LSU Faculty Senate Meeting  
3:00 PM, October 12, 2004, Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union Building

Attendance

Faculty Senate Executive Committee members all present:
1. Claire Advokat (Senate President) 5. Charles Delzell (Secretary)
2. Pratul Ajmera (Member-at-Large) 6. Carruth McGehee (Ex Officio, Immed. Past Pres.)
3. John Chandler (Member-at-Large) 7. Sarah Pierce (Vice-Pres.; left at 4:00 to teach)
4. Andrew Christie (Member-at-Large)

Senators present:
3. Frank Anselmo 15. Maren Hegsted 27. Glenn Pettifer
5. Andrew Christie 17. Dominique Homberger 29. Witoon Prinyawiwatkul
10. Angeletta Gourdine 22. William Metcalf 34. Barbara Wittkopf
11. Linda Griffin 23. Kathy O’Reilly 35. Lisl Zach

Proxies for absent Senators:
1. Pratul Ajmera for Jorge Aravena
2. Claire Advokat for Jon Cogburn
3. Tim Louwers for Larry Crumbley
4. Claire Advokat for Ian Crystal
5. Randall Hall for Bill Daly
6. Warren Waggenspack for Kerry Dooley
7. John Chandler for Wayne Gauthier
8. Warren Waggenspack for Julius Langlinais
9. Rene Pogue for Catherine Lemieux
10. Paul Wilson for Carl Motsenbocker
11. Mary McGehee for Terrie Poehl
12. Rick Weil for Leonard Ray
13. Robb Brumfield for Judith Schiebout
14. Charles Delzell for Robert Tague
15. Mary McGehee for Ann Trousdale
16. Mary McGehee for Aimee Welch
17. David Donze for Grover Waldrop
18. James Cowan for Michael Wascom

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

Parliamentarian: Professor O. Carruth McGehee.

---

1 Jorge Aravena serves as Alternate Senator for Kalliat Valsaraj.
Highlights

1. Senate President Claire Advokat’s report: collective bargaining survey, and photographs of Senators for the Senate website.

2. Further informal discussion of Resolution 05-01, recommending adoption of a new PS-36 (http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions.html).
   - The requirement of an interview; and inbreeding.
   - Explicit requirement of reappointment review by the third year.
   - Choosing outside evaluators.
   - A department’s increased flexibility in choosing outside reviewers.
   - Evaluators from non-academic institutions.
   - Allowing a department to solicit an evaluation from the candidate’s major professor.
   - Minimum number of outside evaluations.
   - New form letter from chair to outside evaluators.
   - Restoration of the department’s right to stop a non-mandatory review.
   - The faculty member’s personnel file to be kept in the department, not HRM.
   - Section XI (“Assistance Program to Enhance Job Performance”).
   - University to pay for the necessary resources.
   - Hypothetical use of the Section XI Assistance Program, followed by use of the PM-35 remediation program.
   - Is Section XI an implementation of a part of Senate Resolution 04-10?
   - Suing for assistance.
   - The three members of the Assistance Team.
   - Section XI prescribes no standards for underperformance or for adjusting to changes in the discipline.
   - Do untenured faculty need the Section XI Assistance Program more than tenured faculty do?
   - Sabbaticals no substitute for Section XI.
   - Will the administration accept Section XI?
   - Does Section XI belong in PS-36?
   - Section XI belongs in PS-36 more than the ill-fated Addendum of April 2003 belonged in PS-36.
   - The fact that someone will get an advantage from Section XI is no reason to oppose it.
   - Section XI opens a window of opportunity.
   - Stopping the Tenure Clock for childcare versus for eldercare.

resolution’s preamble gave a chronology of the 1999 and 2000 versions of PM-35 (which link periodic faculty performance reviews to dismissal proceedings), and of PS-109, as well as the Senate’s various responses to those policies, including Senate Resolutions 00-05, 00-14, and 04-10, and a 2003 faculty questionnaire on PM-35, and a 2004 faculty petition on PS-109. The preamble also mentioned the formation in 2003 of the Tenure-Restoration Coalition (http://TenureRestoration.org). In conclusion, it was resolved that the Faculty Senate directs the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to continue to keep the Senate and the LSU faculty informed of the status or progress of any actions or developments regarding the issues of PM-35, PS-109, or any other policy affecting the tenure-system at LSU. During the discussion, several Senators questioned the need for this resolution, saying that the Executive Committee already keeps the faculty informed on these issues. Other senators found the resolution’s summary of the five-year history of PM-35 developments to contain useful information not widely known; others considered it important that the Senate show its support for the continued efforts of the Executive Committee and the Tenure Restoration Coalition. The vote was 22 to 23, and the resolution was defeated.

4. First reading of Resolution 05-02 (revising the Senate’s committee structure; http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions\R05-02.pdf). 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.
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 proxies for absent Senators and their alternate representatives.

3. Approval of minutes:
The minutes of the September 9, 2004 Faculty Senate meeting (http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Minutes/MSep-04.pdf) were considered. Senator Wittkopf moved to accept the minutes. Secretary Delzell said that the September 9 minutes were wrong on page 11, where Senator Homberger’s remarks on the Senate meeting in “May” had been interpreted as referring to the May 7, 2004 meeting. After writing the first draft of the minutes, Secretary Delzell checked with Senator Homberger, and he learned that she had actually been referring to the meeting of May 15, 2003, which made more sense than May 2004, since it was at the May 15, 2003 meeting that the Senate had added to the PS-36 Addendum being considered then, a statement providing for the evaluation of the academic performance of administrators with faculty rank.

The correction to the September 9, 2004 minutes was accepted, and the earlier motion to approve the (now corrected) minutes was seconded and carried.

4. Senate President Advokat’s report:
   Collective Bargaining Survey: President Advokat reported that approximately 1200 collective-bargaining questionnaires were distributed to faculty; as of October 12, 463 questionnaires had been returned. She said that further questionnaires would be accepted until the November 19 Senate meeting, and that results might be ready for the December or the January Senate meeting.

   Photographs of Senators for the Senate website: President Advokat reported that in response to a suggestion that Senators submit photographs of themselves for the Senate website, four Senators had done so. She invited more Senators to do so.

5. Further discussion of Resolution 05-01, recommending the adoption of a new PS-36 (“Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty: Appointments, Reappointments, Promotions, Advancement to Tenure, and Annual Reviews”):
President Advokat invited Professor O. Carruth McGehee (Chair of the PS-36 Committee) to lead a further discussion of the proposed new PS-36, whose adoption is recommended by Senate Resolution 05-01 (first read September 9, 2004; http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen).

Professor McGehee reported that after the September 9 meeting, the PS-36 Committee received many suggestions for revising the September draft of PS-36, many of which were incorporated into the October 1 draft that the Senate was considering today. (All the drafts of PS-36 considered by the Senate are on the Senate’s website,
Professor McGehee continued to report on certain high points of the draft, today resuming where he had left off, on page 16 of the October 1 draft.

The requirement of an interview; and inbreeding: The current (1997) PS-36 (http://appl1003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/ByNumber?OpenView), requires that the job candidate be interviewed, and it prohibits inbreeding; the proposed PS-36 keeps these provisions (Subsections VI.F and VI.G, respectively), but improves their wording a bit. Senator Pizer mentioned that in the humanities, at least, new LSU Ph.D. graduates are sometimes given instructorships for one year, to help them eventually find a job elsewhere; this practice might be construed as “inbreeding.” He suggested clarifying that the prohibition against inbreeding refers only to the practice of offering tenure-track positions for new LSU Ph.D.’s. Professor McGehee pointed out that the title of the proposed PS-36 is “Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty …”; and that Subsection II.A (“Applicability and Limitations”) says, “PS-36 applies only to tenured and tenure-track faculty …”; and that Section XII (“Glossary”) defines “faculty,” for the purpose of PS-36, as “tenured and tenure-track faculty,” although the glossary goes on to mention that outside the context of PS-36 (e.g., in the Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors, 1-2.2.a), “faculty” refers to all “full-time members of the academic staff having the rank of Instructor or higher….” Senator Delzell added that the Glossary also defines an “appointment” to be an “appointment to a tenure-track or tenured position ….” By then, Senator Pizer was satisfied that no further clarification was needed in subsection VI.G. Professor McGehee further pointed out that Subsection II.C (“Pertinent Policies Stated Elsewhere”) of the proposed PS-36 does not mention the proposed policy on instructors (Senate Resolution 04-04, http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions/R04-04.pdf), even though he had received a suggestion to include it there; the reason for leaving it out of II.C for now is that it has not yet been approved by the University; once it is approved, it should be added to the list in II.C.

Explicit requirement of reappointment review by the third year: Professor McGehee turned to Section VII (“The Probationary Period for Tenure-Track Faculty”) in the proposed PS-36. He said that the 1997 PS-36 is believed, in some quarters, to require a reappointment review (say, by the third year) before reappointing an Assistant Professor hired right out of graduate school; but actually it doesn’t. The proposed PS-36 does (Subsection VII.B, “Timetable Provisions for Reappointments,” item 1).

Choosing outside evaluators: Professor McGehee turned to section VIII (“Promotion and Tenure Reviews”), subsection VIII.B (“Stage 1: Evaluation by Experts Outside LSU”), Subsubsection VIII.B.4 (“Choosing Evaluators: Requirements”) in the proposed PS-36. He said that the most important thing there is item 1: “The evaluators from whom letters are obtained must, taken together, have expertise which covers the areas of the candidate’s work.”

A department’s increased flexibility in choosing outside evaluators: The first example of this increased flexibility under the new PS-36 is in item 2 of VIII.B.4, which says that each evaluator with a university faculty position must hold the equivalent of the rank of Professor or a rank higher than that of the candidate; the words “the equivalent of” were added because ranks are somewhat different in Europe and in some other places. For another example of increased flexibility for departments, Professor McGehee noted that whereas the 1997 PS-36 mentions its preference for evaluators “employed at
institutions with Carnegie Rankings of Research I or II,” item 3 of VIII.B.4 of the proposed PS-36 says:

“Each evaluator must have appropriate professional standing; for example that of a faculty position at a U.S. university whose Carnegie Classification, with regard to research and advanced study, is at least that of LSU.”

The increased flexibility in item 3 above was necessitated by the facts that (a) Carnegie does not classify universities in Canada or in other parts of the world, and (b) Carnegie no longer classifies American universities as “Research I or II”; as of August 2004, the highest classification defined by Carnegie is that of a “Doctoral/Research University—Extensive,” which includes about 150 U.S. institutions, and LSU is among them.

For another example of added flexibility, whereas the 1997 PS-36 says, “No more than one letter can come from any institution,” the proposed PS-36 says, “Letters of evaluation must be obtained from persons from at least three different institutions” (item 5 of VIII.B.4). One reason for this increased flexibility is that some institutions are so large that there may be two people who don’t even know each other, and yet who could each contribute to the evaluation of the candidate; if a department exercises its option to get two letters from one institution, however, then it must pay the “tax” of having to get a fourth letter.

Evaluators from non-academic institutions: Senator Hales mentioned that in his department (Chemistry), the question sometimes arises whether to use evaluators from outside acadème, such as people from government institutions or from industry. Professor McGehee said that under the proposed PS-36, the department must still get the Dean’s approval for evaluators (subsubsection VIII.B.3), and, after the faculty vote, the department must give analysis and explanations, as needed, with regard to the letters from the outside evaluators (subsection V.M, “The Report of a Departmental Recommendation,” item 4). [Secretary’s note: The 1997 PS-36 says that the list of outside evaluators that the department submits to the dean for approval must “include a brief statement of [the evaluators’] qualifications, professional rank, and institution of employment.” The October 1 draft of the proposed PS-36 does not seem to mention this requirement explicitly.] Senator Day said that the proposed PS-36 allows for evaluators from non-academic institutions, where it says that “Each evaluator must have appropriate professional standing, for example …” (VIII.B.4). Senator Cowan found this language insufficiently inclusive of evaluators from government agencies and labs (such as the National Fisheries Service), and from industry; Professor Chandler added the USDA as another example of a nonacademic institution from which an evaluator may be appropriately chosen; and Senator Christie added the example of someone with a high position in a national accounting firm as a potentially appropriate evaluator. Senator Homberger, however, said that we should be careful about going too far away from the academy, because the tradition has been that a letter of evaluation is written by someone who himself has already been in the position (say, associate professor) to which he or she is recommending the candidate, because we want the evaluator to know the requirements of the position. She also asked how we can determine whether an evaluator from industry, for example, has a rank that is appropriate for evaluating a candidate for promotion to, say, full professor. Senator Hales said that his department solicits letters only from people who know American academic institutions. Senator Pizer suggested a compromise: we could require that a minimum of two letters come from people at
academic institutions. Senator Cowan and Professor McGehee thought that the best solution would be to include, in item 3 of VIII.B.4, one or two examples of nonacademic institutions from which outside evaluators may be chosen. Senator Gourdine suggested breaking item 3 up into two sentences, as follows:

“Each evaluator must have appropriate professional standing, for example that of . In the case of an academic evaluator, that person must hold a faculty position at a U.S. university whose Carnegie Classification ….”

Allowing a department to solicit an evaluation from the candidate’s major professor: As a last example of increased flexibility for departments in choosing outside evaluators, Professor McGehee mentioned item 6 in VIII.B.4, which allows a department to use a letter from the candidate’s major professor (provided that there are letters from at least three persons other than the major professor); the 1997 PS-36 prohibits a letter from the major professor. Professor McGehee said that some departments will exercise their right to continue to exclude the major professor from the list of evaluators, but other departments will probably include the major professor in some cases. In mathematics, for example, Professor McGehee has found that the major professor is often a source of stern evaluations and rankings (“this is my number six student”), and a source of information on sorting out the degree of independence of work that is jointly done, and on the degree of development of the person after the dissertation.

Minimum number of outside evaluations: The proposed PS-36 keeps the minimum number of required letters of recommendation at three, even though some had suggested increasing that minimum number to five, according to Professor McGehee. He reported that some departments find it hard enough to get three letters, even after having asked seven people to write. Professor Chandler reported that the LSU Agricultural Center campus had recently revised its policy on tenured and tenure-track faculty; that campus now requires a minimum of five letters from outside evaluators (Ag Center PS-42, “Promotion and Tenure,” Revision 1, September 30, 2004; www.agctr.lsu.edu/inst/admin/policies/policies.asp; Appendix A (“Promotion and Retention Review Procedures”), the section entitled “Review and Approval Process and Participants,” subsection I.c).

New form letter from chair to outside evaluators: Under subsubsection VIII.B.5 (“Communications with Evaluators”) of the proposed PS-36, the form letter that the chair must send to evaluators has been revised, Professor McGehee said. For example, the new form letter includes the following new sentence near the end: “If you send your response electronically, please also send a signed, paper original for our files.” In the new form letter and/or the enclosures therewith, the department chair must make clear to the evaluator the degree of the candidate’s teaching and service responsibilities during the probationary period; the form letter in the 1997 PS-36 only states the percentages of teaching and research in the candidate’s appointment, with no mention of service responsibilities.

Restoration of the Department’s right to stop a non-mandatory review: Professor McGehee recalled that the 1997 PS-36 says that in the case of a non-mandatory review, the eligible voting faculty will meet to determine whether the candidate’s documentation warrants being sent to external evaluators for review; if the determination is negative, the candidate may appeal the decision to the dean, who has final authority. The September 9
draft of the proposed PS-36 accidentally omitted this provision; the October 1 draft restored it, and in a somewhat clearer form (subsection VIII.C, “Stage 2: Recommendation by the Department,” item 5).

The faculty member’s personnel file to be kept in the department, not HRM: The 1997 PS-36 mentions a faculty member’s official personnel file, and says that this file is to be kept in the Office of Human Resource Management. The proposed PS-36 (subsection X.B), however, says that this file is to be kept in the faculty member’s primary department. It also says that the faculty member will have ready access to the file, and may update its contents or add appropriate material at any time. These innovations were introduced already in the 2003 drafts of the proposed PS-36. They were also included in PS-109 (“Annual Departmental Reviews for Faculty and PM-35 Implementation Procedure,” subsection III.B; http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/ByNumber?OpenView), which then-Chancellor Mark Emmert issued in July 2003 after the Faculty Senate, on May 15, 2003, referred the matter to the entire Faculty Council for a vote (a vote that never took place, due to lack of a quorum on December 1, 2003). Once the proposed PS-36 is adopted by the university, it will supersede section III of PS-109; this would, Professor McGehee said, be the first step in the process of dismantling PS-109.

Section XI ("Assistance Program to Enhance Job Performance"): This section of the proposed PS-36 is completely new; Professor McGehee said that Senator Ajmera originated it. While all the other provisions in the proposed PS-36 are used frequently, Section XI is expected to be used only occasionally. It may remind the reader of PM-35 ("Review of Faculty Ranks," http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/PermanentMemoranda?OpenView), but it makes no reference to PM-35, and, unlike PM-35, it contains no provision of mandatory consequences [e.g., dismissal proceedings] resulting from its procedures. Section XI is a procedure that need not be started on the basis of anything negative that the Chair says about the faculty member. It is voluntary--a matter of agreement between the faculty member, the chair, the dean, and the Provost. It involves an appointed faculty committee to provide assistance. Professor McGehee said that the PS-36 Committee finds that this procedure can do no harm. It is a procedure which occasionally may be found to be the tool of choice. There are many possible arrangements between a faculty member and a chair, in terms of distribution of resources, expectations, and projects; those arrangements can continue, and may solve all problems without any reference to this new section XI; but section XI is one defined, formal procedure.

Senator Ajmera further explained Section XI as follows. When we hire new Assistant Professors, we sometimes give them start-up packages, we mentor them, we give them all the help possible. Section XI, by contrast, is only for tenured faculty. This program may be started either by the faculty member or the chair. Sometimes in the course of a faculty member’s career, the field changes, and he or she must re-think his or her place in the field. The faculty member may have a brilliant new idea in teaching or research that would make national impact. The faculty member may already be doing very well, but he or she would like to do something outstanding. Alternatively, the chair may be the one to suggest that this program be started for a faculty member to help solve a problem of underperformance by providing assistance; but it is uncoupled from any kind of PM-35 remediation.
University to pay for the necessary resources: Senator Gourdine noted that the assistance program, may, depending on the case, “involve measures to support the faculty member’s work, such as (for example) reduced teaching duties, assignment of a graduate research assistant, travel expenses, or the purchase of research materials or equipment” (item 2 in Section XI). She asked who would pay for these resources. Senator Ajmera replied that the university administration (the chair, the dean, and the Provost) would pay. The only role of the Provost is to approve the plan and provide resources; the Provost has no role in developing the plan of assistance. Once the resources are committed by the university, no one but the faculty member can choose to terminate the program early (except in a case of financial exigency).

Hypothetical use of the Section XI Assistance Program, followed by use of the PM-35 remediation program: Senator O'Reilly wondered if an underperforming faculty member could first get assistance through the voluntary Section XI program, and, if he was still underperforming, then get further assistance in a PM-35 mandatory remediation program. For this reason, she doubted that the administration would adopt Section XI as long as PM-35 and PS-109 are in place. Senator Ajmera replied that once the Assistance Program ends, reports written by the faculty member, the chair, and the Assistance Team are added to the faculty member’s personnel file, and that is the end of it—like the final report that one writes at the end of a grant; i.e., under the proposed PS-36 (and unlike in PM-35), there is no mandatory procedure that must follow the Assistance Program in Section XI. Senator Ajmera said, moreover, that he was looking a little farther into the future: As Professor McGehee mentioned earlier in the meeting today, the proposed PS-36 would begin the dismantling of PS-109. And the Faculty Senate Executive Committee is currently working on a replacement to PM-35; as this work proceeds, he expects the problem raised by Senator O’Reilly to go away. And even if PM-35 stays, this Section XI cannot do any harm, because the language of Section XI is quite different from that of PM-35.

Is Section XI an implementation of a part of Senate Resolution 04-10? Senator Delzell pointed out, for the benefit of new senators who were not present last spring, that in March, the Senate adopted Resolution 04-10 (http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions\R04-10.pdf), which called, among other things, for the replacement of PM-35 by a new PM entitled “Review and Enhancement of Faculty Performance”; he said that Section XI of the proposed PS-36 was an implementation (on this campus) of the enhancement part of Resolution 04-10. Senator Ajmera agreed only partially, noting that Section XI does not directly address PM-35.

Suing for Assistance: Senator Knapp said that some faculty in his department would want this Assistance Program every year; if the chairman refuses to give this assistance, and if they eventually do not get promoted, they might sue their chairman. Senator Ajmera replied that this Assistance Program is to be used only occasionally, as stated in Section XI. If a faculty member suggests that an Assistance Program be started, and the chair says no, then these communications are put in the file, and that is the end of it; he can’t appeal that decision to the dean, for example. Professor McGehee later added that already now, an Associate Professor can sue (or complain about) his chair over a number of other decisions that he makes; so the chair has to treat the faculty member fairly.
The three members of the Assistance Team: Senator Knapp also asked about very small departments, in which it may not be possible to find three tenured faculty members to form an Assistance Team. Senator Ajmera replied that item 1 of Section XI does not require that the Team members come from the faculty member’s department.

Section XI prescribes no standards for underperformance or adjusting to changes in the discipline: Senator Gourdine noted that Section XI mentions three examples of specific reasons for which an Assistance Program could be started:

“to provide essential support enabling a faculty member (1) to achieve excellence in some new undertaking in scholarship or teaching; or (2) to change the direction of his or her scholarship to adjust to changes in the discipline; and/or (3) to overcome a problem of underperformance.”

Regarding (2) and (3), she wondered if there was some standard by which underperformance could be judged, or by which one could determine whether a faculty member needs to adjust to changes in the discipline. Senator Ajmera said that in a campus-wide document such as PS-36, we cannot be too prescriptive. The department chair understands the discipline, and is in a better position than we are to judge these matters. Ultimately, the decision must be made whether the benefit to the department would justify the expenditure of resources for the faculty member.

Do untenured faculty need the Section XI Assistance Program more than tenured faculty do? Senator Cowan said that at least in his department, the faculty members most in need of an Assistance Program are the untenured faculty members; it is there that his department seems to fall down. He thought that the tenured faculty have already proven themselves, and do not need an Assistance Program. So for him the fact that Section XI is only for tenured faculty is a flaw. Senator Ajmera replied that Section XI is to be used only rarely, and for cases beyond the normal. In every department that he knows about, there are already resources available for untenured faculty members.

Sabbaticals no substitute for Section XI: Senator Christie said that at least in his college (Business), the aims of Section XI are achieved by means of sabbaticals. Senator Ajmera replied that a sabbatical provides no travel money, no equipment, and no assistants. A sabbatical provides only time off, and cannot provide all of these other things.

Will the administration accept Section XI? Senator Peckham asked whether we have any idea of what the administration’s view of Section XI will be. Professor McGehee replied that the deans reviewed an earlier draft of PS-36, and their only suggested change in Section XI was a couple of words in item 2, i.e., no substantive change, and nothing negative. He believes that Section XI is under active consideration at the Provost level. If the Senate recommends adoption of this PS-36 including Section XI, then the administration will have to answer some questions about how to use it consistently across all the departments on the campus.

Does Section XI belong in PS-36? Senator Hales liked the idea of Section XI, but wondered why it belongs in PS-36. Senator O’Reilly was afraid that if we keep Section XI in PS-36, it will slow down the adoption of PS-36. She said that Section XI should be a separate (and expanded) policy. Professor McGehee said that when the Senate begins formal consideration of PS-36, she or some other senator could move that Section XI be stricken, and the Senate could vote on it.
Section XI belongs in PS-36 more than the ill-fated Addendum of April 2003 belonged in PS-36: Senator Delzell remarked that in the spring of 2003, the Senate considered an addendum to PS-36 which was going to include what was then called a remediation program, and the campus was under orders from the LSU System to provide resources for such remediation programs. So it is not such a radical, new idea that the university should provide resources to improve performance, or that such resources should be included under PS-36; now, the proposed Section XI is a new kind of addendum to PS-36, which we have twisted for our benefit, rather than having these resources used as a first step toward firing us.

The fact that someone will get an advantage from Section XI is no reason to oppose it: Senator Homberger said that this Section XI is a very good idea; it is a chance to work on the positive side, and to do things better. As long as we have tenured faculty members, why would we want to deny them the chance to become better? We can’t fire them. Why not have a program that makes everybody better? She said that the only motions she has heard against this program today is that someone may get an advantage. That is mean-spirited and tightfisted; why don’t we want that person to get something better? She said that we should overcome these emotions, and agree that this is a great idea, and all get behind this. She suggested that to avoid the possibility of a chair unfairly denying a faculty member this Assistance Program, we could have a standing committee that receives proposals from faculty members (like an internally funded research grant). Whoever writes the best proposal will get it.

Section XI opens a window of opportunity: Professor Chandler agreed, and said that this Section XI opens a window of opportunity. The proposed PS-36 is already substantially different from the 1997 PS-36, and to provide this Section XI in it allows us to have an assistance program that is completely decoupled from the old notions of remediation and dismissal.

Professor McGehee proposed that the PS-36 Committee should, on November 10, make a new draft of PS-36 based on the discussion today.

Stopping the Tenure Clock due to a grant? Senator Fuentes referred to subsection VII.D, “Adjustments to the Tenure Clock,” item 2: “The faculty member may request that the tenure clock be stopped for a specified period of time, with or without requesting one of the actions named in item 1.” She asked whether a faculty member who got a grant to be away from LSU for a semester could ask that the clock be stopped. Professor McGehee referred to the specific examples at the end of subsection VII.D of circumstances in which such a request would be considered (viz., caring for infants or the elderly or the dependent, or disability or chronic illness). He suggested that getting a grant to be away for a semester would be the opposite of a reason for stopping the tenure clock. He wants to leave a lot of discretion on this issue.

Stopping the Tenure Clock for childcare versus for eldercare: Senator Homberger noticed that subsection VII.D provides for stopping the tenure clock for a maximum of two years for the care of (two) children, and a maximum of one year for the care of one or more elderly. She wondered if this is discriminatory. Why not a maximum of two years for the elderly (with one year for one parent, and another year for the other)? Professor McGehee replied that the limitation on care of children comes from the AAUP, while the limitation on the care of the elderly comes from the University of Wisconsin. Senator Mary McGehee pointed out that the one-year limit on care for the elderly is
preceded by the word “ordinarily”; so there is already some flexibility. Professor McGehee said that it is unlikely that the administration would stop the clock for four years, say, for any kind of combination of reasons.

This concluded today’s discussion of Resolution 05-01 (i.e., of PS-36).


President Advokat explained that the next item on the agenda was Resolution 05-02, on committees. But since that resolution is complex, she asked if anyone wanted to move to modify the agenda so as to first consider Resolution 05-03, on tenure, which appeared to require less time to consider. The motion was made, seconded, and adopted by voice vote.

Senator Delzell then re-read Resolution 05-03, which had been read at the September 9 meeting. Its preamble gave a chronology of the 1999 and 2000 versions of PM-35 (which link periodic faculty performance reviews to dismissal proceedings), and of PS-109, as well as the Senate’s various responses to those policies, including Senate Resolutions 00-05, 00-14, and 04-10 (http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions.html), and a 2003 faculty questionnaire on PM-35, and a 2004 faculty petition on PS-109. The preamble also mentioned the formation in 2003 of the Tenure-Restoration Coalition (http://TenureRestoration.org). In conclusion, it is resolved that the Faculty Senate directs the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to continue to keep the Senate and the LSU faculty informed of the status or progress of any actions or developments regarding the issues of PM-35, PS-109, or any other policy affecting the tenure-system at LSU.

Senator Gourdine suggested changing “former Chancellor Mark Emmert” to “then-Chancellor Mark Emmert” in paragraphs 5, 7, and 9. President Advokat asked if there was any objection to this change; none was heard.

Senators Wittkopf and Day questioned the need for this resolution; they expected the Executive Committee to keep faculty informed about such developments even without such a resolution. Senators O’Reilly and Knapp asked whether the Executive Committee had in the past failed to keep faculty informed. Senator Delzell replied, no; he sees this resolution as the Senate’s authorization to the Executive Committee to continue to keep faculty informed, by all appropriate means, including, for example, by inviting a representative of the Tenure-Restoration Coalition to address the Senate. Senator Hegsted said that the resolution doesn’t mention such an invitation. She also asked whether any policy or rule interferes with the Executive Committee’s power to make such an invitation. Senator Delzell replied that it would have been inappropriate for the resolution to prescribe to the Executive Committee the manner in which the Committee should continue to keep the faculty informed; he wanted the Committee to have confidence that it may utilize any manner it sees fit, including the inviting of outside speakers, if they have something relevant to say.

Senator Homberger found the resolution to be useful, because it gives a clear summary of the five-year history of developments regarding PM-35, which continue up to the present time. The resolution hurts no one, she said; it does not imply lack of trust
of the Executive Committee—otherwise, Senator Delzell would be shooting himself in
the foot, since he is on that Committee. The resolution’s message to the administration is
that we are going to continue. Professor Chandler recalled that in the May 2004 meeting,
a Senator asked the Provost what the administration had done with Senate Resolution 04-
10—was it sitting on the desk of System Vice President Hargrave? Today’s resolution
constitutes “reading the Riot Act” to the administration; this resolution gives the
Executive Committee and the Tenure Restoration Coalition extra support to really push
the administration.

Senator Mary McGehee construed the resolution as implying that the Executive
Committee has been remiss in keeping faculty informed. Senator Delzell replied that the
resolution directs the Committee to continue to keep the faculty informed. Professor
Louwers (proxy for Senator Crumbley) said that he had never before seen the information
contained in this resolution, including the results of the survey and the petition mentioned
in the resolution (even though he had filled out that survey or petition). He therefore
thought that it would be helpful to the rest of the faculty, as well, to see this information
at least once.

Senator O’Reilly called the question. President Advokat asked if there was any
further discussion. There being none, a voice vote was held, which turned out to be
inconclusive. A show of hands then showed that the vote was 22 for, and 23 against the
resolution. President Advokat therefore declared Resolution 05-03 defeated.

7. Resolution 05-02 (Amendments to Article IX of the Senate Bylaws):

http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions\R05-02.pdf):

Professor McGehee read Resolution 05-02 to the Senate for the first time. 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.

Senator Ajmera moved, and Senator Day seconded, Resolution 05-02.
There was a brief discussion.

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 Nov. 19, 2004.