Highlights

1. Senate President Advokat’s report: Regrets from LSU System President William Jen-kins; upcoming election of new Senate officers, and upcoming election and appointment of new committee members.

2. The Senate adopted Resolution 05-08, “Welcoming Chancellor Sean O’Keefe,” sponsored by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The resolution stated that Sean O’Keefe was appointed LSU Chancellor by the LSU Board of Supervisors on January 21, 2005; he brings to the LSU Chancellorship a distinguished record of public service at the highest levels; and he has expressed a commitment to the implementation of LSU’s Flagship Agenda. The resolution declares that the Senate warmly welcomes Chancellor O’Keefe to LSU, and it looks forward to working closely and productively with him to realize the Flagship Agenda and to continue to improve this great university for the benefit of its students, faculty, and staff, and the people of Louisiana.

3. Further consideration of 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.” The Senate adopted a procedural motion to limit further debate on 05-01 after 4:30 today; persons wishing to propose further amendments to the document were invited to present those amendments to the PS-36 Committee on February 3; the Senate planned to vote on the final draft of PS-36 on February 17.

3.a. The Senate inserted a new subsection (right after subsection V.F in the November 5, 2004 draft of PS-36) on recusals due to conflict of interest.

3.b. The Senate also added the following statement: “If an initial appointment with tenure is proposed, the outside letters of evaluation must satisfy the criteria listed in VIII.B.4, page 24.” (VIII.B.4 lists requirements imposed for letters supporting the promotion of candidates within LSU, such as, e.g., that an evaluator must have a sufficiently high rank, and that the letters must come from persons from at least three different institutions, etc.) Even after this change, candidates for initial appointment with tenure may still choose their own evaluators, while internal candidates for tenure may not.

4. The Senate adopted Resolution 05-02 (Amendments to Article IX of the Senate Bylaws). The resolution provides for (1) the abolition of the Committee on Student Recruiting and Retention (due to its inactivity); (2) the replacement of the Public Relations Committee by a new Communications and Development Committee; (3) the revision of the charge and membership provisions of the Council of Policy Committees; (4) the replacement of the Academic Computing Committee by a new Information Technology and Services Committee; (5) the revision of the membership provisions of the Library Committee; (6) the revision of the charge of the Faculty Personnel Policies Committee; and (7) the establishment of a new Benefits Advisory Committee. The senate amended item (3) above, by providing for staggered, two-year terms on the Council of Policy Committees.

5. Motion of no confidence in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, for mishandling the issue of tenure for Sean O’Keefe. The motion stated that the special meeting of the Faculty Senate [January 19, 2005] was inappropriate because (1) it was scheduled on short notice …; (2) the Senate’s position on the issue was thoroughly
addressed during Mr. O’Keefe’s interview process …; (3) actions such as these tarnish the image of our institution and of Mr. O’Keefe in the eyes of the greater community …; and (4) this type of action is likely to create an adversarial relationship between the faculty at large and the Faculty Senate and the new Chancellor ….

The debate on the above motion covered the following topics:

5.a. Importance of allowing freedom to express views.
5.b. All procedures for calling a special meeting were followed; the discussion was appro-priate and beneficial.
5.c. Confidence in FSEC; grateful for meeting; handled appropriately; many puzzled by how tenure was granted.
5.d. FSEC acted in good faith; one might disagree with handling of situation, but no abuse of discretion.
5.e. Newspaper coverage of tenure issue embarrassing.
5.f. Faculty evenly split on a large issue (viz., tenure); no procedural error excluded faculty from voting.
5.g. The issue of the Chancellor’s tenure had not been adequately addressed during the interview.
5.h. The special meeting had to be called on short notice.
5.i. “Service” means service to the academic community, not to the world at large, unless it supports scholarship and teaching.
5.j. The Chancellor Search Committee had nothing to do with granting tenure.
5.k. Applauding FSEC; clarification of whether proxies count for a quorum.
5.l. Two years ago this Senate carped about Chancellor Emmert’s salary; we cannot risk the appearance of not supporting our chancellors.
5.m. Our finest hour; FSEC’s constitutional charge to implement resolutions, including 99-04.
5.n. If the FSEC had not exposed the concerns and called the special meeting, then the Senate would have grounds to recall the FSEC; more “dirt” yet to be exposed.
5.o. Defeat of no-confidence motion, by a vote of 3-34.