

University of Louisiana System

**Title: REVIEW OF FACULTY
RANKS**

Effective Date: January 10, 2003

Cancellation: None

Chapter: Faculty and Staff

Policy and Procedures Memorandum

A reputable university depends on faculty excellence in teaching, research and service. To promote excellence, all members of the faculty should undergo evaluations to ensure that their academic performance is commensurate with their rank and status, and that they remain accountable for their academic performance to the university and the larger community.

The objective of this PPM is to provide a set of guidelines for each of the System campuses to use for reviewing faculty performance. The process may appropriately vary from campus to campus but each campus shall adopt its own procedure for the review process within the framework of this policy and each such campus procedure should be coordinated with existing campus policies and procedures.

Unsatisfactory performance or non-performance by a faculty member occurring and/or arising, in whole or in part, prior to the effective date of this policy, may be considered in connection with a decision to seek removal for cause.

ACADEMIC REVIEW OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Campus policies should include the following basic elements:

1. Statement that all faculty members should be evaluated at least annually by the department chair/head, with review by the dean. The evaluation should be based on the faculty member's job responsibility. The evaluation process must indicate various levels of performance ranging from "unsatisfactory" to higher levels.

2. Provision for mandatory remediation once there have been multiple unsatisfactory reviews by the department head/chair. After two (2) consecutive unsatisfactory regular reviews or three (3) unsatisfactory reviews in a five (5) year period, tenured faculty shall be subject to mandatory remediation. The plan for remediation should be developed by the department head in conjunction with the faculty member and dean.
3. Referral of the matter to a peer committee if the faculty member does not agree with the plan of remediation. If the faculty member does not agree with the plan of remediation proposed by the department head, tenured faculty in the department **will** develop an alternate plan of remediation.
4. Referral of the matter to the Chief Academic Officer if the faculty member, department head and dean cannot agree on a plan of remediation. In those cases where the faculty member, department head and dean cannot agree on the plan of remediation (referred to in number 3 above), the Chief Academic Officer shall determine the final provisions of the plan based on the recommendations by the department head and tenured faculty in the department.
5. Provision for review after a reasonable period under the plan for improvement. If the faculty member has not achieved significant improvement in performance after a minimum of two (2) years of remediation, a recommendation for dismissal may be made.
6. Provision for review by faculty peers prior to dismissal. A recommendation for dismissal automatically will trigger a review by tenured faculty in the department. Based on all recommendations, including that of the tenured faculty in the department, the chief academic officer may recommend that the university president or his/her designee institute proceedings for removal for cause including proper due process.

For any provisions of this PPM that require participation by a group or committee of tenured faculty in the department, and the number of departmental faculty is insufficient, tenured faculty from outside the department shall be selected to participate in the process. Appointments of faculty from outside the department require the approval of the chief academic officer.

Each campus must have a separate policy or practice providing due process for tenured members of the faculty for whom it becomes necessary to consider dismissal for cause.

In certain cases, the university president must exercise discretion as to whether to refer the matter to the performance review policy developed under this PPM or to the separate dismissal for cause policy. This may be done without reference to or at any time during the procedures described in this policy.

Policy References:

Other System Policies

Review Process:

System Administration Staff

Council of Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs

Distribution:

Institution Presidents

Chief Academic Officers