

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

September 10, 2007

A – 127, noon

Senators Present: Michael Alleman, Shelby Anfenson-Comeau, Barbara Batiste, Maura Cavell, Gregory Conway, Jennifer Creswell, Edwin Deshautelle, Wayne Escudé, Bill Henshaw, Gloria Hernandez, Paula Jacobi, Bonnie Johnson, Diane Langlois, Jim Robinson, Kathleen Warner, Sanford Wood.

Senators Absent: None.

Representatives: Stephen Guempel (Administration).

Guests: Rachel Andrus, Mike Axelrod, Angela Buchanan, Robert Hamma, Doug Narby, Christina Vick.

Jim Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

- I. Adoption of Minutes: The minutes of April 24, 2007 were approved.
- II. Chairperson's Report:

The governor addressed the Board of Supervisors and noted there would be money for pay raises. There would be a 2.5% raise overall and an additional 2.5% merit raise.

New system president John Lombardi addressed faculty groups to communicate his guiding philosophy. He stressed the importance of money and performance, while admitting that all research is a "money loser." He plans to be clear in his policies so that people who know better can tell him when he's wrong. There are no plans to delete or consolidate any part of the LSU system, but the president stressed the importance of improving the system overall.

House Bill n. 1.2007, pp. 183-220 holds graduation rates as an indicator of a university's performance. LSUE has a current graduation rate of 11.2%. Steve Guempel noted that LSUE is a special case. Many students get what they want here without graduation, including, specifically, students in the Allied Health program. He added that LSUE had a very high 10 year graduation rate.

III. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies: No meeting was held.

Courses and Curricula: No meeting was held.

IV. Old Business: Sanford Wood reported that the ad hoc committee on web page policy “didn’t get much done” because the proposed department web pages are an administrative decision. LSUE will continue to host individual web pages for interested faculty, but Ron Wright informed the committee that he will not provide any technical support for them. Gloria Hernandez questioned the legality of placing faculty vitae on the internet, but the discussion was tabled until the next meeting.

V. New Business: Angela Buchanan raised a question about starting finals 7:30 a.m. She noted that students with children had a difficult time arriving on time. Paula Jacobi and Ms. Buchanan discussed how they offer flexible arrival time for students under such scheduling constraints. Dr. Wood mentioned the need for more uniformity in scheduling classes. Dr. Guempel said that increased course offerings have necessitated both the early start time and a more flexible schedule. He added that he would speak to Ron Ryder about these issues.

Christina Vick brought up two issues. First, she expressed concern over the “piercingness” of the new fire alarm. She was concerned that its intensity could cause hearing damage. Dr. Guempel offered to check on whether the volume could be controlled, while Ms. Buchanan believed that the alarm was made to conform to a new ADA requirement. Dr. Robinson added that he had a problem with placing wheel-chair students in second floor classrooms since elevators cannot be used during fires (or fire drills). There was general agreement that faculty and staff need increased training in how to use the emergency devices intended to aid such students in descending the stairs. Dr. Vick’s second issue involved the school’s policy of not allowing faculty to schedule office hours between noon and 1:00, especially since the university schedules classes at this time. Doug Narby stated that, in the past, there was a problem with faculty showing up for noon office hours. Dr. Guempel added that the prohibition on noon office hours made scheduling committee meetings easier. He suggested that the university may need to reconsider whether noon classes are necessary now that enrollment has declined.

VI. Adjournment: A motion was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Alleman

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

October 1, 2007

A – 127, noon

Senators Present: Michael Alleman, Shelby Anfenson-Comeau, Barbara Batiste, Maura Cavell, Gregory Conway, Jennifer Creswell, Edwin Deshautelle, Wayne Escudé, Bill Henshaw, Gloria Hernandez, Bonnie Johnson, Diane Langlois, Jim Robinson, Sanford Wood.

Senators Absent: Paula Jacobi, Kathleen Warner.

Representatives: Stephen Guempel (Administration), O'Sanna Vidrine (Staff Senate).

Guests: Judy Daniels, Christina Vick, other.

Jim Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

- I. Adoption of Minutes: The minutes of September 10, 2007 were approved with corrections.
- II. Chairperson's Report:

Dr. Robinson announced that the Board of Supervisors meeting would be held later that week. In addition, to LSUE students—Stephen LeBlanc and Joan Whitherwax—would be in attendance.
- III. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies: No meeting was held.

Courses and Curricula: No meeting was held.
- IV. Old Business:
 - a. Fire alarm: Dr. Guempel said he's checking on the possibility of modifying the sound based on concerns based on concerns by Dr. Chris Vick at the last meeting.
 - b. Final exams: Dr. Robinson talked to Ron Ryder. The scheduling problems seem to be cleared up. Afternoon classes will not take morning finals.
 - c. Office hours: Dr. Guempel stated that only under certain circumstances should we offer classes at noon. He also said that faculty should try not to have office hours at this time, unless the schedule requires it. He emphasized that we need to keep the noon hour free for meetings.
 - d. PS 12: There was a lengthy discussion concerning posting vitae online. It was suggested that we post the vitae on the university's shared drive.

There was also concern expressed about students or potential students finding and contacting professors. Dr. Guempel stated that the university is trying to work on divisional web pages due to a change in online learning. The CALL Initiative requires that the degree programs be put online by 2008 for non-traditional students. This will affect how we conduct e-courses and support services. We will also get a Select grant. A consulting group will provide a complete assessment of all online learning at LSUE. Gloria Hernandez questioned whether it was legal to mandate vitae be published online. It was stated that PS 12 requires it for promotion. Sanford Wood said that some people have suggested that access to vitae be limited to members of each division. Dr. Robinson said that LSU lawyers called the posting of vitae online "a gray area." What's at stake, according to Dr. Guempel is the difference in how each division reviews dossiers. He stated that personally he would want to see what criteria colleagues apply to promotion and how it compares with dossiers that have been published. Dr. Robinson said that this kind of transparency was necessary because pre-tenure review has not worked. He cited the recent example of one faculty member who thought he had met the qualifications for tenure and then was rejected. Ms. Hernandez suggested that instructors going up for promotion needed something like a pre-tenure review. Dr. Guempel said that should be done departmentally. Sanford Wood motioned that PS 12 be sent back to the Academic Policy Committee for re-wording. The motion was seconded, and the senate voted to send PS 12 back to committee.

- e. Program directors: The question was asked whether or not program directors are members of the Academic Council. This is not the case. Dr. Guempel stated that no program directors serve on the Academic Council.

New Business: None.

- V. Adjournment: A motion was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Alleman

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 5, 2007

A – 127, noon

Senators Present: Michael Alleman, Shelby Anfenson-Comeau, Barbara Batiste, Maura Cavell, Gregory Conway, Jennifer Creswell, Edwin Deshautelle, Wayne Escudé, Bill Henshaw, Gloria Hernandez, Paula Jacobi, Bonnie Johnson, Diane Langlois, Jim Robinson, Sanford Wood.

Senators Absent: Kathleen Warner.

Representatives: Stephen Guempel (Administration), Donnie Thibodeaux (Staff Senate).

Guests: Christina Vick.

Jim Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

- I. Adoption of Minutes: The minutes of October 1, 2007 were approved with corrections.
- II. Chairperson's Report: None.
- III. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies:

Chris Vick presented to the senate the committee's suggestions regarding P.S. 12, page 6, item 3 regarding the posting of vitae online. The committee suggested two possible changes to resolve the controversy: either we could re-word the passage and make the posting of vitae voluntary, or we could come up with a way to deny online access to the vitae. The committee encouraged the faculty to voluntarily share hard copies of dossiers and "e-vitae." Dr. Vick added that the committee was concerned over privacy issues regarding the required sharing of e-vitae. There was a general discussion over what happened to dossiers during and after the promotion process. Jim Robinson reminded the senate that the controversial passage P.S. 12 concerns vitae, not dossiers. He added that LSU-Baton Rouge requires faculty vitae to be published online and the faculty's only complaint is that they are only allowed two pages. He also reminded faculty that we don't have to include personal information in e-vitae. The primary question regarding the controversial passage in P.S. 12 is whether or not it will help in establishing transparency to aid candidates for promotion. During the ensuing discussion, several concerns were raised. Wayne Escudé questioned who would enforce the requirement of publishing e-vitae and what penalty would be imposed for

failure to comply. Gloria Hernandez expressed her concern that instructors do not have the equivalent of a pre-tenure review when they go up for promotion. In general, the discussion began moving toward a consensus that faculty should not be "required" to post e-vitae. Sanford Wood then asked Dr. Vick if the committee had reviewed all of P.S. 12. Dr. Vick replied that the committee was charged only with reviewing this particular passage. It was agreed that there were problems with other parts of P.S. 12. Finally, it was moved and seconded that the senate vote on whether or not to accept the proposed change of the wording of the passage from "required" to "encouraged." The proposal passed 9-4. A motion was then made and seconded that the senate ask the committee to review the next proposed change. The motion passed 10-0 with three abstentions.

Courses and Curricula: None.

IV. Old Business: None.

V. New Business: None.

VI. Adjournment: A motion was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Alleman

FACULTY SENATE MEETING
December 3, 2007
T – 108, noon

Senators Present: Michael Alleman, Shelby Anfenson-Comeau, Barbara Batiste, Jennifer Creswell, Edwin Deshautelle, Wayne Escudé, Gloria Hernandez, Diane Langlois, Jim Robinson, Kathleen Warner, Sanford Wood.

Senators Absent: Maura Cavell, Gregory Conway, Bill Henshaw, Paula Jacobi, Bonnie Johnson.

Representatives: Stephen Guempel (Administration), Donnie Thibodeaux (Staff Senate).

Guests: Christina Vick (Academic Policies Chair).

Jim Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

I. Adoption of Minutes: The minutes of November 5, 2007 were approved.

II. Chairperson's Report:

Dr. Robinson announced that the Board of Supervisors was meeting Thursday and Friday. The board would be meeting with John Lombardi on Thursday.

III. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies: Dr. Vick reported that the committee had not met. She asked for more specific direction concerning the changes to P.S. 12. Dr. Robinson stated that he would send out a questionnaire to identify what the faculty concerns are regarding the policy statement.

Courses and Curricula: No report.

IV. Old Business:

a. Bookstore: Sanford Wood queried the senate concerning problems with the bookstore's tendency to under-order textbooks. Several members stated that they had experienced such problems. Two specific reasons for this came up in discussion. First, the bookstore orders textbooks with the understanding that not all students buy their books from the bookstore. Second, the bookstore uses class enrollments from previous semesters to determine how many books it should order; however, enrollment fluctuation sometimes results in a miscalculation of how many books should be ordered.

- b. Physical Plant Services: Dr. Wood brought up a problem with when physical plant services are scheduled. Services sometimes interfere with classes and campus activities, especially in Manuel Hall. Several senators complained specifically about the inconvenience of the bathroom-cleaning schedule. The senate emphasized that this was not a criticism of the workers themselves or the job they were doing; the issue, rather, was when certain activities were carried out.
- c. Amendments to Article IX of the Senate By-Laws:
 - i. Quorum: The following addition was proposed: "For all committees of the Faculty Senate, a quorum to conduct business shall consist of a majority of the faculty members of the committee. The faculty members are those members of the committee who are members of the Faculty Council." Dr. Guempel suggested revising the proposed amendment to read "voting members." The amendment passed.
 - ii. Vacating Positions: The following addition was proposed: "If a voting member of a Faculty Senate committee has three absences out of five consecutive meetings, the position shall be declared vacant." After some discussion, the amendment passed.
- d. Proxy Voting: A question was raised about whether or not an absent committee member could vote by proxy. Dr. Wood said that he would review what the by-laws said about this.

New Business: Dr. Robinson announced that LSUE would begin using "the average of the mean" in processing student evaluations.

- V. Adjournment: A motion was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Alleman

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

January 28, 2008

A – 127, noon

Senators Present: Michael Alleman, Shelby Anfenson-Comeau, Maura Cavell, Gregory Conway, Barbara Batiste, Jennifer Creswell, Edwin Deshautelle, Wayne Escudé, Gloria Hernandez, Paula Jacobi, Bonnie Johnson, Diane Langlois, Jim Robinson, Kathleen Warner, Sanford Wood.

Senators Absent: Bill Henshaw.

Representatives: Stephen Guempel (Administration), Donnie Thibodeaux (Staff Senate).

Guests: Christina Vick (Academic Policies Chair), Doug Narby.

Jim Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.

I. Adoption of Minutes: The minutes of December 3, 2007 were approved.

II. Chairperson's Report:

John Lombardi met with all the chairs of all the system senates. He made four major points. First, he stated that UNO is in compliance with the LSU system. Second, a question was raised concerning tuition exemptions, specifically should children of faculty members receive them. Lombardi's response was that when he was at the University of Massachusetts, he opposed them. Exemptions, he said, were a perk designed to attract good professors; however, he believed that if exemptions were given only to faculty, they would be elitist, and if staff were included as well, the exemptions would be too expensive. His position was that he would rather spend that money on increased faculty salaries and research funding. He added that at U. Mass., the measure passed in spite of his objections. Next, Lombardi addressed the posting of vitae online. He didn't see that this would be a breach of privacy, but he also didn't see the need for it to be mandatory. He recommended that posting vitae be voluntary, but added that the vitae's size should not be limited. Finally, Lombardi made it a point to say that senate chairs could contact him whenever they felt it necessary, though he would prefer such requests in writing in order for him to adequately prepare a response.

Dr. Robinson added that there was "no big news" at the January meeting of the Board of Supervisors, except that prices for sporting events had increased.

III. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies: Dr. Vick reported that the committee had not met. She added that when the committee does meet, it will be looking at the minutes to see why P.S. 12 was not initially accepted. In addition, she requested that Dr. Robinson submit a questionnaire about P.S. 12 to the faculty at large, an idea that was suggested at the previous meeting.

Courses and Curricula: It was reported that the next meeting will be scheduled in February.

IV. Old Business:

- a. Dr. Wood proposed striking a phrase from a proposal he had made to change the by-laws, following a suggestion made by Dr. Guempel. His proposal originally said, "For all committees of the Faculty Senate, a quorum to conduct business shall consist of a majority of the faculty members of the committee. The faculty members are those members of the committee who are members of the Faculty Council." The revised proposal read, "For all committees of the Faculty Senate, a quorum to conduct business shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the committee." The minutes were amended to reflect this.
- b. Proxy Voting: In response to a discussion from the previous meeting, Dr. Wood reviewed the policy concerning proxy voting. A proxy is allowed for the senate only when a member is away on official school business. There is no mention in the bylaws regarding proxy voting in committees. The senate discussed whether or not to allow proxy voting in committee. Several senators raised concerns about how proxy voting might affect discussions in committee that are essential to decision making. The senate decided to follow Dr. Jacobi's suggestion and simply "leave the bylaws silent" on this issue.

V. New Business:

- a. Problems with Evaluations: Dr. Robinson brought up the problem that the scanners used to tabulate evaluation scores do not always produce the correct scores. Several examples were introduced. In one case, of fifteen evaluations completed for a particular class, only one was scanned. Dr. Robinson also added that, though one faculty member had high marks on his evaluations, they scanned as low instead. It was suggested that online evaluations, which, as Dr. Robinson pointed out, Baton Rouge uses, might be a solution to the problem. Dr. Guempel acknowledged scanning is a lot of work, but he wasn't sure if online evaluations were the alternative. Dr. Wood said that this had been proposed to the senate in the past, but had not been well received. Some senators were concerned that online evaluations may attract only the extreme opinions. Ms. Anfenson-Comeau suggested using evaluations for online classes as a test to see how effective they would be campus wide, but Ms. Hernandez pointed out that online students are de facto computer savvy, while many of our other students are actually afraid of technology. Dr. Guempel agreed, stating that we need to consider our students and their ability with and access to

computers. Just before adjournment, another problem with evaluations was introduced, the fact that professors who teach night classes gather their own evaluations; however, time ran out before any further discussion could be had.

- VI. Adjournment: A motion was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Alleman

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

March 10, 2008

A – 127, noon

Senators Present: Michael Alleman, Shelby Anfenson-Comeau, Barbara Batiste, Maura Cavell, Gregory Conway, Jennifer Creswell, Edwin Deshautelle, Wayne Escudé, Gloria Hernandez, Bonnie Johnson, Diane Langlois, Jim Robinson, Sanford Wood.

Senators Absent: Bill Henshaw, Paula Jacobi, Kathleen Warner.

Representatives: Stephen Guempel (Administration), Donnie Thibodeaux (Staff Senate).

Guests: Christina Vick (Academic Policies Chair).

Jim Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

- I. Adoption of Minutes: The minutes of January 28, 2008 were approved.
- II. Chairperson's Report:

Dr. Robinson announced that he was now president-elect of ALFS. Among the issues discussed by ALFS was the possibility of converting sick leave to annual leave. Dr. Robinson added that one of the problems with this plan is that sick leave cannot be denied while annual leave can. The ALFS meets once a year with the CLCU and Dr. Robinson stated that we would need to elect a representative at our next meeting. Dr. Robinson then presented a report concerning the Board of Supervisors. According to the president's report, the LSU chancellor search was going to be open and transparent. Dr. Lombardi anticipated doing the same thing at LSUA. Some concern was expressed about student representation on the LSU chancellor committee. Currently, student representation makes up 15% of the committee, but some feel that student representation carries too much weight. Finally, Dr. Robinson announced that the Board of Regents had approved a criminal justice degree at LSUE.

- III. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies: Dr. Vick brought forward several proposed changes to the long-discussed PS12. The first concerned page 7, #9, which deals with procedures following a split vote on a candidate by his/her division. The primary concern was how the division should present the pros and cons for the candidate to the campus-wide promotion committee. Next, on page 8, several changes were proposed, most of them minor. In section A, "and fifth year" was added to the phrase "third year review." In section D and section E, it

was recommended that the phrase "Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs" be changed to "Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs." Finally, it was recommended that section G be struck out. Dr. Guempel directed senate discussion back to section E, saying that he is not comfortable making a recommendation as part of pre-tenure review. He emphasized that pre-tenure review is a faculty responsibility. Dr. Wood suggested that the comments would not be mandatory, while Dr. Robinson suggested that comments could be made only if there were serious problems. Dr. Guempel again emphasized that pre-tenure is a faculty review, and not an administrative review. He added that faculty are closer to the source and have the best feel for a candidate.

Courses and Curricula: It was announced that the committee would be meeting on March 11.

IV. Old Business:

Dr. Wood proposed a change in the LSUE Constitution. He suggested changing a quorum for the senate from two-thirds to a simple majority. Shortly thereafter, discussion was tabled until the next meeting due to the lateness of the hour.

V. New Business:

None.

VI. Adjournment: A motion was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Alleman

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 14, 2008

A – 109, noon

Senators Present: Michael Alleman, Shelby Anfenson-Comeau, Maura Cavell, Barbara Batiste, Jennifer Creswell, Edwin Deshautelle, Wayne Escudé, Gloria Hernandez, Paula Jacobi, Diane Langlois, Jim Robinson, Kathleen Warner, Sanford Wood.

Senators Absent: Bill Henshaw, Gregory Conway, Bonnie Johnson.

Representatives: Stephen Guempel (Administration), Donnie Thibodeaux (Staff Senate).

Guests: Christina Vick (Academic Policies Chair), Angela Buchanan.

Jim Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.

- I. Adoption of Minutes: The minutes of March 10, 2007 were approved.
- II. Chairperson's Report:

Dr. Robinson stated that he would be attending the Board of Regents meeting next week. He requested emails concerning any issues that individuals would like to place before the Board. He made the same request regarding the upcoming Board of Supervisors meeting. Dr. Vick asked that he email a reminder out to everyone. Dr. Robinson noted that the next senate meeting would have to be rescheduled since it would conflict with a faculty meeting with the Liberal Arts Division Head candidate. Afterwards, Dr. Robinson stated that ALFS, of which he is now the president, needs a new internet address. Currently, the web site, which is limited to the ALFS Constitution, is being hosted by LSUE, but the site needs a neutral address. It was noted from the floor that hosting the site under the current address, luse.edu/alfs, instead of under a separate address was an administrative decision.

- III. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies: Dr. Vick presented the senate with a written report of the proposed changes to PS-12. Before formally presenting the report, she commended the work of last year's committee. What follows is each of the proposed changes (*italics*) and its concomitant discussion.

Page 2 under "Retention": On the next to last line, change "three years" to "five years." The revision would then read "Appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor may not exceed five years" The five-year designation is in accordance with

PM-23.

Dr. Guempel stated that "three years" refers to initial appointments and that he believed PM-23 says that initial appointments cannot exceed three years. In the course of discussion, it was determined that the issue in question regarded contracts. Dr. Guempel observed that the university cannot make an initial appointment for longer than three years. The discussion was tabled until the corresponding wording in PM-23 could be clarified.

Pages 2-3 under "Retention": Picking up after "five years" and continuing to the end of the paragraph, the term "indeterminate tenure" should be defined. The current wording is ". . . upon reappointment after seven years of satisfactory service as Assistant Professor the employee may receive indeterminate tenure. Initial appointments at the rank of Associate Professor are ordinarily probationary and are made for a stipulated term, but upon reappointment after four years of service employees at these ranks will receive indeterminate tenure."

Dr. Guempel said that he believes "indeterminate tenure" was defined in the Board of Supervisor documents. During discussion, it was determined that since there are conditions under which faculty must submit to a post-tenure review, tenure is *de facto* indeterminate.

Page 6, item 3 under "Procedures for Promotion: The 2006-2007 AP Committee wrote the following: "To assist candidates for promotion, faculty who have already been promoted are required to make their vitas available on the campus network." The 2007-2008 AP Committee believe that the posting of vitas should be optional. The new wording would read "To assist candidates for promotion, faculty who have already been promoted are encouraged to make their vitas/dossiers available to candidates within their academic units." This rewording has already been voted on and accepted by the 2007-2008 Faculty Senate.

No discussion.

Page 7, item 8: This item has to do with peer review of candidates for tenure/promotion. The 2007-2008 AP Committee has added: "Only those members of the committee holding a rank equal to or above that for which the candidate is aspiring are eligible to vote on a candidate's application for promotion."

Dr. Guempel pointed out that, under this criterion, some members of the campus-wide committee would not be able to vote on certain candidates, i.e. associate professors would not be able to vote on candidates for full professor. The senate agreed that it would be inappropriate to lower-ranking faculty to evaluate higher-ranking faculty. Dr. Vick suggested that academic units should take into account which of their members are going up for promotion

in a given year and then elect representative to the committee who are of a rank appropriate for evaluating them.

Page 7, item 9. To correct a typographical error, delete the second period after the item number. This item has to do with the campus-wide tenure and promotion committee and the problem of a split vote occurring within a candidate's academic unit. The issue is to eliminate "double-dipping" in voting. The 2006-2007 AP Committee wrote "If a split vote occurs within an academic unit, the head of the unit will ensure that representatives of the unit will present both the merits and deficiencies of the candidate to the campus-wide committee." The 2007-2008 AP Committee changed "the head of the unit" to "the representatives of the unit."

No discussion.

Page 8, item A under "Pre-Tenure": Eliminate the underlining of "and fifth year at rank."

No discussion.

Page 9, item C. Delete "in three years' time."

At this point, Dr. Guempel noted that page 10 of PS-12 defines "indeterminate tenure."

Page 9, item D: Delete the underlining and change "upper administration" to "Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs." The item would then read "The Division Head will then submit and discuss this review with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for review and comments pertaining to the pre tenure candidate."

No discussion.

Page 9, item E. Change "upper administration" to "Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs." The item would then read "Within 10 working days of the meeting with the tenured faculty members of the division, the division head must, both verbally and in writing, provide the candidate with a summary of the faculty discussion/recommendations along with his/her own recommendations which includes the comments of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs."

Dr. Vick noted that this proposed change created some controversy during the previous senate meeting. She explained that Academic Policies Committee proposed this change because, in the past, some candidates for promotion were recommended by both the division and the campus-wide committee but were turned down by the administration, and in other instances, a candidate was not recommended by both the division and the campus-wide committee but was promoted by the administration; therefore, the committee believes

that pre-tenure review process should include at least informal comments from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Due to the controversial nature of the proposed change, Dr. Vick requested that the senate table discussion until she had gone over all of the proposed changes. Discussion was tabled.

Page 9, item G. Omit the entire item, which reads "Individuals may avail themselves of this process for all promotions." The rationale for eliminating item G is that it is misplaced in the section for pre tenure.

No discussion.

Page 10, under "Tenure": Paragraph 3: Omit the sentences that are struck out because the concept covered in these sentences is addressed in the pre tenure section.

No discussion.

Page 10, under "Tenure": Paragraph 4: Either delete or clarify the following sentence: "Persons promoted to the rank of Professor or Associate Professor after less than four years of service may be continued on term appointment through no more than the fourth year."

Dr. Guempel stated that the language of this section was the language of PM-23 and should not be deleted. He also said he was "pretty sure" that it now says "five" years instead of "four."

IV. Old Business:

None.

V. New Business:

None.

VI. Adjournment: Dr. Wood moved to recess until the next meeting so that the senate could begin discussion where it left off. The motion carried. The next meeting was tentatively set for Monday, April 28 at 2:00. The senate recessed at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Alleman

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

April 28, 2008

A – 109, noon

Senators Present: Michael Alleman, Shelby Anfenson-Comeau, Barbara Batiste, Maura Cavell, Gregory Conway, Jennifer Creswell, Edwin Deshautelle, Gloria Hernandez, Paula Jacobi, Diane Langlois, Jim Robinson, Kathleen Warner, Sanford Wood.

Senators Absent: Wayne Escudé, Bill Henshaw, Bonnie Johnson.

Representatives: Stephen Guempel (Administration), Donnie Thibodeaux (Staff Senate).

Guests: Christina Vick (Academic Policies Chair).

Prior to the resumption of the April 14 meeting, elections for 2008-2009 officers were conducted with senators who will begin their tenure next semester. The officers for next year are:

Chairperson:	Jim Robinson
Vice Chairperson:	Jennifer Creswell
Secretary/Reporter:	John Hamlin

Jim Robinson called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

I. Adoption of Minutes: The minutes of April 14, 2007 were approved with changes.

II. Chairperson's Report:

none

III. Committee Reports:

Academic Policies:

Since the previous meeting was recessed, the senate resumed discussion of the proposed changes to PS-12. What follows are the proposed changes and relevant discussion.

Page 2 under "Retention": On the next to last line, change "three years" to "five years." The revision would then read "Appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor may not exceed five years" The five-year designation is in accordance with PM-23.

After some discussion, this change was rejected and the phrase “three years” was restored.

Pages 2-3 under “Retention”: Picking up after “five years” and continuing to the end of the paragraph, the term “indeterminate tenure” should be defined. The current wording is “. . . upon reappointment after seven years of satisfactory service as Assistant Professor the employee may receive indeterminate tenure. Initial appointments at the rank of Associate Professor are ordinarily probationary and are made for a stipulated term, but upon reappointment after four years of service employees at these ranks will receive indeterminate tenure.”

No discussion.

Page 6, item 3 under “Procedures for Promotion: The 2006-2007 AP Committee wrote the following: “To assist candidates for promotion, faculty who have already been promoted are required to make their vitas available on the campus network.” The 2007-2008 AP Committee believe that the posting of vitas should be optional. The new wording would read “To assist candidates for promotion, faculty who have already been promoted are encouraged to make their vitas/dossiers available to candidates within their academic units.” This rewording has already been voted on and accepted by the 2007-2008 Faculty Senate.

Dr. Vick pointed out that the senate had already voted to accept this change.

Page 7, item 8: This item has to do with peer review of candidates for tenure/promotion. The 2007-2008 AP Committee has added: “Only those members of the committee holding a rank equal to or above that for which the candidate is aspiring are eligible to vote on a candidate’s application for promotion.”

No discussion.

Page 7, item 9. To correct a typographical error, delete the second period after the item number. This item has to do with the campus-wide tenure and promotion committee and the problem of a split vote occurring within a candidate’s academic unit. The issue is to eliminate “double-dipping” in voting. The 2006-2007 AP Committee wrote “If a split vote occurs within an academic unit, the head of the unit will ensure that representatives of the unit will present both the merits and deficiencies of the candidate to the campus-wide committee.” The 2007-2008 AP Committee changed “the head of the unit” to “the representatives of the unit.”

No discussion.

Page 8, item A under “Pre-Tenure”: Eliminate the underlining of “and fifth year at rank.”

No discussion.

Page 9, item C. Delete "in three years' time."

No discussion.

Page 9, item D: Delete the underlining and change "upper administration" to "Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs." The item would then read "The Division Head will then submit and discuss this review with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for review and comments pertaining to the pre tenure candidate."

Page 9, item E. Change "upper administration" to "Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs." The item would then read "Within 10 working days of the meeting with the tenured faculty members of the division, the division head must, both verbally and in writing, provide the candidate with a summary of the faculty discussion/recommendations along with his/her own recommendations which includes the comments of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs."

Dr. Guempel stated that he was "not supportive" of this change since pre-tenure review was a faculty-driven process. Dr. Vick expressed the committee's concern that the candidates need to be as prepared as possible. Dr. Guempel pointed out that pre-tenure review does not involve feedback from the campus-wide committee and questioned why the administration should be involved. Discussion was tabled.

Page 9, item G. Omit the entire item, which reads "Individuals may avail themselves of this process for all promotions." The rationale for eliminating item G is that it is misplaced in the section for pre tenure.

No discussion.

Page 10, under "Tenure": Paragraph 3: Omit the sentences that are struck out because the concept covered in these sentences is addressed in the pre tenure section.

No discussion.

Page 10, under "Tenure": Paragraph 4: Either delete or clarify the following sentence: "Persons promoted to the rank of Professor or Associate Professor after less than four years of service may be continued on term appointment through no more than the fourth year."

No discussion.

After Dr. Wood commended the committee for its work, the discussion returned to items D and E on page 9. Ms. Hernandez stated that the faculty would like feedback from the administration and that she wished she would have had such feedback before she went up for promotion. Dr. Guempel reminded her that the proposed change applied only to tenure. Dr. Wood proposed changing the language of the two items so that the vice chancellor

would have the opportunity to offer feedback without making it mandatory to the process. Dr. Guempel said that such a change would be acceptable. The problem with offering feedback, he said, was that the committees, the vice chancellor, and the chancellor all have independent roles in the process, and the possibility of conflicting feedback would put the faculty member going through the process "in a terrible position." He again emphasized that pre-tenure review is a faculty issue instituted to make sure that the tenure process had some degree of accountability. Dr. Wood's first moved change follows:

*Page 9, item D: "The Division Head will then submit and discuss this review with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for **possible** review and comments pertaining to the pre tenure candidate."* [proposed change in bold]

The motion carried. His second moved change follows:

Page 9, item E. "Within 10 working days of the meeting with the tenured faculty members of the division, the division head must, both verbally and in writing, provide the candidate with a summary of the faculty discussion/recommendations along with his/her own recommendations ~~which includes the comments of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.~~" [proposed change struck through]

The motion carried. Dr. Wood then moved to accept all proposed changes that had not already been accepted. The motion carried.

Courses and Curricula:

Dr. Wood raised the possibility of amending the constitution in order to change the criterion for a senate quorum from 2/3 majority to a simple majority. During the discussion, several senators expressed the opinion that a 2/3 majority seemed necessary in order to facilitate valuable debate on important policy issues. The senate voted not to pursue the amendment.

Dr. Wood then asked the senate to consider expanding the university policy on harassment beyond simply sexual harassment. Mr. Thibodeaux agreed with the idea, saying that the staff was also concerned about this. Dr. Wood moved to authorize the chairperson to work with the chair of the staff senate in forming an ad hoc committee with the purpose of expanding the policy. The motion carried.

Dr. Robinson addressed the issue of proposed legislation that would replace sick leave with a combination of sick leave and annual leave or paid time off (PTO). He said that it appears that current employees would be "grandfathered" and could choose to continue under the current system. Generally speaking, the new system would provide the employee with a bank of accrued days which could be used for either sick leave or PTO. He pointed out that there are a couple of concerns with the change. PTO, unlike sick leave, can be denied. Also, in the old system, sick days accrued towards retirement, but under the new system, there would be a limit to how many

days an employee can accrue. Dr. Robinson advised that faculty should keep abreast of the situation. Dr. Guempel added that “any time the legislature starts playing with your benefits, you’ll want to pay attention.”

Finally, Dr. Robinson invited discussion on whether the Honors Program should have non-voting representation in the senate; however, during the subsequent discussion, it became evident that if this were allowed, then any program could demand the same representation. The senate quickly agreed that the Honors Program and all other programs were adequately represented by senators such as, for example, Dr. Billy Fontenot, who is a member of both the Honors Program and Pathways to Success.

IV. Old Business:

None.

V. New Business:

None.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:00.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Alleman