



LSU Faculty Senate Meeting

3:00 PM, December 8, 2004, Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union Building

Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members present:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Claire Advokat (Senate President) | 4. Andrew Christie (Member-at-Large) |
| 2. Pratul Ajmera (Member-at-Large) | 5. Charles Delzell (Secretary) |
| 3. John Chandler (Member-at-Large) | 6. Carruth McGehee (Ex Officio, Immed. Past Pres.) |

Absent: Sarah Pierce (Vice-President)

Senators present:

- | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Helene Afeman | 15. Brian Hales | 29. Terrie Poehl |
| 2. Pratul Ajmera | 16. Steven Hall | 30. Witoon Prinyawiwatkul |
| 3. Frank Anselmo | 17. Gregg Henderson | 31. Leonard Ray |
| 4. Andrew Christie | 18. Laura Hensley | 32. Joseph Skillen |
| 5. Jon Cogburn | 19. Dominique Homberger | 33. Robert Tague |
| 6. James Cowan | 20. Kelli Scott Kelley | 34. Ann Trousdale |
| 7. Larry Crumbley | 21. Julius Langlinais | 35. Warren Waggenpack |
| 8. Ian Crystal | 22. Mary McGehee | 36. Grover Waldrop |
| 9. Bill Daly | 23. William Metcalf | 37. Michael Wascom |
| 10. Louis Day | 24. Kathy O'Reilly | 38. Rick Weil |
| 11. Charles Delzell | 25. Robert Peck | 39. Cathleen Williams |
| 12. Kerry Dooley | 26. Irvin Peckham | 40. Paul Wilson |
| 13. Yvonne Fuentes | 27. Robert Perlis | 41. Barbara Wittkopf |
| 14. Wayne Gauthier | 28. John Pizer | 42. Lisl Zach |

Proxies for absent Senators:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Pratul Ajmera for Jorge Aravena ¹ | 6. Rene Pogue for Catherine Lemieux |
| 2. Kathy O'Reilly for Elmer Godeny | 7. Paul Wilson for Carl Motsenbocker |
| 3. Barbara Wittkopf for Linda Griffin | 8. Kathy O'Reilly for Glenn Pettifer |
| 4. Witoon Prinyawiwatkul for Maren Hegsted | 9. Rebecca Saunders for Judith Schiebout |
| 5. Warren Waggenpack for Gerald Knapp | 10. Mary McGehee for Aimee Welch |

Senators absent without proxies + (# of consecutive absences without proxies):

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Kenneth Bankston 4 | 6. Katie Cherry 1 | 11. Robin McCarley 20 | 16. Victor Stater 1 |
| 2. Shaum Bhagat 3 | 7. David Dismukes 7 | 12. Thomas Neff 7 | 17. Dek Terrel 1 |
| 3. Ruth L. Bowman 4 | 8. Angeletta Gourdine 2 | 13. Milton Rush 1 | |
| 4. Mark Caruso 3 | 9. Randall Hall 2 | 14. Edward Smith 6 | |
| 5. James Catallo 4 | 10. Thomas Lynch 1 | 15. George Stanley 3 | |

Parliamentarian: Professor O. Carruth McGehee.

Invited Guest: LSU System President/LSU A&M Interim Chancellor William Jenkins

¹ Jorge Aravena serves as Alternate Senator for Kalliat Valsaraj.

Highlights

1. *LSU System President/LSU A&M Interim Chancellor William Jenkins' report:*

The search for a permanent Chancellor: He reported that the Chancellor Search Committee has been very active this fall.

Discussions about PM-35 ("Review of Faculty Ranks");

<http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/PermanentMemoranda?OpenView>).

As he had said to the Senate on September 9 [see minutes], there were consequences of that policy that his office put in place (in 1999) that were totally unexpected. He said that he has his "A-Team" working with the Senate's team to see what they can address. He has the drafts of two new PM's submitted by the FSEC to replace PM-35.

2. *Senate President Advokat's report:*

Committee on Committees' call for nominations.

The McGehee Award: Immediate Past Senate President and current Parliamentarian McGehee is retiring from LSU in December 2004. President Advokat initiated an award from the LSU Foundation, called the "McGehee Award." Senator Delzell read *Resolution 05-05: "Thanking and Commending Professor McGehee, and Endorsing the Creation of the McGehee Award"*; adopted unanimously.

3. *Resolution 05-01: "A Proposed New PS-36: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty: Appointments, Reappointments, Promotions, Advancement to Tenure, Annual Reviews, and Enhancement of Job Performance"* (this is the title after the November 19 meeting). This resolution had first been read to the Senate at its September 9 meeting

(<http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions.html>). The Senate informally discussed the resolution at its September 9 and October 10 meetings, after which the PS-36 Revision Committee put out a revised draft of PS-36, dated November 5, 2004 (<http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen>; click on "Other Reports"). At its November 19 meeting, the Senate began formal processing of the resolution, based on the November 5 draft of PS-36. Today (December 8), the Senate resumed seriatim consideration of the pages of the November 5 draft. Some of the topics discussed:

- 3.a. Parliamentary rule against amendments reversing previously adopted amendments.
- 3.b. Motion to restore the November 5 wording on the applicability of PS-36 (wording that did not mention administrators) ruled out of order.
- 3.c. Motion to re-phrase Senator Homberger's Nov. 19 amendment (including under PS-36 faculty who are administrators) adopted.
- 3.d. Explicit mention that Instructors are excluded from PS-36 retained.
- 3.e. "Academic performance" changed back to "job performance."
- 3.f. "Irrespective of any additional administrative appointments" changed to "including tenured and tenure-track faculty concurrently holding administrative appointments ..."
- 3.g. Clarification of the definition of Full-time and Part-time.
- 3.h. Senator Homberger's amendment to describe the three areas of performance to be evaluated, as "academic" areas; failed.
- 3.i. If a faculty member is assigned a job that is unusual and burdensome, then this fact may not be ignored when evaluating other aspects of his job performance.
- 3.j. Whether to consider conduct in evaluating job performance.
- 3.k. Senator Homberger's amendment to drop the words "safety, disruptive, combative."

3.1. Senator Delzell's amendment to restore the pre-1997 definition of "service," which did not include administrative work; failed.

Minutes

1. *Call to order:*

The meeting was called to order by President Advokat at 3:05 PM with a quorum present.

2. *Proxies:*

President Advokat read the names of proxies and alternate representatives for absent Senators.

3. *Postponement of consideration of minutes:*

The minutes of the November 19, 2004 Senate meeting were not ready, and so were not considered.

4. *LSU System President/LSU A&M Interim Chancellor William Jenkins' report:*

Thanks: President/Chancellor Jenkins thanked the faculty, administration, staff, and students for helping him make it through the semester very well and with very few problems, even while he holds two major positions simultaneously (President of the LSU System and Interim Chancellor of the LSU A&M campus).

The search for a permanent Chancellor: He reported that the Chancellor Search Committee has been very active this fall. He has spoken with approximately 40 sitting chancellors at public and private peer universities, and at some Tier 2 institutions. He has a sense of what the landscape is, and what changes are occurring in higher education.

PM-35: Senator Homberger asked the President/Chancellor if there was anything to report on the discussions about PM-35 ("Review of Faculty Ranks");

<http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/PermanentMemoranda?OpenView>).

He replied that he had had one meeting² with a representative group [the Faculty Senate Executive Committee], and has been in constant communication with the Senate President about the issues. He hoped that he and the faculty could resolve all issues. He has had very open and frank conversations with the Executive Committee. As he had said to the Senate on September 9 [see minutes], there were consequences of the policy that his office put in place that were totally unexpected. He said that he has his "A-Team" working with the Senate's team to see what they can address. He has the two drafts³ and they are being looked at at the present time. He doesn't believe that our ultimate goals are diverse in any way; it's just the road that we need to take to get there that is what we need to settle. He is not averse to re-examining that PM. There are aspects that need further discussion. There are aspects of those documents where there is concurrence. We are in conversation, but in progressive conversation. He doesn't believe we are at an impasse or that there is anything that is not malleable or manageable, he concluded.

The President/Chancellor then left the meeting, at approximately 3:15.

² Secretary's note: The Chancellor/President had actually held *two* meetings with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on PM-35: August 12 and November 12, 2004.

³ Secretary's note: The Chancellor/President was apparently referring to drafts of two proposed Permanent Memoranda (PM's) for the LSU System, written by the Senate Executive Committee. One proposed PM was about annual reviews of faculty job performance, and the other was about dismissal for cause for faculty; the two proposed PM's together were intended by the Executive Committee as a replacement to PM-35.

5. *Senate President Advokat's report:*

Committee on Committees' call for nominations: President Advokat announced that the Senate's Committee on Committees (chaired by Senator Wittkopf) would soon broadcast a message about the need for members for various committees.

The McGehee Award: President Advokat announced that Immediate Past Senate President and current Parliamentarian McGehee is retiring from LSU in December 2004. She expressed her respect for and admiration of Professor McGehee. In honor of his retirement, and in consideration of his contributions to this institution, she had taken it upon herself to initiate an award from the LSU Foundation, called the "McGehee Award." She said that Professor McGehee would be asked to designate the criteria for selecting recipients of the award; once that is done, that information would be disseminated. She then invited Senator Delzell to read a resolution honoring Professor McGehee.

6. *Resolution 05-05: "Thanking and Commending Professor McGehee, and Endorsing the Creation of the McGehee Award":*

Senator Delzell read the above resolution (<http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions.html>). It began by enumerating some of Professor McGehee's many and extraordinary forms of service to the Senate and to various university committees. It continued by referring to his many important contributions to mathematics as a faculty member at LSU since 1971, most notably his 1981 proof (with co-authors Louis Pigno and Brent Smith) of the celebrated, 1948 Littlewood conjecture in Fourier analysis, bringing worldwide attention to LSU's Department of Mathematics. The resolution continued by mentioning his terms as Dean of the Division of Academic Services (1986-1990), and as Chairman of the Department of Mathematics (1979-1984). It also mentioned that he is a Fellow of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science, and the winner of the AMOCO Award for Teaching (1980), the LSU "Hub" Cotton Award for Faculty Excellence (2003), and the Mathematics Department Service Award (2004). The resolution concluded by resolving that the Senate commends and thanks Professor McGehee for his numerous and valuable contributions to LSU and the Senate; endorses the creation of the "McGehee Award" in his honor; and conveys its best wishes to him in his retirement.

Since this resolution was intended to be a surprise for Professor McGehee, it had not been announced on the Senate agenda, and was therefore out of order. Accordingly, President Advokat invited a motion to change the agenda so as to allow consideration of the resolution at this time. Senator Ajmera so moved. President Advokat said Senator Ajmera's motion required a two-thirds vote⁴; the vote was unanimous. President Advokat then invited discussion of the resolution. Senator Perlis called the question. Professor Chandler raised a point of order: the Senate Constitution states:

"Resolutions ... introduced during a meeting of the Senate normally shall be voted on at the next meeting. However, by a two-thirds vote of those present and comprising a quorum, the Senate may elect to vote on a resolution during the meeting at which it was introduced."

Senator O'Reilly moved to allow voting on the resolution today; the vote on Senator O'Reilly's motion was unanimous. President Advokat again invited discussion of the resolution itself. Senator Gauthier offered an amendment, to change the last nine words of the resolution, from

"and conveys its best wishes to him in his retirement"

⁴ The Senate Bylaws say: "By a majority vote, the Senate can change the order of the agenda."

to

“and conveys its best wishes to Professor McGehee and members of his family in his retirement.”

The amendment was seconded and unanimously adopted. Finally, President Advokat called a vote on the resolution itself. The vote was unanimous, and President Advokat declared the resolution adopted. The Senate applauded.

Professor McGehee responded by saying that he was surprised and overwhelmed, and he thanked the Senate most sincerely. He said that he intended to serve out his term as Ex Officio member of the Senate Executive Committee (i.e., until the summer of 2005), to help see PS-36 and certain other projects come to fruition. He concluded by repeating that he was overwhelmed; again the Senate applauded.

7. Resolution 05-01: “A Proposed New PS-36”:

This resolution had first been read to the Senate at its September 9 meeting (<http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions.html>). The Senate informally discussed the resolution at its September 9 and October 10 meetings, after which the PS-36 Committee put out a revised draft of PS-36, dated November 5, 2004 (<http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen>; click on “Other Reports”). At its November 19 meeting, the Senate began formal processing of the resolution, based on the November 5 draft of PS-36. President Advokat invited Professor McGehee (Chair of the PS-36 Revision Committee) to remind Senators of the current status of the resolution.

Parliamentary rule against amendments reversing previously adopted amendments: Professor McGehee (who is also Senate Parliamentarian) quoted from Robert’s Rules of Order:

“After the assembly has voted that certain words shall or shall not form part of a pending resolution, it is not in order to make another motion to amend that raises the same question of content and effect....

“Common sense should guide the presiding officer in interpreting the rules, both to give freedom for improvement of the main motion finally to be voted on, and at the same time to protect the assembly from motions for amendment that present questions that it has already decided.”

He suggested that if a motion to amend is made, and it seems to be out of order because the Senate has already decided that question, then the President of the Senate might say that the Chair is in doubt as to whether the motion is in order, because it seems to address a question already decided, and the Chair will put the question to a vote of the assembly. At that time, by a majority vote, the Senate would decide whether the motion is in order or not. This allows a simple majority to allow, in effect, a reconsideration.

Motion to restore the November 5 wording on the applicability of PS-36 (wording that did not mention administrators) ruled out of order: Senator Ajmera referred to the November 5 draft of PS-36, page 2, subsection II.A (“Applicability and Limitations”), second paragraph, first sentence; he moved to restore the original wording there, which was:

“PS-36 applies only to tenured and tenure-track faculty, except when other cases are explicitly addressed, for example in VI.F, page 17.”

At the November 19 meeting, the Senate had adopted Senator Hombberger’s amendment to replace that sentence with the following:

“PS-36 applies to all persons holding an appointment as tenure-track or tenured faculty, irrespective of any additional administrative appointments at the level of

chair or higher, except when other cases are explicitly addressed, for example in VI.F, page 17.”

Senator Ajmera’s motion was seconded. President Advokat said that she had some doubt whether Senator Ajmera’s motion was in order, because it addresses a question already decided. She asked for a vote of the Senate on the question of whether Senator Ajmera’s motion was in order; the vote was 13 to 17, and she declared Senator Ajmera’s motion out of order.

Motion to re-phrase Senator Homberger’s Nov. 19 amendment (including under PS-36 faculty who are administrators) adopted: President Advokat asked for any other amendments on page 2 of the November 5 draft of PS-36. Senator Homberger referred to page 2, subsection II.A (“Applicability and Limitations”), second paragraph, first and second sentences, as amended at the November 19 meeting:

“PS-36 applies to all persons holding an appointment as tenure-track or tenured faculty, irrespective of any additional administrative appointments at the level of chair or higher, except when other cases are explicitly addressed, for example in VI.F, page 17. It sets forth policies and procedures with regard to appointments, reappointments, promotions, tenure, annual reviews, and job performance enhancement.”

She moved to replace those two sentences with the following three sentences:

“PS-36 applies to all persons holding an appointment as tenure-track or tenured faculty, irrespective of any additional administrative appointments, as well as to persons who are explicitly included in PS-36, for example in VI.F, page 17. It does not apply to other faculty, such as instructors or non-teaching research faculty. PS-36 sets forth policies and procedures with regard to appointments, promotions, tenure, and annual reviews, and the enhancement of academic performance.”

Senator Wascom seconded this motion. The following discussion ensued.

Deletion of the phrase, “or non-teaching research faculty”: Senator Perlis wondered about the phrase “non-teaching research faculty.” Professor McGehee said that this phrase was problematic, because a tenured faculty member could, for some time, have no teaching duties. He suggested dropping those words. Senator O’Reilly said that the Vet School has clinical track faculty who teach but don’t do research, and it also has research faculty. PS-36 is being applied to them for promotion, but not for tenure; this needs clarification, and she understood that in the future, a new, separate policy would be written to cover those ranks. Senator Delzell moved to amend Senator Homberger’s amendment in the way that Professor McGehee had suggested, namely, to drop the words “or non-teaching research faculty.”

Explicit mention that Instructors are excluded from PS-36 retained: Senators Robert Perlis and Mary McGehee questioned, in addition, the need to explicitly mention that instructors are excluded from PS-36, since they are already implicitly excluded, due to the facts that they are not tenure-track, and that the title of the new PS-36 refers to tenure-track faculty. Senator Delzell answered that until now, all versions of PS-36 (dating from the first version, in 1976) included instructors; after such a 30-year tradition of including instructors, it is wise to make it as clear and explicit as possible that the new PS-36 will change that feature. Professor Chandler added that last February, the Senate had recommended a new, separate policy for instructors, which is still being considered by LSU’s administration. Senator Homberger added that five (or twenty-five) years from now, most of us will not be here in the Senate, and what is clear to us now may not be clear to others who come along later.

President Advokat put Senator Delzell's amendment to a vote; the vote was 41 to 0. President Advokat therefore invited further discussion on Senator Homberger's motion as amended.

"Academic performance" changed back to "job performance": Professor McGehee pointed out that Senator Homberger's motion entails another change to the November 5 draft: namely, it would also change

"and job performance enhancement" to

"and the enhancement of academic performance."

At the November 19 meeting, the Senate had taken a position (in other passages) favoring "job performance" over "academic performance." He reminded Senators that "job performance" is a comprehensive term, while he was not sure about "academic performance." Senator Ajmera moved to amend Senator Homberger's motion, so as to return to the phrase in the Nov. 5 draft, namely:

"and job performance enhancement."

President Advokat put Senator Ajmera's amendment to a vote; there was no objection.

"Irrespective of any additional administrative appointments" changed to "including tenured and tenure-track faculty concurrently holding administrative appointments ..." Senator Langlinais found the phrase "irrespective of any additional administrative appointments" in Senator Homberger's motion to be meaningless and redundant; he wondered if this means an appointment over and above 100%. He thought that perhaps what was intended is an appointment "in lieu of." Professor McGehee said that the PS-36 Committee had recommended deleting the phrase about additional administrative appointments, because it does not have a clear meaning. Senator Langlinais so moved; it was seconded.

Senator Delzell read from the fourth version (1979) of PS-35, "Performance Evaluation of Professional, Administrative and Non-Teaching Academic Personnel"⁵:

"All persons holding professional and non-teaching academic appointments, including those who hold concurrent administrative and faculty appointments[,] such as Deans and Department Chairpersons/Head[s], will be included in the evaluation process under PS-35 for those segments of their duties which are associated with administrative appointments. Direct professorial functions are not to be included as part of the evaluation and are covered under PS-36."

Senator Delzell then read from the current, 1996 version of PS-35:

"... [Administrative] employees with faculty rank are excluded [from PS-35] and should be evaluated as part of PS-36...."

He explained that the above change to PS-35 that the administration made in 1996 blurred the distinction between academic and administrative work, and that Senator Homberger's language was part of a larger package of amendments to the November 5 draft of PS-36 that would restore the clear distinction between academic and administrative work that was in place at LSU from 1976 to 1996.⁶

⁵ Secretary's note: For the next ten minutes or so, the recorder did not record, because I did not notice that the cassette needed to be flipped over (because I was busy passing out copies of PS-35).

⁶ Secretary's note: My notes show that at some point around here, while the tape was still not rolling, Senators Peckham and Ray, and Professor McGehee, spoke. Also during that 10-minute gap, Senator Langlinais' amendment to drop the "irrespective" phrase from Senator Homberger's amendment was, apparently, defeated; but my notes do not show exactly how.

Senator Perlis suggested changing the “irrespective” phrase in Senator Homberger’s amendment to a phrase starting with “including faculty who hold ...” Senator Delzell moved the adoption of Senator Perlis’ suggestion as an amendment to Senator Homberger’s motion, but recycling some of the specific language he had quoted above from the 1979 PS-35, as follows:

“PS-36 applies to all persons holding an appointment as tenure-track or tenured faculty, including tenured and tenure-track faculty concurrently holding administrative appointments, as well as to persons who are explicitly included in PS-36,”

Senator Delzell’s motion was seconded, and then adopted by a vote of 30 to 10.⁷

President Advokat then put Senator Homberger’s (further amended) motion on Subsection II.A to a vote. It passed by a vote of 40 to 5.

Clarification of the definition of Full-time and Part-time: Professor McGehee then introduced a proposal drafted by the PS-36 Revision Committee on December 2 to revise subsection II.B (“Part-Time Appointments”) of the November 5 draft of PS-36. This entailed revising the definitions of “full-time” and “part-time” in the Glossary (Section XII, pp. 35-7), as follows: *replace*

“11. **Full-time.** A full-time employee is one who is employed for 100% of effort.”

with

“11. **Full-time.** A faculty member at LSU is full-time if employed for 100% of effort, considering the total of his or her appointment at LSU and LSU-recognized joint appointments, if any, at other institutions; for example, at other LSU System campuses. He or she is part-time if employed for anything less than 100% of effort in that sense.”

Then *replace*

“15. **Part-time.** A part-time employee is one who is employed for anything less than 100% of effort.”

with

“15. **Part-time.** See **Full-time.**”

This takes care of the people with joint appointments in the AgCenter campus and the LSU A&M campus, for example.

Finally, the PS-36 Revision Committee had recommended changing Subsection II.B (p. 2 of the November 5 draft) *from*

“Tenured and tenure-track faculty appointments are understood always to be full-time except when there is a temporary change to part-time status or an approved leave for a specified period of time. See for example PS-12, or item 1 of VII.D on page 21 of PS-36. If and when a faculty member requests and accepts a regular part-time appointment, then his or her tenured or tenure-track status will be cancelled.”

to

“Tenured and tenure-track faculty appointments must be full-time (as defined by item 11, Section XII, page 36) except when there is an approved leave, or a change to part-time status, for a specified period of time. If and when a faculty member requests and accepts a regular part-time appointment, then his or her tenured or tenure-track status will be cancelled.

“With regard to leaves, see PS-12. See also, in PS-36, item 1 of VII.D, page 21.”

The above proposals concerning the definition of part-time do not change anything as it stands in the policy universe, Professor McGehee said. This is one of those cases where we decided to put

⁷ At this point the tape recorder resumed its work; so there should be no significant gaps in the rest of these minutes.

wording in PS-36 to convey information about policy established by the LSU System. If we deleted this section altogether (as we could), it wouldn't make any difference; but here we have a clear advisory that might be useful sometimes, he concluded.

Senator Waggenpack moved the amendment of PS-36 as proposed above; the motion was seconded. Senator Perlis noted that the amendment uses the terms "LSU" and "LSU System," but the glossary does not define LSU, and he wondered if "LSU" means what he called "the Baton Rouge campus."⁸ Professor McGehee offered to put a definition of "LSU" and the "LSU System" in the glossary. Senator Trousdale referred to the proposed new definition of "full-time" above; the second sentence of that definition uses the words "part-time"; she suggested setting those words in boldface type. Professor McGehee suggested, instead, changing the title of entry 11, "Full-time" to "Full-time/Part-time," all of which would be in bold; there was no objection. President Advokat put Senator Waggenpack's motion to amend PS-36 as proposed above to a vote; the vote was 45 to 0, and President Advokat declared the motion adopted.

Senator Homberger's amendment to describe the three areas of performance to be evaluated, as "academic" areas: President Advokat called for any further amendments to the November 5 draft of PS-36, page 2. There being none, she went on to page 3, and then to page 4. Senator Homberger moved amending page 4, section IV, first three sentences, as follows:
replace

"These guidelines will govern every evaluation of a faculty member's job performance and every decision with regard to initial appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure.

"The appropriate areas for consideration are the three traditional ones of scholarship, teaching, and service as described below. The distribution of emphasis among the three areas will be consistent with the department's mission and with the faculty member's job description and work assignments."

with

"These guidelines will govern every decision with regard to initial appointment, reappointment, promotion, advancement to tenure, and the assessment and enhancement of the job performance of every faculty member.

"The job aspects appropriate for consideration are the three academic areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The distribution of emphasis among these three academic areas will be consistent with the department's mission and with the faculty member's job description and work assignments."

Reasoning behind the proposed amendment: Senator Homberger's reasoning for the above amendment was that if we don't specify what aspects of job performance we are considering, then it could be construed as including administrative performance, or performance that really has nothing to do with being a tenured professor. She distributed to Senators copies of a 1999 essay by the American Association of University Professors, entitled "On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation"

(<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/collegia.htm>); its first paragraph (like PS-36) mentions teaching, research, and service, and its second paragraph mentions a "highly unfortunate" tendency in recent years to introduce a fourth area of evaluation, often called collegiality. Senator Homberger's amendment was intended, partly, to exclude such additional areas of evaluation. Her motion was seconded.

⁸ Secretary's note: the official name of this campus is "the LSU A&M campus."

If a faculty member is assigned a job that is unusual and burdensome, then this fact may not be ignored when evaluating other aspects of his job performance: Senator Ajmera agreed in principle with Senator Homberger's amendment, but thought that this could lead to some trouble. He recounted the case of a faculty member who had been assigned to develop a Masters-level curriculum for a year or a year and a half, but then was not evaluated based on the job-assignment, but on not having produced enough refereed publications. In 1997, Senator Ajmera talked to Ralph Kinney (who was working on PS-36 then); the latter said that they worked hard to prevent a department from pulling the rug out from under a candidate in the above way; that was the reason that PS-36 refers to the candidate's job-assignment. For that reason, Senator Ajmera wanted to keep the November 5 draft of PS-36 as it is.

Whether to consider conduct in evaluating job performance: Senator Cowan said that conduct needs to be considered in evaluating job performance. Senator Delzell addressed the question of whether to evaluate a faculty member's conduct, by making an analogy to PS-44, "Grades," which says:

"While it is appropriate (and indeed inevitable) that the instructor should exercise subjective judgment in determining grades, particularly in 'borderline' cases, the judgment should be based solely on academic considerations. Grades must not be utilized as coercive or punitive measures reflective of a student's behavior, attitude, personal philosophy, or other personal characteristics except as those qualities relate directly to the student's level of mastery of the course material."

Senator Delzell said that, in the same way, we as faculty members should not be "graded" on whether our boss likes us. On the other hand, just as a student who engages in misconduct is sent to the Dean of Students, so also those of us who engage in misconduct should be sent to PS-104 Dismissal for Cause proceedings. For example, if we are somehow endangering our colleagues, then that should be addressed in some more serious venue than in PS-36, which concerns things such as merit raises.

Reasons to consider conduct in annual evaluations: Senator Day replied that it is not about whether the boss likes us, but about a pattern of conduct that disrupts department morale and interferes with the functioning of the department. He recounted the case of a faculty member in his department who consistently engaged in ex parte contact with job candidates they were trying to recruit, without notifying the department, and telling the candidates how awful this place is, and not to come here. His department search committee didn't find out about these phone calls until later. This is the kind of behavior we are talking about here in Section IV, he said. The problem with using PS-104 is that that is about dismissal for cause, and we, instead, are talking about the annual evaluation of a faculty member, which may or may not lead to dismissal.

Senator Cogburn asked Senator Day if the kind of misconduct he described above could be evaluated as a part of the "service" area mentioned in Section IV. Senator Day didn't think so.

Debate closed: Senator Wascom referred to the third paragraph of page 5 of the November 5 draft of PS-36, which addresses misconduct. Senator Homberger said that her next amendment would address that paragraph; meanwhile, she wanted to answer the various statements above about misconduct. President Advokat told her that we should not pursue that topic, and we should get a decision on Senator Homberger's amendment. Senator Homberger pointed out that she had not spoken to the topic of conduct before in the debate. Senator Wittkopf moved to close debate. President Advokat put Senator Wittkopf's motion to a vote; the vote was 34 to 8. Accordingly, President Advokat put Senator Homberger's motion to amend to a vote; the vote was 8 to 35, and President Advokat declared the motion to have failed.

Senator Homberger's amendment to drop the words "safety, disruptive, combative": President Advokat asked for any more amendments to page 5. Senator Homberger moved to change the third paragraph *from*

"Essential to every evaluation and decision are the fundamental expectations of intellectual honesty; cooperative ethical, and professional conduct, respect for others' rights and safety; and the avoidance of disruptive or combative behavior that interferes with the work of the academic unit. A failure to meet these fundamental expectations must be considered, and will have a negative effect, whenever a faculty member is evaluated."

to

"Essential to every evaluation and decision are the fundamental expectations of intellectual honesty; cooperative ethical, and professional conduct, and respect for others' rights and safety."

Reasoning behind the proposed amendment to drop the words "safety, disruptive, combative": Senator Homberger's reasoning for this shortening of that paragraph was as follows: A brief sentence, as suggested, seems to be sufficient to frame the issue at hand. The mention of charged words (e.g., safety, disruptive, combative, etc.) implies that these are common problems among the faculty at LSU. Such a notion, however, would be rather embarrassing, as it conjures up an image of a bunch of immature kids rather than of the intellectual leadership of a flagship university. In cases in which a faculty member were truly endangering the safety of his colleagues or threatening to bring down his academic unit, a department chair can resort to PS-104, "Dismissal for Cause for Faculty," she said.

Furthermore, the threat of "negative effects" is not only too vague to be useful, but is also in contradiction to the last paragraph before subsection IV.A: "No provision in PS-36 will be used or interpreted to suppress freedom of speech or the right to dissent."

In addition, the AAUP statement on collegiality (cited above in these minutes) recommends that only academic work be subject to evaluation based on a careful evaluation of the pros and cons of including a collegiality category to annual review. Even PS-44, on assigning grades to students, says: "the judgment should be based solely on academic considerations." What is fair for students should be equally so for faculty members, she concluded.

Senator Delzell referred to the pre-1997 versions of PS-36 (1976, 1977, 1979, 1980, 1984, and 1991), none of which contained a statement on collegiality, rights, combativeness, etc.; he urged a return to the pre-1997 policy. Senator Ajmera explained that he knew firsthand that those words were added in 1997 because they had been sorely missed. There were many cases in the University at that time that warranted such a provision, because of some disruptive behavior. It was not a personality problem; it is the behavior of one individual that affects the harmonious working of the whole department. Especially when labs are shared, the whole progress can come to a screeching halt because of those things. In 1997 people saw that problem. But the November 5, 2004 draft of PS-36 has better wording than the 1997 version, arrived at after long hours of discussion in the PS-36 Committee.

Senator Anselmo favored the amendment, because he had seen cases in which faculty members who disagreed were labelled "uncollegial." Senator Perlis liked the positive phrasing of the amendment. He also pointed out that the word "cooperative" already implies "not disruptive, not combative." So he thinks that those ideas are expressed by Senator Homberger's shorter statement, but expressed in a more positive way.

Senator Peckham opposed the amendment. He would worry about mentioning the requirement of avoidance of disruptive and combative behavior if we didn't have the next

sentence in PS-36: “No provision in PS-36 will be used or interpreted to suppress freedom of speech or the right to dissent.” That statement covers his only worry about this paragraph. Senator Cowan found that most changes in the November 5, 2004 draft from the 1997 PS-36 were to improve the clarity in PS-36; he opposes the amendment because it makes the statement on conduct more ambiguous.

Senator Delzell mentioned that, according to the 1999 AAUP essay on collegiality cited above, the consideration of collegiality was at the time only a recent trend in the history of academics; it was not a good trend, and now it is probably in retreat in other schools; so he supported the amendment. Senator Cogburn said that being cooperative and non-combative, etc., is part of one’s service (a point also made in the AAUP essay); so he, too, supported the amendment.

Senator Ajmera said that the provision in question is not concerned with an individual’s disruptive actions per se, but only those disruptive actions that affect the functioning of the whole department. This must be remembered when voting on Senator Homberger’s amendment, he said.

Senator Perlis moved to amend Senator Homberger’s amendment, by adding the following sentence at the end of the passage in question: “Behavior that is particularly beneficial or detrimental to the functioning of the department may be taken into consideration.” There was no second to this motion, and President Advokat declared that Senator Perlis’ motion had failed.

At this point, the term “friendly amendment” had been used several times throughout this and earlier Senate meetings. Professor McGehee, as Parliamentarian, explained that there is no such thing as a “friendly amendment” in Robert’s Rules of Order. If someone offers an amendment, and there is no objection to it, then it is adopted. A member of an assembly may say that his amendment is friendly, but if it gets no second, then that indicates that there is an objection.

Senator Wittkopf moved to close debate. President Advokat put the motion to a vote; the vote was 30 to 5. President Advokat then put Senator Homberger’s motion to amend to a vote: the vote was 18 to 24, and President Advokat declared that the motion had failed.

Amendment to restore the pre-1997 definition of “service,” which did not include administrative work: President Advokat then asked for any further amendments to page 5 of the November 5 draft of PS-36. There being none, she moved on, in turn, to pages 6, 7, and 8. At that point Senator Delzell offered an amendment to page 8, section IV.C (“Service”), paragraph 2, second sentence: he wanted to *replace*

“In some cases, specific service will be a substantial and explicit part of a faculty member’s work, as specified in the rules of the department (see Section III, page 3); or in the job description. Such is the case, for example, when the faculty member occupies an administrative position; or when part of the mission of the department is to deliver benefits of its knowledge, disciplines, and skills to the community....”

with:

“In some cases, specific service will be a substantial and explicit part of a faculty member’s work, as specified in the rules of the department (see Section III, page 3); or in the job description. Such is the case, for example, when the faculty member occupies an administrative position below the level of department chair; or when part of the mission of the department is to deliver benefits of its knowledge, disciplines, and skills to the community....”

Reasoning for the above amendment: The above motion to amend was seconded. Senator Delzell gave the following reasoning for the amendment: This amendment is essentially the policy of the first six versions of PS-36 (1976, 1977, 1979, 1984, and 1991). The 1997 PS-36 changed the old definition of service to include all administrative work by faculty members. This amendment today would undo the 1997 change, and restore the old policy. And, as argued previously, it is important to distinguish “service” (which is part of academic work together with teaching and scholarship) from “administration” (which is identified and paid for apart from academic work). Unless we maintain this distinction, it could happen that faculty members who perform substantial service-related activities may request to be evaluated also as administrators.

Definition of “service” in pre-1997 versions of PS-36: Senator Delzell read from the 1976 version of PS-36: “Competent service in one or more of the following: *departmental* administration, college and university committees, community service, and professional organizations” (emphasis added). So for twenty years, “service” did not include high-level administration; that change came in only in 1997, and is a dilution of the meaning of service; he wanted to restore the old definition of service.

Are Directors below the level of chair? Senator Christie said that in the College of Business there are different centers, whose directors are classified as administrative positions, not service positions. For example, in the Accounting Department we have the Center for Internal Auditing, which is internationally recognized. His understanding is that the Director of that Center is an administrator.

Senator Dooley said that his understanding was that the LSU System does not recognize any administrative position below the level of Chair. The Director of a Center is the equivalent of a Chair. Senator Peckham disagreed, and said that he is holding an administrative position below the level of Chair, as Director of the Writing Program. Senator Dooley said that that is the equivalent of a Chair. Senator Peckham said that his Chair doesn’t think so. [Chuckles.]

One evaluation, combining academic and administrative work: Professor McGehee said that the Nov. 5 draft recognizes that the evaluating officer for a chair, a dean, or the Provost, is the line officer above him or her. He called senators’ attention to page 31, subsection X.C (“The Annual Review Process”). The evaluation of a dean or a chair pretty well has to be done by an evaluating officer (just one). There may be systematic consultation of faculty in the unit (he expects that there will be; there already is in most of our units now). There may be consideration of departmental duties, but still that is to be brought together in the one evaluation of the supervising officer. “The process will occur in the faculty member’s primary department, with the chair as the reviewing officer, ...; except when the faculty member is serving as an administrator—for example, as the chair—and reports to an officer above the department level, who will then be the reviewing officer.”

Next, Professor McGehee re-read the passage from page 8 that is to be amended (quoted above). The various passages that recognize exceptional provisions for people who are in the position of chair or higher were put together pretty thoughtfully by the PS-36 Committee, he said; they will mesh with good practice. He advised against separating or alienating the work of our line officers, even at high level, from that of faculty. He said that it seems to him that tenured faculty experience and the values and knowledge of someone who is tenured faculty needs to be represented in their mind, in what they do, whether they are administering, as they do, the process of promotion and tenure, all kinds of considerations of faculty concerns, or dealing with the people who write the checks, representing the University to the public. We need

to embrace them in the context of faculty service, and not draw a line there. He sees no utility in doing that, and strongly urged senators not to make that kind of change.

Is Senate service worth anything? Senator Gauthier asked if the time we are serving right now, as senators, is worth anything. Is this kind of service worth it? President Advokat said that she hoped that everyone feels that it is; otherwise it is depressing. Professor Chandler said that there is a form (PAR-12?) one fills out quarterly listing one's duties and obligations; and Faculty Senate service is an item on the list that one can check off; that counts as service. Someone [female] called out that that was an older form.

Separate reviews of academic performance and administrative performance: Senator Peckham asked if the effect of Senator Delzell's amendment is to make it so that administrators at the level of Chair and above cannot cite their administrative work as part of their service. Senator Delzell said yes, that was his intent. He also reminded senators of the pre-1996 versions of PS-35 (which he had passed out earlier today), on evaluating staff; that PS says just what Senator Peckham said: "... those who hold concurrent administrative and faculty appointments such as Deans and Department Chairpersons/Head, will be included in the [PS-35] evaluation process under PS-35 for those segments of their duties which are associated with administrative appointments. Direct professorial functions are not to be included as part of the evaluation and are covered under PS-36." What Senator Delzell had in mind (and what used to occur for 20 years or more, as he understands it), is that there would be two separate evaluations; they could be placed in one, single personnel file at the end of the day; that would be proper; but there should be a separation. It worked for twenty years, and he didn't see why it couldn't work again.

Professors who do 0% academic work, and 100% administrative work: Senator Steven Hall said that he enjoyed Senator Delzell's article in the December 8 *Tiger Weekly* ("Administrators should do some academic work"), and agreed that administrators should, at least occasionally, do some academic work. He said that a department head could be a tenured professor, but have a 100% administrative position, and 0% academic appointment. In this document, we are not in a position to define academic appointment. There is a disconnect. [The rest of his comments were hard to hear on the tape.]

Would a professor with, say, a 50% academic and 50% administrative workload have to publish as much research as a 100% academic professor under this amendment? Senator Cowan said that there is a larger question; because Senator Delzell's argument is that we should do two separate reviews. This would be a disservice to administrators; if they are held to the same standards as professors for publications, then they will never be reviewed favorably as academicians. We must consider that those people are serving a dual role. Senator Delzell said that he did not intend to hold an administrator to the same standard as a 100% academic faculty member; that is not what his amendment says, and that is not what the pre-1996 PS-35's said either. He referred to the Graduate School (see <http://appl003.lsu.edu/grad/gradschool.nsf/index> and [http://appl003.lsu.edu/grad/gradschool.nsf/\\$Content/Requirements+for+Graduate+Faculty+Status?OpenDocument](http://appl003.lsu.edu/grad/gradschool.nsf/$Content/Requirements+for+Graduate+Faculty+Status?OpenDocument)): "Evaluation of Administrators: The following is copied from a memo by Dean Hargrave to all departments on November 7, 1978 and is the procedure which is still followed by the Graduate Council today.

"With respect to the extent to which persons with administrative responsibilities must satisfy requirement for "current and sustained creative activities related to programs of graduate education as evidenced, by publications in recognized journals in the field," The Graduate Council, in 1978, passed a resolution on this question:

“““For department chairmen, deans, associate deans, and other persons holding administrative positions, the publication productivity may be less than that expected of other members of the department. At the same time, however, some ‘current and sustained activity’ should be in evidence. Graduate Faculty membership should reflect a working relationship to the graduate program as well as the proper qualifications for that relationship.”””

Defeat of amendment: Senator Christie moved to close debate. President Advokat put it to a vote; the vote was 32 to 0. President then put Senator Delzell’s motion to amend to a vote. The vote was 6 to 33, and President Advokat declared that the amendment had failed.

8. Adjournment:

There was a motion for adjournment, which was seconded. After an affirmative voice vote, President Advokat declared the meeting adjourned at 5:00PM.

Minutes prepared by Charles Delzell, Secretary;
approved by the Senate February 17, 2005.