Tuscaloosa	President (reports to system chancellor)	38,000	\$63,000,000
U of Arkansas, Fayetteville	Chancellor (reports to system president)	28,000	\$158,000,000
U of Mississippi, Oxford	President (reports to system commissioner)	22,000	\$135,000,000
Mississippi State	President (reports to system commissioner)	22,000	\$241,000,000
Texas A&M, College Station	President (reports to system chancellor)	69,000	\$905,000,000
<u>Single Institution</u>			
U of Kentucky	President	29,000	\$378,000,000
Vanderbilt U (private)	President	13,000	\$712,000,000

*Flagship campus only