

Comments on the Changes in PS-36-T  
Carruth McGehee

April 9, 2007

“Version A” of PS-36-T will mean the version endorsed and proposed by the Faculty Senate in its resolution of February 17, 2005, as revised in the deans’ review. It was conveyed to the Provost’s office for consideration, bearing the date of March 8, 2006. It is available at

<http://www.math.lsu.edu/~mcgehee/PS-36-T.doc>

“Version B” will mean the version which is set to be adopted by the University. It was returned recently to the Faculty Senate for comment. It is available at

<http://www.math.lsu.edu/~mcgehee/PS 36-T Draft Version 03 16 07.doc>

(Note: Use that whole line for the URL; this won’t work as a link because of the spaces.)

Professor Bill Daly, President of the Faculty Senate, asked me to examine Version B. I’m offering here a list and analysis of the changes that I have found. Over 100 items appear on my list.

I trust that the complaints made here will be duly considered. However these points are resolved, I am ready to say that the Senate is about to mark the completion of an excellent achievement. The issuance of the new PS will bring significant reforms and an improved policy document. And we will have affirmed anew the precedent of faculty leadership in the formulation of faculty personnel policies.

Version B, set to be adopted as the new PS, incorporates many changes from the Senate’s Version A - - in policy, wording, and arrangement. The Senate, if there is any point where it sees an important policy issue, should by all means state its position. Otherwise, and assuming that the Senate will like the changes overall or find them tolerable, there is no need for the Senate to take formal action. Let me explain. The Senate’s Version A remains on the record, in any event. There are, in Version A, a few points of policy and exposition which Version B omits, and does not contradict, or perhaps allows to “go without saying;” and which may still be of use when one seeks interpretations for policy and practice. In other words, even if the Senate celebrates the arrival of the new PS, the Senate should not endorse Version B in such a way that in any sense erases its endorsement in 2005 of Version A, or wipes out the extensive legislative history and wide consultation with faculty and administration that underlies it.

The list of changes is divided into three parts. The first deals with serious flaws, like mistaken references to Board Regulations; the second, with apparent errors that need to be corrected; and the third, with changes to which I offer no objection.

### ***Serious Flaws, Like Mistaken References to Board Regulations***

In preparing Version A, we took pains to cite Board of Supervisors Bylaws and Regulations, as well as other University policies, at all points where they had a significant bearing. In writing such references, we sought to avoid inaccurate or misleading formulations. It may be true that a statement about Board Regulations which is inaccurate, misleading, or absent-mindedly written, will soon enough be recognized as such, and will ultimately be ignored and do no harm. Nevertheless it seems important to point out some statements that have popped up in Version B and suggest that they be reconsidered.

1. In Section I, paragraph 1, the following two sentences have been added; I call particular attention to the phrase that I've italicized: "All personnel decisions described in this policy statement, *not based on financial exigency or change in departmental programs*, shall be made solely on the basis of professional merit, quality of contribution to the University, and the competent and regular performance of assigned duties. Such decisions will be made without regard to race, creed, color, marital status, sexual orientation, religion, sex, national origin, age, mental or physical disability, or veteran's status."
  - a. One might always argue for or against putting particular statements into the Preamble. The merit basis of decisions is well and elaborately described in Section III; it need not be repeated here. Nevertheless, finally, I have no objection to the first sentence, provided the italicized phrase is removed; or to the second sentence, which repeats the nondiscrimination provisions from PS-01.
  - b. I do suggest that the two sentences, if they remain, should become a separate paragraph.
  - c. A general rule: If you have to mention financial exigency in the Preamble, then you've got inappropriate material in the Preamble. I agree that it is proper to mention financial exigency and/or refer to Section 5-13 of the Board Regulations in certain places - wherever it is needed to make a policy formulation complete and correct. But then the wording needs to be careful.
  - d. I realize that the italicized phrase appears also in essentially the same sentence occurring in the same place in the current PS-36. That's not a recommendation for it!
  - e. Financial exigency is directly relevant to terminations before end-of-contract; those decisions are covered by Section 5-13 of the Board Regulations. The "personnel decisions described in this policy statement" are those of hiring, reappointments, promotions, and annual evaluations. How is it that under ("based on") financial exigency, we would *make a*

*decision on a hire or a promotion, free of the requirement to make it on the sole basis of merit? How so?*

- f. The passage allows the interpretation that “*change in departmental programs*” is a condition on a par with, and independent of, financial exigency. But does it have such a status? Based on what part of the Board Regulations – where is that phrase found? I realize that changes in programs and organizational arrangements can be relevant to personnel decisions - but in any event, how is it that *we would make such decisions without primary regard to merit?*
2. Version A’s subsection V.J, “Required Notice of Reappointment,” has been renumbered V.G and somewhat reformulated. I have no objection to most of the changes. However, I wish to comment on the opening paragraph of V.G.
- a. The opening sentence is misplaced; it says “Upon expiration of a term appointment, the employee is a free agent to whom the University System has no obligation.” It doesn’t fit logically here.
  - b. In this quote from the opening paragraph of V.G, I’ve italicized a questionable phrase: “A decision not to reappoint a faculty member may be reached through a reappointment review process (Section VIII of the present policy), tenure review process (Section IX of the present policy), or *as otherwise authorized by the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors (Chapter II, Section 2-7 and Chapter V, Section 5-13).*” I agree that Section 5-13 of the Board Regulations, on financial exigency, does indeed authorize other, extraordinary means of deciding not to reappoint. But Section 2-7 does not authorize any such means of reaching such a decision; or if it does, then those means ought to be described. One should be careful and specific in referring to Section 2-7, especially since parts of it apply to NT (non-tenurable) personnel with professorial titles.
  - c. You should not mention Board Regulations Section 5-13 (financial exigency) in exactly this place; you are saying that when a non-reappointment decision is made under Section 5-13, the “following schedule” for required notice of nonreappointment (quoted from Board Section 2-7) ordinarily applies. Not so! Section 5-13 states quite different notice requirements!
  - d. *I suggest that subsection V.G be rewritten to read as follows: “A decision not to reappoint a faculty member will ordinarily be reached through a reappointment review process (Section VIII of the present policy) or a tenure review process (Section IX of the present policy). Such a decision requires no further administrative or Board of Supervisors approval. Written notice of the decision will ordinarily be provided in accordance with the following schedule (Board of Supervisors Regulations, Chapter II, Section 2-7):” [Then state the items 1, 2, and 3 without change, followed by this paragraph:] “ Once a faculty member is notified that he or she will not be reappointed, the decision will not be suspended during any appeal. Upon expiration of an appointment, the employee is a free agent to whom the University System has no obligation.” [Finally, add*

*this concluding paragraph:]* “In extraordinary circumstances, a decision to terminate an appointment may be reached through dismissal for cause, under PS-104; or through financial exigency, under the Board of Supervisors Regulations (Chapter V, Section 5-13).”

3. I wish to propose a fix for a problem that is present in Version B, and that was not correctly dealt with in Version A either. In Version B, subsection VI.A, item 1, the first sentence reads as follows: “For an initial appointment, the faculty panel shall include all tenured and tenure-track faculty of a department or a committee designated by the tenured and tenure-track faculty.” The committee alternative is an important provision, but is not well regulated. RECOMMENDATIONS:
  - a. The first sentence of item 1 of VI.A should read as follows: “For an initial appointment, the faculty panel shall include all tenured and tenure-track faculty of a department; or, if so provided in the department’s rules, shall be a committee of tenured and tenure-track faculty.”
  - b. The decision on whether to use such a committee and how to set it up should belong to the tenured **and tenure-track faculty**. So: The second sentence of item 1 in III.B reads as follows: “A unit’s rules may be made or amended by majority of the tenured faculty in the unit, including the chair or dean, who serves as the presiding officer.” An additional sentence should be added, as follows: “The tenure-track faculty will be included also for the purpose of adopting rules, if any, whereby a committee is designated to act as the panel for an initial appointment (see VI.A, item 1).”
  - c. Further explanation: It is not enough to say, It can be done this way, or that way – “X or Y.” In such a matter of governance, the practice needs to be set and understood (and/or modified) in advance. When it is not addressed in the rules, the PS must provide the default practice, thus: “X; or, if so provided in the department’s rules, Y.”
4. Version A’s subsection VIII.A (“Annual Reviews, Reappointment Reviews”) has been deleted and replaced by Version B’s VIII.A, a “Preamble,” to which, *per se*, I offer no objection. Also, VIII.B and VIII.C have been partially rewritten. The material in VIII.A-C was thoroughly discussed and developed in the preparation of Version A, and is important to good departmental practices during the probationary period for untenured faculty. Therefore my first choice would be to see the Version A material essentially restored. However, I will limit the following recommendations to three basic points.
  - a. RECOMMENDATION (1): In the first sentence of VIII.C, the words “or, if so provided in the department’s rules, a committee thereof” should be deleted. Those words would contradict the definition in subsection VI.A of the faculty panel for a reappointment review. That definition does not allow the option of “a committee thereof.”
  - b. RECOMMENDATION (2): The review committee, which meets to consider a case prior to the beginning of a possible reappointment review, is referred to properly in the opening paragraph of VIII.B. Unfortunately

it is undefined there. I suggest adding a sentence to the end of the opening paragraph of VIII.B, as follows: “The review committee, whose purpose is to give preliminary consideration to a case possibly coming up for a reappointment review, will have the same membership as the faculty panel for reappointment defined in Section VI; or, if so provided in the department’s rules, a committee thereof.”

- c. By way of further explanation: As Version A’s VIII.A makes clear – and as Version B’s subsection IX.C.2 makes more clear - the review committee for an untenured faculty member meets every year to discuss his or her progress. (See also the present PS-36, IV.B.2.a.) Only in some years is there a reappointment review.
  - d. RECOMMENDATION (3): Version A (in VIII.A, item 4) made this statement: “The decision not to reappoint can be reached only as a final result of a reappointment review; if such a review does not take place, then the term of the faculty member’s appointment will be extended so that it will continue through the next two years.” Note that the context restricts this provision to persons not due for a tenure review, etc. While this provision is present implicitly in Version B, a clear and explicit statement to this effect needs to be restored to this Section.
5. Version B’s Section IX (see IX.C, item 1) provides the listing of items in the candidate’s review file; compare with the definition of the review file in Version A’s subsection IX.E. Note that the candidate’s response to the department’s recommendation is, in Version B unlike Version A, not required to be placed in the review file before it goes forward to the Provost, and so forth. Presumably this is an oversight. To correct this oversight, insert at the end of item 4 of IX.C this sentence: “The response will become part of the review file.”

### ***Errors That Need Correcting***

- 6. In an oversight which will no doubt be corrected when the new PS is adopted, Version B is misleadingly titled as if it were Version A (of 03 08 06).
- 7. In subsection II.A, there seems to be a careless typing error in sentence 2: “PS-36-T applies to all persons holding an appointment as tenure-track or tenured faculty, including tenured and tenure-track faculty including those holding administrative appointments.” RECOMMENDATION: Say perhaps, more simply, “PS-36-T applies to all persons holding appointments as tenure-track or tenured faculty, including those holding administrative appointments.”
- 8. RECOMMENDATION: The one-sentence first paragraph of subsection IV.C needs a space between it and the second paragraph. Also, the sentence shouldn’t be completely italicized. Compare the better usage in sentence 3, paragraph 1, IV.A.

9. Version A's subsection V.I, "Provost's and Deans' Advisory Committee," has become Version B's V.F and has been modified somewhat.  
RECOMMENDATION: Rewrite item 1, which says "The Provost will annually appoint the Provost's Advisory Committee from its membership." What does the phrase "from its membership" mean? Should it be simply be deleted?
10. In Version B's subsection VII.A.4, in the paragraph on the dean's approval, an instance of bad writing has been introduced, leaving it unspecified where the dean will send a negative recommendation (to the Provost, presumably), and whether the attending material will be forwarded too (presumably it will). For better phrasing, see Version A's VII.A.5.
11. VII.C ("Requirement of an Interview") contains an inappropriate comma.
12. In VII.E.2, line 5, "years service credit" is probably meant to be "years of service credit." Also, one wonders whether "one or two years of service credit" was intended, or perhaps a construction parallel to that of VII.E.1 is desired.
13. In line 5 and in line 6 of VIII.B, a comma is missing.
14. In the first line of IX.A.3, a comma needs to be removed.
15. In IX.C, in the formatting of the numbered, lettered, and bulleted lists, the typist lost the battle with MSWord, and may wish to try again. I sympathize.
16. In IX.D, item 2, The phrase "Except as provided in item 1 of this section" should be corrected to read "Except as provided in item 1 of this subsection" or, better yet, "Except as provided in item 1."
17. In XIII.A, in the definition of "Faculty Member's File," line 4, it should be "faculty member's annual reports," plural, not "report."
18. The following statement appears as the last sentence of paragraph 1 at the beginning of subsection XI. "Sampling of student opinions should be carried out in such a manner as to assure that students are free to convey honest opinions without fear of reprisal and that ratings are both reliable and valid." That sentence does not belong there. It should be the second sentence of item 9 of *the second list* in subsection IV.B, which would then read as follows: "9. Evaluations of teaching and testimonials by present or former students. (Sampling of student opinions should be carried out in such a manner as to assure that students are free to convey honest opinions without fear of reprisal and that ratings are both reliable and valid.)"
19. In the first paragraph of Section XII, "*Voluntary Assistance Program*" should be consistently boldface, or consistently not.

20. In Section XII, in the formatting of the numbered list, the typist lost the battle with MSWord, and may wish to try again. I sympathize.
21. In XIII.A, the Glossary, the entry for “Job Description” should be deleted or else given a definition. Deletion would be fine.
22. In XIII.A, since you’re not numbering the entries, the phrase after “Part-time” should be “See ‘Full-time, Part-time’ above.”
23. In XIII.A, the entry for “Peer Advisor” should be deleted or else given a definition. Deletion would be fine.
24. In XIII.C, at the end of the first paragraph of the sample letter, we see: “responsibilities ~~during the probationary period.~~” Either remove that phrase or eliminate the strikethrough.
25. In item 3 of the sample letter, XIII.C, change “research” to “scholarship” at the beginning of the bracketed passage on the second line. The use of “research” here makes no sense, because “scholarship” has been adopted in PS-36-T as the general term. Note that, as stated in the bracketed passage, the letter writer is free to use the term “research” in the letter if that’s appropriate to the department and discipline.
26. Please reconsider carefully the changes that have been made in the paragraph (third from the end) in the sample letter, XIII.C, that begins “Published LSU policy ... .” Compare it with the corresponding paragraph in Version A. I’m not bothered by changes that follow from legal considerations; I’m concerned with the awkward phrasing, and with the use of “maker” instead of “writer.”

### *Other Changes, Noted without Objection*

27. The title of the PS has been changed, in that the phrase “Advancement to Tenure” is replaced by just “Tenure.” In the third paragraph of subsection IV.B, and again in the fourth paragraph of subsection IV. C, the phrase “case for ... advancement to tenure” has been replaced by “case for ... tenure.” Like changes appear at other points. NO OBJECTION.
28. Version B has no Table of Contents or Index. NO OBJECTION. You may see the technical difficulties as prohibitive, especially given the properties of Microsoft Word. After the new PS is adopted, I would be glad to provide an annotated version which the Senate could post as a PDF file, incorporating the Table of Contents and Index, and perhaps also some informational footnotes and cross-references.

29. In Section I, paragraph 2, “the decision to advance a person to tenure” has been replaced by “the decision to award tenure.” Similar changes appear elsewhere. NO OBJECTION.
30. In the third paragraph of Section I, the sentence “With tenure, the University grants heightened job security in order to allow long-term plans and undertakings, and in order to encourage originality, creativity, innovation, and independence” has been removed, and a quotation from the Board Regulations has been inserted which makes the “heightened job security” precise and gives it authoritative grounding. NO OBJECTION.
31. Section II is now entitled “General Provisions” instead of “Preliminaries.” NO OBJECTION.
32. Subsection II.A has been rewritten, with various omissions and rearrangements. NO OBJECTION. (Except for the matter described in the previous item.)
33. The subsection entitled “Definitions of Certain Terms” has been deleted. NO OBJECTION. This subsection adopted one solution to certain problems of exposition and clarity. If those are solved some other way, fine.
34. A new subsection II.B, “Joint Appointments,” has been inserted here, mainly just pulling together subject matter that appeared in other Sections of Version A. I detect only one change in substance. We had been advised that a joint appointment had been made by Southern University and LSU, so Version A countenances such a possibility, whereas Version B’s II.B does not (although a certain entry in the Glossary still does!) NO OBJECTION.
35. The subsection II.C, “Part-Time Appointments,” has been rewritten. It appears that the term “tenure clock,” used in Version A, will be absent from Version B – where a year will be “counted as service toward tenure” or not. NO OBJECTION. Awkward though.
36. Subsection II.D (“Pertinent Policies Stated Elsewhere”) of Version A has been deleted. NO OBJECTION. This deletion (like the loss of Table of Contents and Index) may be considered to affect adversely the properties of exposition and usability which we valued highly in preparing Version A. However, the loss could be remedied by an annotated reference version of the PS.
37. Subsection II.E (“Effective Date”) of Version A has been deleted. NO OBJECTION. The deleted material will go without saying, right?
38. Section III is entitled “Rules of a Department or other Unit” instead of “Rules of a Unit.” NO OBJECTION. The subject of Section III is the adoption of rules pertinent to the policies and procedures dealt with by PS-36-T.

39. Subsections III.B and III.C have been rewritten, with several changes. (1) Version A allowed a departmentalized college's bylaws to delegate the making of rules to an elected body of faculty; Version B does not allow such delegation, but keeps rule-making in the hands of the tenured faculty in the unit. (2) Version A allows a unit's bylaws to require agreement on rules by a body of faculty including more than just the tenured faculty. Version B does not countenance such a requirement. (3) Unlike Version A, Version B does not require the Provost to consult with the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel Policy before requiring a change in a unit's rules. It does, however, still specifically require units to provide their current rules to that Committee. NO OBJECTION.
40. Subsection III.D, making Robert's Rules the standard authority on parliamentary procedure, has been deleted. NO OBJECTION.
41. Section IV is now entitled "Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Job Performance" instead of "Guidelines for Criteria." NO OBJECTION.
42. The second paragraph of Section IV has been rewritten slightly. NO OBJECTION.
43. Also in the third paragraph of subsection IV.B, the sentence "Evaluations by experts outside LSU are essential to the formation of this judgment" [with regard to the quality of a candidate's scholarship] has been replaced by "It shall be the general policy of the University to utilize evaluations by experts outside LSU in the formation of this judgment." NO OBJECTION.
44. Paragraphs 2 ("In some cases, specific cases ...") and 3 of Version A's subsection IV.C have been modified in their wording. Most notably, the sentence "All faculty are expected to play a citizen's part in fulfilling these responsibilities" has been replaced by "All faculty members are expected to remain informed, participate in meetings, and cast votes." NO OBJECTION.
45. In subsection IV.C, paragraph 4, which introduces the list of examples of service, now contains the following additional words: "a faculty member's service is governed by the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors; LSU System and LSU policies, as well as the provisions of the Code of Ethics for Government Employees." NO OBJECTION.
46. Subsection V.A ("Confidentiality") has been modified slightly. NO OBJECTION.
47. Subsections V.C, V.D, and V.E have been modified and combined into one new subsection V.C, "The Role of Line Officers." NO OBJECTION.

48. The subsections V.F and V.G have been modified and combined into one new subsection V. D, “Conflict of Interest, Recusals, Exclusions, and Other Restrictions.” The new subsection V.D contains some of the material which, in Version A, was stated in subsubsection VI.A.4 in terms of exclusion from faculty panels. NO OBJECTION. Presumably it is clear that a required recusal from a decision entails non-membership on the faculty panel for that case.
49. Version A’s subsection V.H, “Right to a Peer Advisor,” has become Version B’s subsection V.E, “Peer Advisor,” and has been modified somewhat. The right to a peer advisor in Version A applied to certain meetings identified throughout the document; in Version B, it applies to conferences held “as part of the annual review process or for purposes of notifying the faculty member of a decision made pursuant to this policy.” The peer advisor “may participate in the discussion” according to Version B; “may attend the meeting” in Version B. NO OBJECTION.
50. Version A’s subsubsection VI.A.1 (“Preliminary Definition of the Faculty Panel”) has become the opening statement of Subsection VI.A (“Faculty Panel Composition”) and has been rewritten. One change that should be noted is the following: Version A said “For an initial appointment to a tenure-track position, the faculty panel will include the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty with primary appointment in the department; except that the rules of the department (see Section III, page 6) may, for some or all such cases, define the panel to be a committee including only some of the said faculty.” Version B says “For an initial appointment, the faculty panel shall include all tenured and tenure-track faculty of a department or a committee designated by the tenured and tenure-track faculty.” NO OBJECTION. Presumably it is understood that the reference is always to faculty with primary appointment in the department.
51. Version A’s subsections VI.A.2 (“Members Added by the Department’s Rules”), VI.A.3 (“The Chair as Member of the Faculty Panel”), and VI.A.5 (“Members Added by Appointment”) have been renumbered as VI.A.1, VI.A.2, and VI.A.3 and somewhat modified. NO OBJECTION.
52. Version A’s subsubsection VI.A.4 (“Recusals, Exclusions, and Other Restrictions”) has been deleted. The provisions of items 1, 2, 3, and 5 appear in Version B’s subsection V.D. The statement in item 4 that a faculty member may recuse himself or herself voluntarily does not appear in Version B. NO OBJECTION.
53. Version A’s subsubsection VI.A.6 (“Voting Twice on the Same Decision”) has been deleted, and its subject matter is covered in Version B’s V.D and VI.A.3. NO OBJECTION.

54. Version A's subsection VI.B ("Participation by All Faculty Panel Members") has been deleted, and its subject matter is covered in Version B's V.C, paragraph 3. NO OBJECTION.
55. Version A's subsection VI.C ("The Manner of Voting") has been renumbered as VI.B. The statement in Version A, "The rules of the department may further specify and regulate the manner of voting," has been deleted. NO OBJECTION.
56. Version A's subsection VI.E ("The Report of a Departmental Recommendation") has been renumbered as VI.C. The last sentence of the subsection, which elaborates on the ability of the department's rules to vary the procedure for assembling the report, has been deleted; but its provision may be understood to be contained already in the last paragraph. NO OBJECTION.
57. Subsection VII.A, "Procedure," refers to certain applicable subsections without identifying them by number. NO OBJECTION. The document becomes a bit harder to use when cross-references are missing, but as mentioned above we can solve this problem by providing an annotated edition.
58. This statement has been removed from VII.A: "In all cases, the provisions of subsections VII.B-VII.F will be observed." NO OBJECTION. I interpret the context to imply that those provisions (numbered and arranged differently in Version B) apply in all cases, in any event, so the statement is unnecessary.
59. Version A's subsections VII.A.1 and VII.A.2 ("An Open Process") have been combined in Version B's subsection VII.A.1. Changes have been made in wording and some cross-references have been removed, but there are no changes in substance. NO OBJECTION.
60. Version A's subsections V.A.3, V.A.4, and V.A.5 have been renumbered in Version B as V.A.2, V.A.3, and V.A.4. In the new V.A.2 ("A Recommendation to Appoint"), some cross-references and affirmations of provisions that appear elsewhere have been removed. In V.A.4 ("Approval Procedure; Official Offer"), several changes have been made in arrangement and in wording. One change of note: All offers with an annual salary of more than \$100,000 must be approved by Board, Chancellor, and President. NO OBJECTION.
61. The last statement in Version A's V.A.4, "If HRM receives the report of a background check and deems the results to be unsatisfactory, then employment will be canceled or terminated," has become the separate subsection V.A.5 in Version B, and is more amply stated. NO OBJECTION.
62. Version A's subsection V.F ("An Appointment Without the Terminal Degree") has been removed, and its material included in subsection V.B ("Minimum Qualifications for Appointments"). In V.B, there are minor changes in wording, some cross-references have been removed. NO OBJECTION.

63. VII.D (“Inbreeding”) has been slightly reworded. NO OBJECTION.
64. In Section VII.E, there are minor changes in wording, some cross-references have been removed, and tenure clock regulations are stated without using the term “tenure clock.” NO OBJECTION.
65. Section VIII is entitled “Reappointment Reviews” instead of “The Probationary Period for Tenure-Track Faculty.” NO OBJECTION.
66. Version B’s subsection VIII.A is entitled “Preamble” and states that reappointment decisions are important, and reasonable progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure is expected. NO OBJECTION.
67. Items 1 and 2 in Version B’s VIII.C are brought over from Version A’s Section XI to avoid a reference forward. NO OBJECTION.
68. Paragraph 2 of Version A’s VIII.C.1 allows the dean to use an advisory committee, and it has been deleted. NO OBJECTION. Presumably such use remains an option for deans.
69. VIII.C.1 has undergone some rewording. There has been added an affirmation of the requirement of written notice in the case of reappointment. NO OBJECTION.
70. Version A’s subsection VIII.D (“Adjustments to the Tenure Clock”) has been revised, avoiding the term “tenure clock,” and re-entitled “Adjustments to Counting Service Toward Tenure.” Approval of the LSU System President or his designee is explicitly required. Version A’s examples of personal circumstances that will be considered have been deleted, along with its indicated maximums for tenure clock adjustments; Version B’s formulation is: “During a period of time when the faculty member’s personal obligations or situation can reasonably be anticipated to impede progress toward tenure.” NO OBJECTION.
71. Version B omits the opening paragraph of Version A’s Section IX. It read as follows: “By means of the procedures defined below, the University seeks to uphold high standards for all promotions; and to take especially great care in every decision to grant tenure, since tenure entails a major long-term commitment by the institution. A tenure candidate’s record should show promise of a career characterized by continuing growth, excellent job performance, and superior value to the department’s and University’s mission. In the tenure review, the decision should be regarded as a genuinely open question, and the deliberations are properly more rigorous and thorough than in previous reviews and evaluations of the candidate.” This passage was not discussed or recommended by the Faculty Senate, but rather was added during the deans’ review at the urging of one of the deans. NO OBJECTION. But it seems a worthwhile cautionary preamble for Section IX, and one wonders why it was deleted.

72. Subsection IX.A (“General Provisions”), an introduction to the content and terminology of the Section, has been shortened. NO OBJECTION, though clarity and understanding suffer from the change.
73. Subsubsection IX.A.1 (“When a Review Will Be Conducted”) has been changed only slightly. NO OBJECTION, though cross-references and an informational footnote have been removed.
74. Subsubsection IX.A.2 (“The Decision on Reappointment”), **I am very pleased to note**, has not been substantially changed. NO OBJECTION, though once again cross-references have been removed.
75. Subsubsection IX.A.3 (“Line Officers’ Responsibilities”), consisting perhaps of provisions that go without saying, has been deleted. NO OBJECTION.
76. Version A’s IX.A.4 (“Withdrawal from a Mandated Review”) has been renumbered IX.A.3 and slightly revised, but is unchanged in substance. NO OBJECTION.
77. Version A’s IX.A.5 (“An Early Review”) has been renumbered IX.A.4; the definition of “early review” has been omitted (and is taken care of the Glossary); and there are slight changes in wording. NO OBJECTION.
78. Version A’s IX.A.6 (“The Review Committee”) has been renumbered IX.A.5 and has been reworded slightly. NO OBJECTION.
79. The composition of items 5 and 6 in IX.B.4 is bad form, since they break a single sentence into two parts. NO OBJECTION. Presumably it’s clear that this is not a requirement that it takes six letters to fulfill. For example, the same 3 letters could fulfill both constraints.
80. In IX.C, in Version B, the items that the chair is to place in the review file for study by the faculty panel is enumerated, rather than identified by a reference to a Version A’s subsection IX.E (“Contents of the Review File”). NO OBJECTION.
81. In Version B, in IX.C, item 3, the chair’s own statement and recommendation on the case is listed, and in item 4 the chair is required to provide a copy to the candidate. This change corrects an oversight in Version A. NO OBJECTION.
82. Version A’s subsection IX.D (“Stage 3: Consideration by Higher Offices”) is entitled “Stage 3: Consideration at Additional Administrative Levels” in Version B. NO OBJECTION.

83. Version A's subsection IX.E having been deleted, as already noted, subsection IX.F ("Late Events and Evidence") has been renumbered – and is unchanged! Of course, NO OBJECTION.
84. Version B has a new subsection IX.F, "Disposition of Supporting Material." NO OBJECTION.
85. *Summary of Comments on Section IX: The substance of Version A's Section IX is largely unchanged, with relatively little gratuitous tinkering. I'm quite pleased.*
86. In Section X ("Appeals"), subsection X.A ("Procedures"), there are several changes (NO OBJECTION):
- a. An appeal must be submitted within 30 days of receipt of the decision.
  - b. Time limits are also stated, within which the dean and the Provost must act, and within which the faculty member must respond to their actions. However, when and if the Provost submits a question to the Faculty Grievance Committee, there is no deadline on their deliberations.
  - c. The faculty member may go to the Grievance Committee, or may use the appeal procedure of Section X, but not both.
87. In Version A's subsection X.B ("Grounds"), item 1 says: "The faculty and academic officers of the University will be held responsible for following the procedures set forth in PS-36-T, other University policies, and the rules of units (See Section III). However, procedural errors that do not corrupt the process or affect the substance of a decision will not be grounds for delaying, reconsidering, modifying, or setting aside that decision." In Version B, item 1 reads as follows: "The only procedural errors which can form the basis of an appeal are those which affect the faculty member's due process rights." NO OBJECTION.
88. Version A's Section XI ("Annual Departmental Reviews for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty") has been more efficiently entitled "Annual Departmental Reviews for Faculty."
89. In subsection IX.A ("Preamble"), the sentence "Such procedures aim to nurture and support faculty work and faculty careers, to recognize excellence, and be fair to everyone" has been deleted from the first paragraph. NO OBJECTION.
90. In the second paragraph of subsection IX.A, the following sentences have been added: "The process will disclose and identify the strengths and weaknesses in job performance that may have a bearing on rewards or other decisions affecting the faculty member. The chair will offer advice and assistance for the remediation of negative factors, if any." These sentences make up item 3 in Version A's XI.C.1. NO OBJECTION.

91. Version A's subsection XI.B ("A Faculty Member's File") has been moved to the Glossary (Version B's subsection XIII.B). The definition contains an important statement of policy. NO OBJECTION.
92. Version A's subsection XI.C ("The Annual Review Process") has been renumbered XI.B. The opening paragraphs have been rearranged and revised somewhat, with two notable changes. (1) This statement has been inserted: "Sampling of student opinions should be carried out in such a manner as to assure that students are free to convey honest opinions without fear of reprisal and that ratings are both reliable and valid." That sentence should be the second sentence of item 9, subsection IV.B, as I have recommended in an earlier item. (2) The sentence "In that case, the evaluation of the faculty member's performance of his or her departmental duties will be carried out in the department as provided in its rules; and the reviewing officer will collect, consider, and incorporate said evaluation" has been deleted. NO OBJECTION. This provision should "go without saying."
93. Version A's subsection XI.C.1 ("Objectives") has been deleted. However, its item 3 reappears in Version A's XI.A. It is a bit unfortunate that this full statement of the objectives has been removed; but its content is perhaps adequately implicit elsewhere. NO OBJECTION.
94. Version A's XI.C.2 ("Preliminary Steps") has been renumbered in Version B as XI.C.1. Item 3 has been deleted, which reads in part as follows: "In the case of an untenured faculty member for whom a reappointment review will take place instead of an annual review process, as provided in Section VIII, the chair will advise him or her of that fact, and will explain the procedures that will follow." NO OBJECTION. This deleted provision now appears in Version A's XI.C.6, which is a better location. Likewise with certain other deletions.
95. Version A's XI.C.3 ("Further Steps for Tenure-Track Faculty") has been renumbered in Version B as XI.C.2 and has been entitled "Further Steps for Evaluation of Tenure-Track faculty. There have been some deletions of some perhaps-not-critical provisions. NO OBJECTION.
96. Version A's XI.C.4 ("Further Steps for Tenured Faculty") has been renumbered in Version B as XI.C.3 ("Further Steps for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty"), and some provisions deleted. NO OBJECTION.
97. Version A's XI.C.6 has been renumbered and relocated as Version B's XI.C.4 ("Evaluation by the Chair"). It absorbs some of the material that was deleted from other subsections; the reorganization seems to be an improvement. NO OBJECTION.
98. XI.C.5 has been modified in minor ways. NO OBJECTION.

99. *Summary of Comments on Section XI: The substance of Version A's Section XI is largely unmarred, and for the most part the changes represent an improvement. I'm quite pleased.*

100. Version A's Section XII, "Assistance Program to Enhance Job Performance," in Version B bears the title "Voluntary Assistance Program to Enhance Job Performance." The Section has been revised in a number of ways, but probably remains workable for the intended purposes. NO OBJECTION.

101. Version A's Section XIII, the Glossary, is entitled "Appendices" in Version B. The Glossary is now subsection XIII.A. Revisions have been made to the Glossary entries. Except as noted earlier, NO OBJECTION.

102. The sample letter-to-evaluators in Version A's IX.B.5 appears in Version B's subsection XIII.C ("Sample Letter to External Evaluator"). The third-from-last paragraph has been revised, probably because of legal considerations, but as stated in an earlier item, I've asked for reconsideration of the phrasing, particularly the use of "maker" for "writer."