Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
Monday, 2/16/04, 3:00 p.m.  
Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union


Absent: Jack Beggs, Louis Gagliano, Kristin Gansle, Angeletta Gourdine, Julius Langlinais, Robin McCarley, William Metcalf, William Moore, Kathy O'Reilly, Aravamudhan Raman, Mark Slovak, and Robert Ward

Proxies: Claire Advokat for Mary McGehee and Aimee Welch; Kaliat Valsaraj for Danny Reible; Tim Page for Priscilla Allen; Kelli Scott Kelley for Tom Neff; Larry Crumbley for Ji-Chai Lin; Jon Cogburn for Jill Sultor; Nancy Nelson for Dennis Landin and Laura Hensley; Linda Griffin for Sigrid Kelsey and Leonard Ray, Lori Bade for Joe Skillen

Guests: F. Neil Mathews (Student Life & Academic Services), Karen Denby (Academic Affairs), Sarah Liggett (English), Teresa Summers (Human Ecology & SACSCOC Reaccreditation), Frank Cartledge (Academic Affairs)

I. Call to Order by President McGehee
   A. Reading of Proxies

II. Minutes from January 21, 2004 Faculty Senate Meeting
   A. Approved

III. Elections
   A. Committee on Committees: four members and one alternate; there were no nominations from the floor
      1. Candidates are:
         John Baker, Professor, Philosophy
         Ronald Garay, Professor, Mass Communications
         Randall Hall, Professor, Chemistry
         Erwin Poliakoff, Professor, Chemistry
         George Strain, Professor, Veterinary Medicine
         Michael Wascom, Associate Professor, Environmental Studies
      2. Elected to the committee were: George Strain (40 votes), John Baker (39 votes), Michael Wascom (39 votes), Ronald Garay (33 votes), and Randall Hall as Alternate (25 votes)
B. Grievance Committee, three persons and one alternate; there were no nominations from the floor
   1. Candidates were:
      Donald Dean Adrian, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
      Gary Breitenbeck, Professor, Agronomy
      Bill Daly, Professor, Chemistry
      Joseph Recapito, Professor, Foreign Languages and Literature
      Daniel Satterly, Professor, Poultry Science
      Bruce Sharky, Professor, Landscape Architecture
   2. Elected to the committee were: Joseph Recapito (40 votes), Bruce Sharky (33 votes), Bill Daly (30 votes), and Daniel Satterly as Alternate (24 votes)

IV President’s Report
A. Report from PS 36 Committee
   1. Document dated 2/13/04 “An Early, Partial Draft” ; sections I-III are available for reading and comment; President McGehee requested feedback and suggestions; President noted that the PS 36 Committee meets once a week and hopes to provide a new document by the end of the semester

B. Notes on PM-35 Issues and Alternatives, dated February 13, 2004
   1. President McGehee provided to the Faculty Senate a handout for their perusal and feedback; document also available at the President’s website: http://www.math.lsu.edu/~mcgehee/XPM-35.html

V. Provost Risa Palm Comments
A. Announced the work of Teresa Summers regarding her efforts in the accreditation process; the visitation team for accreditation will visit the LSU campus 4/27-4/29 and will be looking at the Quality Enhancement Plans (QEPs); the Provost called attention to and invited faculty input on the QEPs which can be found on the LSU website; Provost noted the four principles of QEP undergraduate student learning, they are 1) defining what an LSU undergraduate will know and will be able to do upon graduation; 2) determining multiple pathways for students to achieve these university-wide learning outcomes; 3) giving greater attention to how students learn and adapting instruction accordingly; and 4) using more creative ways to assess student learning in undergraduate programs.

B. Provost Palm brought to our attention the idea of a Freshman Residency Requirement; desires to make a case academically for this program prior to making the requirement policy; President McGehee commented that a senate committee
(thereby soliciting faculty input/shared governance) should have a good look at the Freshman residency requirement very closely prior to its coming before the Senate.

C. Provost Palm announced the summer reading assignment will be the book *Fast Food Nation – The Dark Side of the American Meal* by Eric Schlosser and requested faculty input on being involved in this program; anyone desiring to be involved should contact Teresa Summers directly (578-7697; tsummer@lsu.edu).

V. Senate Resolutions

A. SR 04-04: Instructor Policy (Sponsor: Lou Day)
   1. Procedural motion approved (voice vote) to consider the motion seriatim, with sections defined as follows:

   - Sections I, II, and III (pages 1 and 2)
   - Section IV (pages 3 and 4)
   - Section V (page 5)
   - Section VI (pages 6-8)
   - Section VII and VIII (pages 8-10)
   - Sections IX and X (pages 11 and 12)

   2. Section I, II, and III no discussion

   3. Section IV (pages 3 and 4); Discussion:
      a. Senators discussed Point 1 or the Proposed Amendment to 04-04; mentioned changing the wording of part time and part year; also questioned whether or not Instructors currently in the various ranks would or would not be grandfathered in; President McGehee answered that grandfathering would be dependent upon each unit, that the units would work it out;

      b. Senators voted on the Proposed Amendment to 04-04 in IV.G which reads as follows:

      Replace IV.G, which now says:

      *See the definitions of year and of part-time in Section II, page 2. No provision of this Policy Statement outside the present Section IV, and no provision of the unit’s Policy, applies to, or implies any University obligation with respect to, Instructors who are part-time or part-year employees; except when there is an explicit indication to the effect that it does apply to them.

      - with the following:

      *See the definitions of year and of part-time in Section II, page 2. Except when there is an explicit statement to the contrary, no provision of this Policy Statement outside the present Section IV, and no provision of the unit’s Policy, will apply to Instructors who are part-time or part-year employees, nor will any such provision be interpreted to diminish their rights deriving from other policies or regulations.
c. Senators voted (by voice): Amendment, part 1 passed.
d. Discussion of Point 2 of the Proposed Amendment to 04-04 which was
to “Delete the first bullet in VI.B, which says ‘At least thirty days before the end of a part-time or
part-year appointment.’”, senators voiced concerned over deleting the bullet;
e. Senators voted (by hand) on Amendment, part 2:
   For deleting the bullet: 30 votes
   Against deleting the bullet: 27 votes
f. Discussion of Point 3 of the Proposed Amendment to 04-04 which reads
as follows:

In Section VII, insert a new second sentence and delete “Then,” from the
beginning of the present third sentence, so that the paragraph, which now reads as follows:

*If an Instructor so requests, the unit may, at its discretion, approve a change to
part-time employment, leave without pay, or another type of leave for a specified period of time,
subject to the requisite approval by higher University offices. Then, upon returning to full-time
employment, the Instructor will resume his or her former status, title, and rank under the Policy....
will read like this:

*If an Instructor so requests, the unit may, at its discretion, approve a change to
part-time employment, leave without pay, or another type of leave for a specified period of time,
subject to the requisite approval by higher University offices. Such an approved leave or
temporary change will not diminish the provisions for job security in Section VI. Upon returning
to full-time employment, the Instructor will resume his or her former status, title, and rank under
the Policy....

g. Senators voted (by voice): Amendment passed
h. Senator noted a change on page 3, Section IV.B, July 1, 1977 should be
changed to 1997
4. Section V (page 5)
a. Senator discussion: comments noting that each unit will determine the
importance of Rank I or II when determining promotion issues;
5. Section VI (pages 6-8)
a. Senator discussion: inserting the word “normally” in VI.D, point 1 (pg.
7) so the sentence would read: “An Instructor at a higher rank will normally have priority for
reappointment over Instructors of lower rank who are employed by the same unit and who are in
the same category (see item 2)”; senators felt by inserting the word “normally”, the instructors
were given greater job security; senators also suggested adding at the end of point 1 the following
sentence in VI.D, point 1 (pg. 7): “Exceptions will be made by the voting faculty as defined in
VI.F or as specified in the unit policy.”

b. Voted by hand (but no count): above points in 5.a. and b. passed.
c. Further discussion suggested replacing the word “normally” in VI.D.,
point 1 with the word “usually”;
d. Voted by hand (but no count); replacing the word “normally” with
“usually” does NOT pass.
e. Senators then voted (by hand) on the entire amendment:
   For Amendment:  26
   Against Amendment:  23
   Amendment Passed

6. Sections VII and VIII (pages 8-10); Sections IX and X (pages 11 and 12)
   No Discussion; Senators voted by hand on SR 04-04:
   For:  50
   Opposed:  3
   SR 04-04 as amended, passed.

B. SR 04-10 Principles and Guidelines for a Replacement of PM-35
   Procedural motion to place this resolution prior to Old and New Business;
   approved, first reading by Senator Chip Delzell; will appear in Old Business at the March meeting

C. SR 04-07 A Bylaws Amendment Establishing the Educational Policy Committee,
   first reading by President Carruth McGehee; will appear in Old Business at the March meeting

D. SR 04-09 A Bylaws Amendment Concerning General Provisions for Senate
   Committees, first reading by President Carruth McGehee; will appear in Old Business at the March meeting

E. SR 04-06 A Bylaws Amendment Replacing the Review and Long Range Planning
   Committee, sponsored by Tom Lynch and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee; President
   McGehee suggested adding the following sentence at the end of the “Be it Resolved...”
   paragraph: “The present members of the Long Range Review and Planning Committee will
   become members of this committee and serve out their terms”; senators voted by a show of
   hands (no count taken) on resolution as amended: Passed as amended.

Meeting adjourned 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Lori Bade, Secretary
ADDENDUM
(The following Senate Resolutions all had their “first reading” at the February 16, 2004 Faculty Senate Meeting. Resolutions will be further discussed at the March 18, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate).

Senate Resolution 04-06
A Bylaws Amendment Replacing the Review and Long Range Planning Committee
(Recommended by the Senate Executive Committee)
(Read by Senator Tom Lynch)

Be it Resolved, that in the committee list of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the provisions for the Review and Long Range Planning Committee shall be deleted, and the following provisions for a new committee shall be inserted into the list in alphabetical order. The present members of the Long Range Review and Planning Committee will become members of this committee and serve out their terms.

Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

Charges
1. With regard to the budget and planning processes of the University: To assure an effective advisory role for the faculty; to encourage the use of faculty expertise; and to keep the Senate informed.
2. To review and make recommendations, as needed, with regard to
   * the budget-development process;
   * the budget at preliminary stages;
   * the approved budget; and
   * audits of University operations.
3. To review and make recommendations with regard to the long-range implications, for the University’s evolving mission, of current budget issues and alternatives.
4. To review and make recommendations with regard to the Master Plan and long-range planning in general.
5. To consider questions and issues which may be referred to it by the Faculty Senate or the Executive Committee.
6. When instructed to do so by the Senate; or on its own initiative, with the approval of the Executive Committee: To establish study groups, and to conduct forums or workshops, in order to inform the general faculty or to collect their views.
7. When instructed to do so by the Senate; or on its own initiative, with the approval of the Executive Committee: To establish special committees, with specified terms, to consider issues or conduct studies.
8. To select, from among its elected members, the faculty representatives to the University Budget Committee.

(Continued on next page)
Membership
The voting members shall be eight faculty, six elected and two appointed. They will serve three-year terms, except that the terms will be staggered in a manner decided by the Executive Committee. The members should be present or former members of the Executive Committee, present or former officers of a policy committee, or persons with other appropriate experience. They may not concurrently serve in administrative positions as chairs or higher.

The six elected members: Each year at its March meeting, the Senate will elect persons to fill vacancies for terms that begin in the fall, and will also elect an Alternate, who will stand by to fill any vacancy that may occur on the Committee during the next year. The Executive Committee will serve as nominating committee for these positions, after receiving suggestions by the Committee on Committees, and nominations from the floor will be called for.

The two appointed members: The Executive Committee will appoint two additional members who will be selected to improve breadth of representation, or to meet needs for expertise.

Ex officio members: The Provost or Provost's designee will be an ex officio member. The Provost and Executive Committee may jointly appoint up to two additional ex officio members.
Faculty Senate Resolution 04-07
A Bylaws Amendment Establishing the
Educational Policy Committee
Draft of February 5, 2004
Carruth McGehee

Be it Resolved, that the following provisions for an Educational Policy Committee shall be included in alphabetical order in the committee list of the Faculty Senate Bylaws:

Educational Policy Committee
Preamble

With regard to educational programs and policy at LSU, the Regulations of the Board of Supervisors (Chapter 1, Section 1-2) assign authority to the faculty, subject to the authority of the Board. The Regulations distribute this authority among the faculty of departments, colleges, and schools, and the Faculty Council. The Faculty Council delegates its authority to the Faculty Senate under the terms of the Senate Constitution.

Among the several Senate committees which assist the Senate in carrying out its responsibilities in this area, the Educational Policy Committee will hold a central position. Its jurisdiction will include all matters of educational policy which are appropriate to the Senate and not assigned to other Senate committees.

Charges

2. To facilitate the faculty's leadership role in fostering the quality and success of the University's educational function.

3. To consider in broad perspective the conception and performance of the University's educational mission; and to concern itself with factors that have significant impact upon undergraduate and graduate studies, including the character and quality of educational programs, conditions of student life, and intellectual climate.

4. To conduct research and make recommendations on emerging issues.

5. To encourage, promote, and evaluate innovative and experimental educational programs.

6. To communicate with other Senate committees and other University entities, while respecting their jurisdictions.

7. To assure that faculty have convenient access to ample information about the University's educational function, and to promote understanding of (for example):
   - How well students are progressing toward degrees and achieving the goals of academic programs.
   - How various policies, conditions, and other factors affect the academic success of students.

Such reports and information may come from inquiries and studies conducted by other Senate Committees or other University offices or entities on matters that lie within their jurisdictions. The Educational Policy Committee may make inquiries and conduct studies
on its own to supplement those sources.

8. To establish study groups, and to conduct forums or workshops, in order to inform the faculty or to collect their views.

9. To coordinate the support role of Faculty Senate committees in preparing reports to accrediting agencies.

10. To advise the Executive Committee on the establishment of special committees of the Senate, with specified instructions and terms of service, when necessary to assist in fulfilling these charges.

**Membership**

The voting members shall be eight faculty--six elected and two appointed--and two appointed students, as provided below.

The faculty members will serve three-year terms, except that the terms will be staggered in a manner decided by the Executive Committee. They should be present or former chairs or other active members of Senate Committees concerned with education; persons presently or formerly substantially engaged in curricular or educational matters in a department, college, or other academic unit; or persons with other appropriate experience. They may not concurrently serve as department chairs or higher administrative officers.

**The six elected members:** Each year at its March meeting, the Senate will elect persons to fill vacancies for terms that begin in the fall, and will also elect an Alternate, who will stand by to fill any vacancy that may occur on the Committee during the next year. The Executive Committee will serve as nominating committee for these positions, after receiving suggestions by the Committee on Committees, and nominations from the floor will be called for.

**The four appointed members:** The Executive Committee will appoint two additional faculty members who will be selected to improve breadth of representation, or to meet needs for expertise; and two student members for one-year terms. One of the students will be an upper-division undergraduate, and the other will be a graduate student.

**Ex officio members:** The Provost or Provost's designee will be an *ex officio* member. The Provost and Executive Committee may jointly appoint up to two additional *ex officio* members.
Faculty Senate Resolution 04-09
A Bylaws Amendment Concerning General Provisions for Senate Committees
January 23, 2004
(Author: Carruth McGehee)

Be it Resolved, that the Faculty Senate Bylaws shall be amended as follows.

- In Article IX (Committees), items 1-12 will be replaced by the following.

1. Members of Standing Committee
   a. The usual term of service for a voting member of a standing committee will be three years for faculty, one year for students. Terms will be staggered in a manner determined by the Executive Committee, so that approximately one-third of the voting faculty members of each committee will begin their terms each year. A person may serve for more than three consecutive years in exceptional cases, considering, for example, the need for continuity or special expertise.
   b. In the spring, each standing committee will elect, as chair for the following year, one of its members who is not in the last year of his or her term on the committee. Whenever there is no chair in place, the Executive Committee may appoint a chair to serve until the committee elects one.
   c. In provisions for a term of service on a committee, other than for an \textit{ex officio} or student member, a \textit{year} will be understood to begin on the first day of fall semester classes; and to end on the day before the first day of fall semester classes—unless otherwise specified in these Bylaws or by the appointing authority.
   d. If a vacancy occurs, and if there is no elected Alternate to fill it, the Executive Committee will fill it by appointment, after receiving the recommendation of the Committee on Committees.

2. Special Committees and their Members
   a. When the Senate by resolution or the Executive Committee creates a special committee, it will specify the charges and a definite term of service.
   b. Unless the creating entity provides otherwise, the Executive Committee will appoint the members of a special committee and will appoint the chair.
   c. Unless otherwise directed in its charge, a special committee will file its report only with the appointing authority.

3. General Provisions for all Committees
   a. An \textit{ex officio} member of a committee will be nonvoting, and will
not serve as chair.

b. The Executive Committee will decide questions of committee jurisdiction that may arise.

c. Each committee is authorized to hold discussions with, make inquiries of, and convey its decisions and recommendations to the appropriate administrative office. In so doing, the committee must stay within its stated charge, observe appropriate channels, identify the communication as coming from the committee, and comply with the reporting requirements of the next item.

d. Except as may be provided otherwise in these Bylaws, each committee will report its activities in timely fashion to the Senate through the Executive Committee; and will respond to requests for information about its activities from the Senate or from the Executive Committee.

e. The Senate may, by resolution, instruct a committee or reverse a committee action.

f. The representatives of a committee recommending a Resolution to the Senate, even if not Senators, will have the privilege of the floor to move its adoption.

4. The Standing Committees of the Senate

Note: Here will begin the alphabetical list, by committee name, beginning with the Academic Computing Committee.

• Item 8 of the provisions regarding the General Education Committee shall be deleted. This item lists as a charge of that committee that it is “to transmit all reports and recommendations to the administration through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, with the exception of the subcommittee on exceptions to the general education requirements.”

Note: The subject matter of “item 8” would be covered by 3cde above.
SR 04-10 Principles and Guidelines for a Replacement of PM-35
(Sponsored by Senators Pratul Ajmera, John Chandler, Larry Crumbley, Charles Delzell, Dominique Homberger, Sarah Pierce, John Pizer, Robert Tague, and Kalliat Valsaraj)
Read by Charles Delzell

Whereas the LSU Faculty Senate has already expressed its strong support for tenure (Senate Resolution 00-05, “Policy Statement on Tenure,” adopted January 18, 2000), and
Whereas Chancellor Emmert has called PM-35 “unworkable,” and
Whereas no version of PS-36 has ever mentioned dismissal proceedings as a purpose or consequence of annual reviews, and
Whereas annual reviews already guide merit raises and job assignments, thereby encouraging faculty members to excel in their job performance, and
Whereas the Bylaws of the Board of Supervisors and/or PS-104 already provide procedures by which LSU can dismiss faculty for serious nonperformance of duties, and
Whereas any explicit or implicit coupling of annual reviews with dismissal may affect the historical status of LSU’s tenure system, and
Whereas LSU has a strategic goal to attract and retain excellent faculty,
Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty Senate recommends that PM-35 be replaced by a new PM that contains no mandatory procedures resulting from annual reviews, and no mention of dismissal.
Faculty Senate Resolution: SR 00-05
Policy Statement on Tenure

Whereas, the institution of tenure has long served the American public and the system of higher education in the United States very well, and

Whereas, the purpose of tenure is sometimes misunderstood, and

Whereas, it is important for faculty to enunciate a position on this issue,

Therefore be it resolved that the LSU Faculty adopts the following statement on tenure:

The LSU faculty strongly supports the institution of tenure. Tenure plays an essential role in guaranteeing academic freedom and institutional integrity, benefitting institutions, students, faculty, disciplines, and society at large.

* Tenure maintains the strength of academic institutions, as it is the permanent faculty that provides leadership and direction. Tenure provides stability and mitigates the effects of fads and fashions.

* Tenure helps to renew academic disciplines by ensuring the continued supply of individuals who will dedicate their careers to advancing those disciplines.

* Tenure helps maintain academic quality by establishing a set of high standards that must be met for continued employment. Standards for ongoing contract renewals are typically less stringent.

* Tenure supports work on significant long-term projects.

* Tenure provides strong protection for free flow of ideas, guaranteeing the right to express views without fear of dismissal.

* Tenure provides the benefit of job security, which helps attract highly talented individuals to teaching and research.

Tenure has played a central role in establishing and maintaining the strength and quality of American higher education. Individual abuses of the tenure system should be addressed directly, rather than by eliminating one of the cornerstones of our educational system.
need and the availability of funds for the position. Any appointment may be
terminated by the Board of Supervisors because of financial exigency or
change in institutional programs such that the employee can no longer
serve the University in a capacity mutually satisfactory to both the
employee and the University. In such a case every reasonable effort
will be made to find some appropriate alternate assignment for the
individual within the University.

VIII. Annual Review. Each department chairman or head will annually
review the service of each faculty member and will discuss the results
of this review with the person. The purpose of the annual review
is to help the faculty member identify goals for improvement of his
service to the department, and to help the department arrive at decisions
about reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary increments.

The department head will make a record of the review and the
conference. The faculty member will initial this record to indicate
that he has read it. If he disagrees with it in any degree he may
submit a statement to be attached to the record. A copy of the record,
with any attachments, will be forwarded to the Chancellor's office
for inclusion in the individual's official personnel file.

Since these reviews will enter into personnel decisions they
should be done as dispassionately and as expertly as possible.
and forward it with the candidate's vita and certification of academic credentials to the Office of Human Resource Management.

If the dean does not recommend approval of the appointment, she/he will forward the Employment Contract, candidate's vita and certification of academic credentials to the Provost with a statement explaining the reasons.

Other documents in the appointment file will be returned to the chair until final disposition of the recommendation.

Human Resource Management will route the Employment Contract and vita to the Provost for final approval. After review and recommendation by the Provost, the original of the Contract will be returned to the chair, through the dean, for signature by the candidate.

c. Tenured associate professor/professor • The appointment file will be submitted to the dean for review.

If the dean recommends approval of the appointment, she/he will sign the Employment Contract and forward it with the candidate's vita and certification of academic credentials to the Office of Human Resource Management (HRM).

If the dean does not recommend approval of the appointment, she/he will forward the Employment Contract, candidate's vita and certification of academic credentials to the Provost with a statement explaining the reasons.

Other documents in the appointment file will be returned to the chair until final disposition of the recommendation.

HRM will route the Employment Contract through the following administrative levels for review and recommendation to the System Office:

- Provost;
- Chancellor.

5. University Review (tenured appointments only)—After review and recommendation by the Provost and the Chancellor, the Employment Contract and vita will be forwarded to the Office of the President for final approval.

6. LSU System Review (tenured appointments only)—Tenured appointments must be approved by the President of the LSU System.

7. Offer of Employment

An Employment Contract cannot be forwarded to a candidate for her/his review and signature of acceptance until final administrative approval has been secured. Any supplementary correspondence from a chair/dean outlining secondary details such as office space assignments, etc., should not be forwarded to the candidate until final administrative approval of the Contract. This does not preclude a chair from having preliminary discussions with the candidate prior to offering the Contract.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. POLICIES

1. Purpose

Performance evaluations should assist the faculty member with her/his future professional development as well as contribute to an understanding of how her/his contribution is viewed by students, colleagues, and the chair. Evaluators should consider the professional development of their faculty as well as evaluate achievements. Collectively, the reviews will also help the chair, dean, and other administrative officers to assess the strengths and weaknesses of a department or college.

2. Sources

Evidence of performance may be obtained from many sources including, but not limited to, annual reports from the faculty member, updated resumes, and other evidence related to the criteria set forth in Section II. The evaluations of nontenured faculty must include opinions of the tenured faculty. 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.

3. Interval

Normally, reviews will be conducted annually for all faculty during the spring semester and will cover the previous calendar year. A review for promotion and/or tenure within the same academic year may serve as the annual review.

B. PROCEDURES

1. General

While departments may differ in the manner in which they conduct the performance evaluation, the procedure devised should record accurately, in a manner which is clear even to those outside the University, the individual's achievements as measured against the appropriate criteria.

Performance evaluations become part of the official personnel file and are utilized over a long period of time in making decisions regarding retention, promotion, and salary; therefore, it is important that the process be inherently fair, systematic, and uniform within the academic unit.

2. Department Review and Report

The chair will annually oversee and/or conduct a review of the performance of each faculty member.

a. Nontenured Faculty

As part of the annual review, the tenured faculty, or their designated committee, will meet to evaluate the performance of each nontenured faculty member.

Joint Appointments • The reviews of faculty holding joint appointments will be conducted by the primary department. Written statements of evaluation must be submitted by the faculty and the chair of any secondary unit in which the faculty member is jointly appointed. These statements become a part of the official performance evaluation file.

As a result of the review, a written advisory and evaluative faculty report regarding each nontenured faculty member will be provided to the chair. The report should reflect the majority as well as the minority views of the eligible voting faculty. In the case of strong disagreement, separate majority and minority reports may also be submitted. The report, signed by a faculty representative, will accompany the annual performance evaluation report given to each nontenured faculty member and will accompany the recommendation submitted by the chair to the dean.

The chair will summarize her/his assessments on the department report form (annual performance evaluation), sign the form and submit it along with the faculty report for nontenured faculty to the faculty member. The faculty member will sign the form thereby designating that she/he has seen the evaluation and return it to the chair. The
CONVENTIONAL OBLIGATIONS, CONTRACTS
West's Louisiana Annotated Civil Code 1870, Bk. 3

 Provision of a rental agreement requiring lessee to provide insurance coverage for damage caused by "any other cause that may occur on the time the equipment leaves lessor until the time it is returned" did not require lessee to provide insurance coverage for damage to equipment caused by action of lessor's employees in hooking equipment to lessor's truck. Jayco Sales & Service, Inc. v. Smith, 3974, 303 So. 2d 554.

2. Options
Contract providing that vendor granted option to vendee to purchase tract of land within one year from date of execution of contract or vendee to acquire the property as result of certain pending lawsuits permitted vendee to select either of times specified in which to exercise his option and did not require vendee to purchase property upon vendor's securing of clear title thereto in less than one year, notwithstanding time-of-essence provision in contract, given that other agreements between parties on subject indicated that option was exercisable one year after vendor secured clear title. Arguability in contract would be resolved against vendor as drafter thereof. Rogers v. Mettraler, App. 1 Cir. 1983, 342 So. 2d 390.

20. Sales
Where the owner of a plantation enters into a written contract with a merchant, who furnishes supplies to the tenants on said plantation, whereby said planter agrees that he will waive his lessor's privilege in favor of said merchant, in case of a total failure of the crop, and the word "total" is erased and there is a conflict of evidence as to whether it was written in, the contract will be construed against defendant who wrote it, for the reason that it would be nugatory if the word "total" were left in it. Goldberg v. Torrey, App., Guiby's Dec. 2d Cir. 1885) 100.

Art. 2050. Provisions interpreted in light of each other
Each provision in a contract must be interpreted in light of the other provisions so that each is given the meaning suggested by the contract as a whole.


Comment
This Article reproduces the substance of C.C. Art. 1955 (1870). It does not change the law.

History and Text of Former Codes

Sources:
C.C. Art. 1955 (1870); French Civil Code Art. 1161.

Titles III and IV of Book III of the Civil Code of 1870, which formerly contained C.C. arts. 1756 to 2291, all relative to Obligations, were amended and reenacted by Acts 1984, No. 331, to contain C.C. arts. 1765 to 2057, effective January 1, 1985.

Cross References
Insurance contracts, construction, see R.S. 22:654.
Laws in pari materia, construction, see C.C. art. 17.

Law Review Commentaries