LSU Faculty Senate Meeting
3:00 PM, September 9, 2004, Atchafalaya Room, LSU Union Building

Attendance

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

Senators present:
3. Frank Anselmo 19. Steven Hall 35. George Stanley
10. Ian Crystal 26. Catherine Lemieux 42. Rick Weil
11. Bill Daly 27. Thomas Lynch 43. Cathleen Williams
15. Wayne Gauthier 31. Robert Peck
16. Linda Griffin 32. Robert Perlis

Proxies for absent Senators:
1. Emily Elliot for Katie Cherry 5. Maren Hegsted for Witoon Prinyawiwatkul

Senators absent without proxies:

Parliamentarian: Professor O. Carruth McGehee.
Invited guest: Interim Chancellor and LSU System President William Jenkins.

---

1 J. Aravena serves as Alternate Senator for Kalliat Valsaraj.
2 “The President shall appoint a Parliamentarian prior to the discussion of business at any meeting of the Senate…”—LSU Faculty Senate Bylaws. In the summer of 2004, newly elected President Advokat appointed then-President McGehee as Parliamentarian.
Highlights

1. LSU System President/Interim Chancellor William Jenkins’ report: Chancellor search, new students, new faculty, unintended consequences.
2. Senate President Advokat’s report: improved Senate website, Chancellor search.
3. Election of Senator Andrew Christie (Accounting) as the third at-large member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
   Preliminary discussion of the September 2 draft of the PS-36 Committee’s proposed new PS-36:
   - The Senate’s role in developing PS-36.
   - PS-36 will no longer cover Instructors or research-only professors.
   - Contents; index; and the rules of a department.
   - Collegiality vs. “essential expectations.”
   - “Avoidance of disruptive and combative behavior.”
   - Elimination of “Notable in at least two of the areas [teaching, research, and service] and satisfactory in the third.”
   - Clarification of the right to a peer advisor.
   - Adding voting faculty in promotion and tenure decisions.
   - Faculty from the LSU Agricultural Center campus voting on tenure cases on the LSU A&M campus.
   - Initial appointment and the “tenure clock.”
   - Adjustments to the tenure clock.
   - Early promotion and tenure reviews.
   - An appointment without the terminal degree, as “Acting Assistant Professor.”

At the October 12 Senate meeting, the Senate will begin to consider the (39 + vii) pages of the proposed new PS-36 seriatim; if time allows, the Senate will then vote on 05-01.

5. First reading of a resolution: “Informing faculty of developments regarding PM-35, PS-109, and related issues.” The resolution’s preamble gives 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 mentions 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. The resolution will be considered at the October 12 Senate meeting.

6. Discussion of annual reviews (a topic in PS-36) of the academic work of faculty members who are also full-time administrators.
Minutes

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

2. **Proxies:**
Proxy and alternate representatives for absent Senators were read.

3. **Approval of minutes:**
The minutes of the April 13, 2004 Faculty Senate meeting ([http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Minutes/MApr13-04.pdf](http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Minutes/MApr13-04.pdf)) were considered. Senator Christie said that the April 13 minutes were wrong (on page 1) to list him as “Chair” of the Academic Standards and Honors Committee at that time; back then, he should have been listed only as a “member.” A motion to approve the corrected April 13 minutes was made, seconded, and carried.

A motion to approve the minutes of the May 7, 2004 meeting ([http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Minutes/MMay-04.pdf](http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Minutes/MMay-04.pdf)) was made, seconded, and carried.

4. **LSU System President/Interim Chancellor William Jenkins’ report:**
   - **Chancellor search; new students; new faculty:** The System President/Interim Chancellor reported that the search for a permanent Chancellor is underway. In the next two weeks, the Search Committee’s announcement should be in the *Chronicle*. He has greeted many faculty and student groups. The quality of our incoming freshman students is as good as ever. We have 60 new faculty.
   - **Unintended consequences:** The System President/Interim Chancellor said: “… I have met during the summer with your Executive Committee, and we’re tackling some of the thorny issues and some of the other unexpected consequences of some of my decisions as President and that I will address, and we’re going to do that together as well, as we move ahead. During my time with you, and as I mentioned to you last time, I suspect it will be six months–it could be longer and perhaps unfortunately could be shorter–I hope to help solve some, one or two, and there are not a host of these, there are one or two nettlesome problems that have become an obstruction for our progress as an institution, and I am very well positioned, as I mentioned last time, to do that. There are … these are a few little aspects, in large measure, aspects that determine faculty success, that aren’t working as smoothly as not only I would like, frankly I’ve heard that from across the campus since I have been coming onto the campus, and I can fix those for you in the next six months or so, and I believe some, frankly, have already been addressed….”
   - **Chancellor search:** Senator Daly said that he had heard that there was going to be a “redefinition” of the position of Chancellor. The System President/Interim Chancellor said that he wasn’t aware of any such plan, and that he would have known about it if there were such a plan.
   - **Racial diversity of the new faculty:** Senator Griffin asked how many of the newly hired faculty are African American. The System President/Interim Chancellor said that
Bob Kuhn [Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Planning/Comptroller] would know the numbers, and reaffirmed his commitment to diversity. Senate President Advokat said that she would inquire about the numbers.

**Chancellor Search Committee website:** After the System President/Interim Chancellor left the Senate meeting (at 3:16PM), Faculty Senate Executive Committee member at-large John Chandler asked Senate President Advokat for the URL of the Chancellor Search Committee’s new webpage. President Advokat promised to find out. Later in the meeting, she announced that the URL is www.lsu.edu/chancellor/search.

5. **Senate President Advokat’s report:**

**Improved Senate website:** President Advokat thanked Faculty Senate Executive Committee former member-at-large Robert Ward, and Sumanth Yenduri, whom Professor Ward had hired as the new webmaster of the Senate’s webpage, http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen. That page has been substantially upgraded by Mr. Yenduri. President Advokat also thanked immediate past President and current Parliamentarian Carruth McGehee for all the information he put up on the site during his term in office.

**Chancellor search:** President Advokat, who is on the Chancellor Search Committee, invited the Senate to offer its suggestions and ideas on the search for a permanent Chancellor. She promised to present those suggestions and ideas to the Chancellor Search Committee.

6. **Election of a third at-large member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:**

On August 31 the Executive Committee had already nominated newly elected senator Andrew Christie (Accounting) for the third at-large position on the FSEC. At the September 9 Senate meeting, President Advokat opened the floor for additional nominations. Senator Daly nominated newly elected senator Grover Waldrop (Biological Sciences). There being no further nominations, ballots were distributed, marked, collected, and eventually counted. Later in the meeting, President Advokat announced the result: 33 ballots for Senator Christie, 13 ballots for Senator Waldrop, and 4 invalid or blank ballots. President Advokat declared Senator Andrew Christie the third at-large member of the Executive Committee.

7. **A proposed new PS-36:**

President Advokat invited Immediate Past President Carruth McGehee (Chair of the PS-36 Committee) to read Resolution 05-01 (http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen). He did so:

“Resolved: The Faculty Senate recommends that the University adopt the document

A Proposed New PS-36:

Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty: Appointments,

---

3 The Senate Bylaws (http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen) state: “Before the first [Senate] meeting of the Fall term, the [Faculty Senate] Executive Committee shall nominate and announce in the Agenda for the meeting at least one newly elected senator to fill the third at-large position on the Executive Committee. At the first meeting, nominations will be opened, and the election held.”
Reappointments, Promotions, Advancement to Tenure, and Annual Reviews

to replace the PS-36 that was issued July 1, 1997”
(http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/ByNumber?OpenView).

The resolution was moved and seconded.

Seriatim consideration of the pages of PS-36: Professor McGehee then read a
procedural motion [on the same page as Resolution 05-01] to (1) discuss the September 2
draft of the proposed new PS-36 (attached to Resolution 05-01) informally at the
September 9 Senate meeting, and then (2) consider, at the Senate’s October 12 meeting,
the (39 + vii) pages of the proposed new PS-36 seriatim. (Later drafts of the PS-36
Committee’s proposed new PS-36 will be available at
moved the adoption of Professor McGehee’s procedural motion. The procedural motion
was then seconded, but not voted on; there appeared to be no objection to it.

The Senate’s role in developing PS-36: Professor McGehee began a discussion of
the proposed new PS-36. He thanked the other members of the PS-36 Committee (who
are listed on the cover page of the September 2 draft of the proposed new PS-36); he
thanked in particular Professors Pratul Ajmera and Stacia Haynie, who joined the PS-36
Committee in the spring and summer of 2004, respectively, and who contributed many
new ideas. He reminded Senators that the Senate has historically exercised great
influence on the various past versions of PS-36. The Senate’s authority to make
recommendations on such personnel policies (and on other aspects of University life) was
formally “ratified” in January when the LSU Faculty Council (i.e., all full-time faculty
members on the LSU A&M campus) adopted Professor John Chandler’s amendment to
the Senate Constitution (that amendment introduced a new Section 2 to Article I; see
http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/FSCB.pdf).

PS-36 will no longer cover Instructors or research-only professors: Professor
McGehee then reported on several new features in the proposed PS-36. For one thing,
the September 2 draft has 10 pages of notes at the end identifying major changes that this
draft makes to the 1997 version of PS-36. For another thing, while the 1997 PS-36 deals
with tenure-track and tenured faculty as well as instructors and research-only faculty, this
proposed PS-36 deals only with tenured and tenure-track faculty; in the spring of 2004,
the Senate had recommended a separate policy on instructors (Senate Resolution 04-04,
http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions/R04-04.pdf),
which is still being reviewed by LSU’s attorneys; and in the future, another separate
policy for research-only faculty should be written.

Voting on the new Chancellor’s tenure: Senator Wilson asked if the new,
permanent Chancellor (once selected) will be tenured in some department at LSU, and if
the faculty in that department will be allowed to vote on whether to grant him or her
tenure. Professor McGehee said that that procedure has always been the policy, as far as
he knows.

Contents; index; and the rules of a department: Professor McGehee called
Senators’ attention to the new format and organization of the proposed PS-36, including
its detailed table of contents and its index, which, together, should make it easy for one to
find every mention in the document of any particular topic. Section III of the proposed
PS-36, “The Rules of a Department or Other Academic Unit,” clarifies a unit’s authority to make its own rules consistent with the proposed PS-36.

**Collegiality vs. “essential expectations”:** Professor McGehee said that Section IV of the proposed PS-36 (“Guidelines for Criteria” for evaluation of faculty) is important. For one thing, it avoids the term “collegiality,” which is often associated with the suppression of dissent, the enforcement of conformity and subservience, and other mischief (see the AAUP’s essay on the subject, [http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/collegia.htm](http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/collegia.htm), which says, among other things, that collegiality should not be elevated to the status of a fourth major area of faculty evaluation, after scholarship, teaching, and service). On the contrary, the proposed new PS-36 declares that no provision of it will be used or interpreted to suppress the right to dissent. On the other hand, the proposed PS-36 refers to “essential expectations,” which it identifies as “intellectual honesty; cooperative, ethical, and professional conduct; avoidance of disruptive or combative behavior; and respect for others’ rights and safety.” Except in cases where these essential expectations have not been met, the appropriate areas for consideration of a faculty member’s performance are the three traditional ones of scholarship, teaching, and service, according to the proposed PS-36.

**Did the Senate Executive Committee make this change?** Senator Anselmo remembered that collegiality had been discussed in the May 7 Senate meeting, and asked what role the Executive Committee had in the changes to the collegiality statement, and what the 1997 PS-36 says about collegiality. Professor McGehee read the parts of the 1997 PS-36 mentioning collegiality (“Criteria … General,” and Appendix A, “Definitions,” where collegiality is defined as “Acting in an ethical and professional manner regarding colleagues”), and explained that, though the Executive Committee was consulted, it was the PS-36 Committee that had changed the 1997 statement on collegiality to the proposed statement on essential expectations. The proposed PS-36 makes it clear that for a department to address a faculty member’s behavior with respect to “essential expectations” should be an extraordinary thing, but which must be done if there is a problem there. On the other hand, there are aspects of collegiality that can and should be addressed as part of a faculty member’s scholarship, teaching, and service.

**“Avoidance of disruptive and combative behavior”:** Senator Homberger was concerned that the above phrase is a matter of value and of culture. What would be perfectly normal behavior in one person could be considered in another person as excessively combative or argumentative. She found this phrase unnecessary and dangerous in the proposed PS-36. The other parts of the definition of “essential expectations” (intellectual honesty; cooperative, ethical, and professional conduct; and respect for others’ rights and safety) cover what we want to cover, she said, and are couched in a positive way; and probably every culture and every person can completely agree on what is meant. Professor McGehee suggested that this could properly be the subject of an amendment to the proposed PS-36 when the Senate begins formal processing in October.

**“Negative effect”:** Senator Knapp asked about the “negative effect” that a failure to meet the essential expectations would have on a faculty member’s evaluation: how much of a negative effect? Professor McGehee said that this would be left to the judgment of the voting faculty in the department.
“Disruptive and combative behavior”: Senator Pizer also found the phrase “avoidance of disruptive and combative behavior” unnecessary. Based on his experience on the Faculty Grievance Committee, such behavior would normally come to the attention of, and provoke the intervention of, the Office of Human Resource Management (HRM), which would make the decision whether to address that behavior, possibly leading to dismissal proceedings. Given that this kind of behavior is the natural domain of HRM, he suggested that this kind of behavior is not the proper subject for a tenure clause in PS-36.

“Disruptive behavior”: Senator Ajmera said that disruptive behavior can hurt the educational mission of the department, and one’s colleagues. For him it is important that one should not be able to get tenure simply by being collegial and nice, though uncollegial behavior should, in extreme cases, be grounds for denying tenure.

The need for some statement on collegiality: Senator Lynch said that in his experience on promotion-and-tenure committees both here at LSU and at many other universities, collegiality will always be discussed and considered by P&T committees, even if the written policy governing such committees does not provide for considering collegiality. Therefore, it is better to be up-front and honest about it and spell it out in the policy.

Professor McGehee invited Senators to send further ideas to him at mcgehee@MATH.lsu.edu. (Don’t omit “math”!)

Elimination of “Notable in two areas, satisfactory in the third”: Professor McGehee then explained that the proposed PS-36 (Section IV) drops from the 1997 PS-36 (“Criteria … General”) the clause stating that a faculty member’s work must be “notable in at least two of the areas [teaching, research, and service] and satisfactory in the third.” In some departments, at least for Assistant Professors, the two primary concerns are necessarily scholarship and teaching; in other departments, there is a definite service component to their duties. Departments should be able to define appropriate standards in all the areas in which a faculty member must perform; there should be no license to be merely “satisfactory” in any one of the three areas; and the interrelated nature of the three areas needs to be recognized. The PS-36 Committee has rebuilt the guidelines for criteria (Section IV) accordingly, he said.

Clarification of the right to a peer advisor: Next, Professor McGehee moved to Section V of the proposed PS-36, “General Procedural Provisions.” For example, subsection V.H, “Right to a Peer Advisor,” is essentially the same as in the 1997 PS-36, except that the 1997 PS-36 mentions this right only in the preamble and in the glossary. In every place in the proposed PS-36 where a meeting at which the faculty member has a right to a peer advisor is mentioned, the document says, “V.H applies.”

Adding voting faculty in promotion and tenure decisions: Subsubsection V.L.4 of the proposed PS-36, “Adding Voting Faculty,” provides that in case there are fewer than five voting faculty in a particular unit, the academic officer to whom the chair reports will, after consulting with the chair and the voting faculty, appoint additional voting faculty from outside the unit. Senator Christie observed that if a department is out of favor with a Dean, then the Dean may stack the voting faculty in a manner contrary to the wishes of the department. Professor McGehee gave the example of Jim Richardson, head of the Public Administration Institute, which has four faculty members besides the head. On Professor Richardson’s initiative, he got additional voting faculty added, to give more
heft to his recommendations for hiring. Senator O’Reilly asked whether Associate Professors from the outside the department may be among those voting faculty added to vote on a promotion to Full Professor. Professor McGehee said no (see V.L.4 of the proposed PS-36).

Faculty from the LSU Agricultural Center campus voting on tenure cases on the LSU A&M campus: The LSU AgCenter is a separate campus of the LSU System (different from the LSU A&M campus). Senator Gauthier reported that three or four years ago, as a result of a merger, faculty in LSU A&M’s College of Agriculture now have joint appointments on the LSU A&M campus and on the AgCenter campus, though many faculty on the AgCenter campus are still 100% on that campus, and do not have joint appointments on the LSU A&M campus. Yet faculty who are 100% on the AgCenter campus vote on the tenure of LSU A&M College of Agriculture faculty, and vice versa, he said. For the faculty who are 100% on the AgCenter campus, teaching plays no role, and scholarship and/or service are the only areas that count.

How often are there fewer than five voting faculty? Senator Weil asked how common it is for a department at LSU to have fewer than five voting faculty on a promotion case. One third to one fourth of the time? Professor McGehee said yes, but promised to find more accurate numbers. Professor Chandler said that his department (Dairy Science) has only two Full Professors, including one who was originally 100% on the Ag Center campus before he came into the department. Professor Chandler was satisfied with the system of allowing outside faculty to vote on promotion cases.

More on AgCenter faculty voting on LSU A&M promotions: Prof. McGehee returned to an issue raised by Senator Gauthier above. He said that AgCenter Chancellor Bill Richardson, and former LSU A&M Chancellor Emmert, agreed that faculty who are 100% on the AgCenter campus should not vote on the promotion of faculty who are partly on the LSU A&M campus. On the other hand, informal consultation between faculty on the two campuses can be neither commanded nor outlawed.

Evaluation of service of AgCenter faculty: Senator Wilson remarked that he is also on the Faculty Senate of the LSU AgCenter campus. In 2002 the AgCenter campus adopted its PS-42 (“LSU AgCenter Promotion Interim Policy Statement,” [www.lsuagcenter.com/Inst/Admin/policies/PS-42%20interim.pdf] ), which is similar to the LSU A&M campus’ PS-36. [Other remarks inaudible.] Professor McGehee said that the proposed PS-36 (subsection IV.C) is not trying to address the promotion of someone to a position in the AgCenter. The proposed PS-36 lists some examples of service (subsection IV.C), but leaves each unit free to evaluate the service of a faculty member. Professor Chandler mentioned item 11 in IV.C, “leadership in technology transfer, economic development, or job creation,” as an example of service that is relevant to the AgCenter’s mission.

faculty member initially hired as an Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure, year four in the tenure clock is the year of mandatory tenure review. The 1997 PS-36 says that year three on the tenure clock is the year of mandatory tenure review, though this campus hasn’t been doing that since PM-23 was changed in 2002. The proposed PS-36 says that year four is the year of mandatory tenure review, in accordance with the 2002 PM-23.

Adjustments to the tenure clock: Professor McGehee then moved to subsection VII.D, “Adjustments to the Tenure Clock,” in the proposed PS-36. This subsection reflects current practice at LSU for some years, and complies with AAUP guidelines, according to which the tenure clock may be stopped in certain cases, such as for the care of small children or elderly relatives, or during disability or chronic illness. Subsection VII.D resembles the policy at the University of Michigan. President Advokat asked if the proposed PS-36 allows a faculty member to stop the tenure clock twice, first for up to two years while caring for two or more children, and again for up to one year while caring for elderly relatives, for example. Professor McGehee said yes. Senator Stanley suggested clarifying the language of VII.D, by using the word “and” or “or,” as appropriate. He also noted that the index of the proposed PS-36 does not contain the entry “maternity leave.” He also suggested adding the word “extensions” (which arises in several places in the document) to the index. Professor McGehee promised to add those entries. Senator Homberger suggested an additional entry in the index for “parental leave.” Senator Stanley further suggested adding, in subsection VI.E, a reference to subsection VII.D, so that the reader of VI.E realizes that exceptions to the seemingly strict language of VI.E will occur four pages later. Senator Hall asked whether there is a maximum total adjustment to the tenure clock in the proposed PS-36. Professor McGehee replied no, but pointed out that an adjustment for caring for children would be subject to a maximum of one year per child (with a maximum of two years total for all children); and an adjustment for elder care or disability would be subject to a maximum of one year; these maxima come from the AAUP guidelines.

Early promotion and tenure reviews: Senator Skillen suggested that subsection VII.D (“Adjustments to the Tenure Clock”) of the proposed PS-36 refer also to subsubsection VIII.A.3 (“An Early Review”), since an early (i.e., nonmandatory) tenure review might be construed to be an “adjustment” of the tenure clock. Senator Pizer noticed that subsubsection VIII.A.3 does not say whether the faculty member may insist on an early review or not, and suggested the addition of language to VIII.A.3 saying that an early review will not take place without the permission of faculty of the appropriate rank. Professor McGehee said that the proposed PS-36 takes the position (in subsection VIII.A, second paragraph) that a faculty member may insist on an early review. Senator Pizer said that it is theoretically possible that faculty members would insist on early reviews even in frivolous cases. Senator Christie said that the 1997 PS-36 says that in the case of an early review, the voting faculty can decide that the documentation submitted by the candidate does not warrant being sent to external reviewers (“Promotion and Tenure,” B.3.a). Professor McGehee said that he would check on whether the proposed PS-36 has a similar clause.

An appointment without the terminal degree, as “Acting Assistant Professor”: Subsection VI.F of the proposed PS-36 (“An Appointment Without the Terminal Degree”) is similar to provisions in the 1997 PS-36, except that where the 1997 PS-36
designates a faculty member hired without the terminal degree as an “Instructor,” the proposed PS-36 calls for the use of the term “Acting Assistant Professor,” instead, so as not to create confusion with the proposed Instructor policy (Senate Resolution 04-04, http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions/R04-04.pdf).

Senator Weil asked if there is an interface between subsection VI.F of the proposed PS-36 and the tenure clock (subsection VI.E). Professor McGehee replied that the intention was to start the tenure clock at the time the Acting Assistant Professor is promoted to a tenure-track Assistant Professor. Senator Christie noted that subsection VI.F requires the salary of an Acting Assistant Professor to be “reduced,” even though peer universities may hire such people at higher salaries. Professor McGehee said that the intent was merely to allow a department the discretion to hire an Acting Assistant Professor at a reduced salary, and he promised to clear that up in the next draft of the proposed PS-36.

8. Professor Chandler’s motion to modify the agenda of the meeting:

At approximately 4:35PM, Faculty Senate Executive Committee member-at-large Chandler moved that discussion of PS-36 be suspended, so as to allow time for other items on the agenda. Senator Stanley asked what the next couple of items on the agenda were. President Advokat listed Resolution 05-02, followed by “new business.” Professor McGehee said that Resolution 05-02 was not really ready for a first reading at this meeting, and suggested that it be postponed to the October 12 meeting. Senator Lynch raised a point of order, saying that Professor Chandler’s motion to change the agenda was not debatable. Parliamentarian McGehee said that it was debatable. Senator Crumbley called the question. Senator Crumley’s motion was not seconded, but the Senate nevertheless appeared to be ready to end discussion of Professor Chandler’s motion. A voice vote on Professor Chandler’s motion was held, but the result was considered inconclusive. A show of hands then yielded a conclusive vote in favor of the motion. Accordingly, President Advokat asked if there was any new business.

9. Resolution on informing faculty of developments affecting the tenure-system:

Senator Delzell read a resolution, entitled “Informing faculty of developments regarding PM-35, PS-109, and related issues” (http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions.html). 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. The resolution was seconded, and will be considered at the October 12 Senate meeting.
10. Annual reviews of the academic work of faculty who are administrators:

Faculty members who do no academic work: Senator Wilson launched a discussion by questioning whether full-time administrators, including Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Provosts, and Vice Provosts, who are called “faculty members,” are evaluated for their academic work (scholarship, teaching, and service) in their home departments like other faculty members are, even when those administrators do no academic work in their home departments. He wanted to be allowed to see the annual reviews of such “faculty members.”

Senate Resolution 03-09, Proposed Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators (http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions/R03-09.pdf, May 2003): Senator Homberger was concerned that the proposed PS-36 contains no statement on evaluating administrators holding faculty appointments. She seemed to remember that in May 2003, when the Senate discussed Resolution 03-10 (the proposed Addendum to PS-36), the Senate adopted an amendment on that subject; see the minutes of the May 2003 meeting: http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Minutes/MMay-03.pdf.

Professor McGehee said that Resolution 03-09 provides for evaluation of the administrative work of administrators, and so is on a different subject from PS-36, which entails annual reviews of the academic work of faculty members. Resolution 03-09 is under discussion between the Executive Committee and the Provost and Deans; the September 15, 2004 draft of such a proposed policy is at http://www.math.lsu.edu/~mcgehee/FS/Eval-3.pdf. He expects a policy statement based on 03-09 to be issued, perhaps this fall. The chief principle there is that when an administrator is evaluated by the supervising administrator, there should be systematic consultation with the faculty in the administrator’s unit. The Deans and Provost pointed out problems with Resolution 03-09, which faculty saw as well in the fall of 2003. He expects that the coming policy statement will be a significant advance, at least in some units.

Postponing voting on PS-36 until the policy on evaluating administrators is issued: Senator Wilson said that full-time administrators do not deserve to be called faculty members, because they do not teach or do any of the other work that real faculty members do. He asked whether former Chancellor Emmert, for example, ever taught classes during the time he was a faculty member at LSU. Professor McGehee mentioned that one component in the expected policy statement on evaluation of [the administrative work of] administrators will be that there will be an annual report by administrators to the faculty in their home unit. Under the proposed PS-36, a department that is home to an administrator is free in its rules (Section III) to evaluate that administrator’s role in that department. Senator Wilson asked if that means that a department could commence dismissal proceedings against the Chancellor, for example. Senator Waggenspack said that a number of his constituents want the process of evaluating administrators to be pushed on the same timetable as the evaluation of faculty members. The department already knows about the performance of the administrators very well: those administrators do nothing for their home departments. Senator Gauthier recommended that chairs and deans somehow be required to actually read the annual reports that their faculty submit. Senator Homberger suggested postponing voting on PS-36 until the
Senate sees the policy on evaluating administrators; it doesn’t make sense, she said, to cement a policy on evaluating faculty members, before we know how those of our faculty colleagues who are also full-time administrators will be evaluated. Senator Crumbley seconded Senator Homberger’s suggestion. Professor McGehee requested voting on PS-36 as soon as possible, because it goes as far as it needs to in its subject matter, to mesh well with a good policy on evaluating [the administrative work of] administrators. We need to correct some of the problems in the 1997 PS-36, he said. Different units in the university have had drastically different experiences with their administrators. He said that in the last two years, there were lots of faculty evaluations of deans, systematically conducted by the Provost’s office, with the result that a lot of new deans have been appointed. There are units where, for Chairs, the process is not working effectively; and there are units that don’t have the concept of a rotating Chair more or less elected by the faculty. Senator Waggenspack clarified that his motive is not to delay voting on PS-36, but to accelerate an acceptable process of review of administrators.

One PS for all tenure-track/tenured faculty, including those who are administrators: Senator Homberger asked if there is a definition of the duties of an Assistant Professor, an Associate Professor, or a Full Professor. Senator Ajmera said that when one is hired, there is a job-description in the contract. Senator Homberger asked what job-description there is for an administrator who is also hired as a faculty member. If an administrator is hired 100% as an administrator, and also as a faculty member, then is he working 150%? 200%? What is he doing as a faculty member? Because, she asked, if someone doesn’t do anything as a faculty member, then why should we give him or her a faculty appointment? Whereas if he does do something for the faculty appointment, then he should be evaluated for that academic work as a faculty member; she is not talking about an evaluation of his administrative work. Senator Mary McGehee asked what level of administrator Senator Homberger was referring to. Senator Homberger replied that she was talking about all administrators with professorial appointments. Everyone who has tenure-track and tenured appointments should come under the same PS. Otherwise we have some faculty who do come under PS-36, and other faculty members who don’t, because they don’t do any work for their faculty appointment; this is a slippery slope, she concluded.

11. Adjournment:

Senator Day moved for adjournment. After an affirmative voice vote, President Advokat declared the meeting adjourned at 5:04PM.
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