

(Minutes compiled by K.M. Dooley)  
**DRAFT**

---

**College of Engineering Policy Committee (CPC)**  
**Minutes of Meeting held on 11-13-03**

---

**Meeting Agenda :**

**AGENDA**

1. Approval of minutes of 10/9/03 meeting.
  2. Survey status
  3. Discussion: Overhead Returns
  4. Discussion: How college will address ABET report
- Other business?

**Members in Attendance (BOLD indicates present)**

BAE – **Mailander**<sup>2</sup>  
CEE – **Willson**, Pardue, Sansalone  
ChE – **Dooley**, **Podlaha**  
CM – Gill  
ECE – **Trahan**, **Vaidyanathan**<sup>3</sup>  
IMSE – **Knapp**<sup>1</sup>  
ME – **Raman**, **Gonthier**  
PetE – **Smith**  
<sup>1</sup>committee chairman  
<sup>2</sup>for Monroe  
<sup>3</sup>also proxy for Gu

**Others Present: None**

**Meeting Minutes :**

1. Meeting called to order at 4:40 p.m.; the minutes of the 10/09 meeting were approved for distribution.
2. The Chair distributed a copy of Faculty Senate Resolution SR03-09, “Proposed Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators.” The text of the resolution can be found at: [http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions/sr03\\_09.htm](http://senate01.lib.lsu.edu/facsen/Resolutions/sr03_09.htm) . The resolution was adopted by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2003.

The Chair indicated that the resolution had gone to the Council of Deans for their feedback. The request for additional feedback and revision is coming strictly from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Certain changes to the document were being considered before a final policy is promulgated.

4. There was further discussion of the motion passed at the 10/07 meeting (“The Dean should be evaluated annually, the standard Faculty Senate administrator evaluation form being sent to the Faculty in 2 weeks.”).

The Chair said that he had been sent the attached letter from the Provost’s Office. The key points of the letter were (quoting from it):

“As previously communicated, I am committed to conducting the biannual evaluation of the Dean during the spring semester. As part of this review, faculty input will be solicited.

I request that your committee cease its current efforts and instead, participate in the spring evaluation process. As a reminder, since I am not authorizing the CPC to conduct an independent evaluation, no University resources may be utilized to facilitate this process.”

The Chair also indicated that he had spoken with Marian Caillier Augustine of Human Resource Management. Ms. Augustine indicated that legal issues were involved, and should the CPC be sued over any evaluation of the Dean, that the committee members would not be protected by the University’s Attorneys.

After discussion, the following motion was proposed:

The survey of the Dean should be canceled, and any forms already received should be returned to the Faculty.

The motion passed, 6 in favor, 5 opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 6 pm.