

UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

CONTINUING REVIEW OF FACULTY ACHIEVEMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The unusually strong commitment of the faculty at the University of New Orleans has been the defining characteristic of the institution. Since the founding of this university, the faculty has contributed to the development of the University through:

- Teaching - Faculty members convey knowledge to our students, and guide them in the development of the critical thinking skills that they need to compete in a complex world.
- Research and Creative Endeavors - Faculty members are involved in the creation and dissemination of new knowledge, the adaptation of existing knowledge to changing environments and circumstances, and other creative activities that better the lives of our varied constituencies.
- Service - Faculty members participate in the governance of the academy and provide valued services to their profession, the university, and their community.

The faculty affirms the necessity of a strong system of tenure and academic freedom to carry the free inquiry that is the basis of higher education. We fully support the statements on academic freedom and tenure contained in the By-laws of the Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors and in the American Association of University Professors Policy Documents and Reports. We also affirm the necessity of a strong system of due process in the review of a faculty member's performance.

With the following process of continuous review of all its members, the faculty of the University of New Orleans reconfirms its continuing commitment to providing excellence in the teaching of our students, the advancement of knowledge, and service to the academy and to our community. Our process for the continuous review of faculty achievements therefore recognizes that the roles of a faculty member are many and diverse, and all these roles contribute to the success of the University in pursuit of its mission.

PRINCIPLES TO GOVERN THE REVIEW OF FACULTY ACHIEVEMENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

- The ongoing evaluation of the faculty shall take into account all types of meritorious activities in which the faculty members are engaged, and must include an appropriate balancing of emphasis on teaching, research and creative endeavors, and service.

- The ongoing evaluation of the faculty shall recognize the essential role of quality teaching in the successful accomplishment of the mission of the University of New Orleans.
- The ongoing evaluation of the faculty shall be based upon clearly articulated criteria, which reflect changing expectations of the types and levels of professional engagement, which occur throughout a faculty member's career.
- The procedures in this document are intended to form the basic outline to be followed by all departments and colleges of the University. These procedures are the minimum that will be acceptable. Departments and colleges, however, have the flexibility to develop additional procedures that suit their individual needs,

BIENNIAL REVIEWS

PM-35, Review of Faculty Ranks, issued by the President of the Louisiana State University System directs that "all faculty members will be reviewed at least every other year."

Although full-time faculty members at the University of New Orleans are reviewed on an annual basis for merit pay and other considerations, tenured faculty members will be reviewed every second year with regard to this policy. Tenure-track faculty who have not yet earned tenure are not subject to the procedures outlined in this document, since the existing pre-tenure review process is designed to assist them in their development, as well as handle performance problems as needed. Tenured faculty members, including department chairs, deans, and administrators will be reviewed by their immediate supervisors. Promotional reviews and merit evaluations may take place alongside the process detailed in this document, but this process and its purpose are separate and distinct from those associated with promotional reviews and merit evaluations

Quality teaching is a University expectation and, therefore, is an essential element in faculty evaluations. Departments will measure teaching quality using a variety of methods that must include both student evaluations of teaching and other measures, such as peer review, teaching portfolios, etc. In addition to requiring quality teaching, the ongoing evaluation of faculty will take into account all types of meritorious activities in which the faculty members are engaged, and this must include an appropriate balancing of emphasis on teaching, research and creative endeavors, and service. While it is desirable for faculty to be competent in all three areas, excellence in one area can balance deficient performance in other areas, with the exception of teaching. Because of the special emphasis in effectiveness in teaching, all faculty members are welcomed and encouraged to take advantage of services provided by the Center for Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT). The activities that faculty members might consider as examples of teaching, research, or service are listed in Appendix 1. Departments may add further appropriate criteria to the lists, as needed.

Evaluations must be related to the faculty member's specified duties. These duties are determined on an individual basis by the faculty member's dean upon the recommendation of the

department chair. Departments and colleges are encouraged to develop mechanisms to document the agreed upon determination of an individual's duties. Deans must review and sign at least 25 percent of each chair's reviews during each review cycle, so that the dean will examine the chair's reviews of each faculty member at least once every eight years. The dean's examination will cover all reviews since his or her last examination of the faculty member. The dean will also review all evaluations that show deficiencies during the current year and meet with both the faculty member and the chair in those cases. The dean will then decide if the deficient evaluation issued by the chair is appropriate. The dean's decision will be considered final. If the dean renders his/her decision in favor of the faculty member, the deficient review will not be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. If the dean renders his/her decision in favor of the chair, the faculty member has thirty calendar days to request that the matter be referred immediately to the Peer Review Oversight Committee (see below) for peer review.

Recognizing that these reviews lead to a summative evaluation, every attempt will be made to provide sufficient information by which faculty members can assess and reflect on their contributions to the university. Reviews are intended to identify areas of personal excellence that should be maintained and suggest areas that need improvement. This review process will begin on a trial basis in the 2000-2001 academic year, with a purely formative review at the end of that academic year. Evaluations will then take place at the end of the 2001-2002 academic year and every other year thereafter. When the chair's review indicates deficient performance, a dialog will be initiated between the chair and the faculty member to enhance the faculty member's performance. After two consecutive deficient evaluations, with the stipulations below, the chair will confer with the faculty member and initiate the more extensive peer-review as stipulated in the Faculty Assistance section of this document to fulfill the requirements of PM-35.

- A faculty member whose teaching performance is judged deficient will be subject to peer review.
- A faculty member whose performance in either research or service is judged deficient, and who does not demonstrate offsetting excellence in at least one area will be subject to peer review.

As part of the developmental nature of the required reviews, chairs must inform each faculty member of the results of this review using the Biennial Evaluation Form (Appendix 2). When necessary, chairs will provide additional guidance that could improve the faculty member's performance. Those forms to be reviewed by the dean will bear the dean's signature before transmittal to the faculty member.

Biennial evaluations will be concluded by the end of the spring semester. Deans and department chairs will determine the schedule for evaluations. Colleges must schedule the review process to allow sufficient time for the chair to complete the evaluation and inform each faculty member of the results of the review before the end of the academic year. The evaluation will include available information about the quality of performance. Information received after the review is conducted will be used in the next review period.

Faculty members are encouraged to use the results of the evaluation to help prepare for and set personal goals for the next academic year.

PEER REVIEW

After two consecutive deficient evaluations, a tenured faculty member will be provided a more extensive peer-review process. A standing committee, the Peer Review Oversight Committee (PROC), functions to oversee any mandated peer reviews as they arise. The PROC is composed of one voting member and one alternate elected by the faculty of each college and the Library from among its tenured faculty. Faculty members with administrative rank of chair and above are excluded from serving. Voting members and alternates serve concurrent three-year terms, which are staggered to assure continuity. Immediately following the first elections after the adoption of this policy the chair of the Policy Committee shall convene the PROC and determine by random lot which three members (and their alternates) shall serve for three years, which two for two years, and which two for one year. At the end of these respective terms elections shall be held in the college units for new members for full terms. The Policy Committee chair shall also direct the election of the PROC chair by the voting members.

The PROC will oversee all aspects of the peer review process. Should two consecutive deficient evaluations by a faculty member's chair trigger the more extensive peer review, the PROC will oversee the selection of a Peer Review Committee (PRC) for each case. The PROC will ensure that due process is followed in the ensuing review and faculty assistance processes.

In order to insure impartiality, as well as insure that the reviewers in each case are the ones most appropriate to review the academic area of the faculty member under review, each PRC will be constituted through a combination of random and judicious selection as follows:

- two members selected from the tenured faculty of the college where the faculty member under review resides,
- two members selected from the tenured faculty outside the college where the faculty member under review resides, and
- one member selected by the faculty member under review from the tenured faculty of any college.

As in the case of the PROC, faculty members with administrative rank of chair and above are excluded. The members will be selected using the following procedures. The faculty member under review may choose any tenured faculty member without an administrative appointment to serve on his/her PRC. In addition, two pools of eight tenured faculty members, one pool from within the college of the faculty member under review and one pool from outside that college, will be randomly generated. Those selected by this random process will have the opportunity to recuse themselves, based on hardship or conflict of interest, with those recusals subject to approval by the PROC. The faculty member under review will also have the opportunity to

request that someone be removed from the pools, but only for cause. These challenges are also subject to PROC approval. From the names remaining, the PROC will select two faculty members from inside the college and two from without, whom they judge to be best able to review this particular faculty member's performance.

Once the PRC is selected, it will first be charged with determining whether the deficient review is justified. To that end, it is required to meet with the department chair and with the faculty member him/herself, and it is empowered to consult with anyone else it deems appropriate, and to request any documentation it deems appropriate. The PRC should complete its review within 30 calendar days after it is convened, and a majority vote of its members will determine its judgement. The committee will provide a brief written summary of its deliberations and its findings, and a copy of this document will be given to the faculty member under review, to the department chair, to the college dean, and to the Provost.

If the PRC decides that the first or second deficient review by a chair was not called for, it will inform the faculty member, the chair, the college dean, and the Provost of this finding and direct that this PRC finding be registered in the affected faculty member's files. The faculty member will be next reviewed as if no unsatisfactory review had been made for the review that was rejected.

FACULTY ASSISTANCE

If the review by the PRC validates the two consecutive deficient evaluations, then the Provost, dean, department chair, the director of the CELT, and chair of the PROC will meet and appoint a committee of consultants with sufficient expertise to assist the faculty member in remedying the deficiency. This assistance committee may include consultants drawn from the faculty member's department, the CELT, the Writing Center, the Office of Research, or any other resources that may assist the faculty member to overcome the deficiency.

The faculty member will continue to undergo regular reviews by the department chair during this period. If at any time during this period the chair decides that the faculty member's performance is no longer deficient, the chair may recommend to the PROC that the faculty member's assistance be suspended. If the PROC concurs, the faculty member's next review will take place as if no deficient finding had been made. Otherwise, at the end of the three-year period, whichever committee is assisting the faculty member will write a report outlining its view of his/her progress.

If the committee of consultants assisting the faculty member believes that he/she is not cooperating with the improvement plan, they may refer the matter back to the PROC. At this time, the PROC may examine all the documentation – the original deficient review, as well as any intervening evaluations by the department chair, the report by the PRC, and the report(s) by the committee assisting the faculty member. The PROC may meet with the department chair and

with the faculty member him/herself, and it is empowered to consult with anyone else it deems appropriate, and to request any additional documentation it deems appropriate. If, after examining the evidence, the committee feels that the faculty member has not made a good faith effort to improve his/her performance, the matter will be referred to the Chancellor who will institute proceedings for removal for cause based on the recommendation of the PROC. These proceedings shall follow the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook under “Disciplinary Policies and Procedures,” specifically the section on the “Procedures for the Imposition of a Severe Sanction.”

Otherwise, after three years of assistance the faculty member will be reviewed again by the PROC. At this time, the PROC will examine all the documentation – the original deficient review, as well as any intervening evaluations by the department chair, the report by the PRC, and the report by the assistance committee. The PROC is required to meet with the department chair and with the faculty member him/herself, and it is empowered to consult with anyone else it deems appropriate, and to request any additional documentation it deems appropriate. If, after examining the evidence, the committee feels that the faculty member has not made significant improvements in his/her performance, the matter will be referred to the Chancellor who will institute proceedings for removal for cause based on the recommendation of the PROC. These proceedings shall follow the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook under “Disciplinary Policies and Procedures,” specifically the section on the “Procedures for the Imposition of a Severe Sanction.”

Adopted: U.N.O. University Senate, May 18, 2000

Appendix 1

**EXAMPLES OF CRITERIA THAT MAY BE EMPLOYED
IN THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY**

Faculty members are to be evaluated on the quality and scope of their work in fulfillment of the missions of University of New Orleans and in the context of the particular roles and responsibilities of the individual faculty member. These are illustrative lists and are not designed to be exhaustive.

TEACHING

Includes classroom instruction, advising (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate), supervision of undergraduate and graduate research, library services, clinical supervision, and mentoring.

Indicators of Satisfactory Performance may include, but are not limited to:

- Effective teaching performance, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and student outcomes;
- Effective direction of graduate research or creativity activity, as evidenced by student satisfaction and student outcomes;
- Selection for a university, college, departmental, or professional society outstanding teacher award;
- Development of effective pedagogical methods and materials, including computer based and multimedia resources, as evidenced by peer evaluation, student satisfaction and outcomes;
- Development of new courses or major revision of existing courses;
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials;
- Receiving external or internal grant support for teaching/teaching projects;
- Reflective critique and continuous improvement of teaching, as evidenced by self-evaluation;
- Direction of graduate student thesis or dissertation research;
- Chair or member of graduate student advisory committees;
- Evidence of high quality in class preparation, interaction, and accomplishments;
- Effectively coordinating a multi-section course;
- Service as departmental undergraduate or graduate advisor (may also be included as a service activity where appropriate);
- Managing and/or developing library collections for teaching enhancement;
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced teaching effectiveness;
- Receiving on a competitive basis internal funding for teaching;
- Participation in University honors and/or other programs for mentoring the professional development of students.

Possible Measures/Sources of Information:

Self-evaluation:

- Reflective response to student ratings and comments and to peer review;
- Analysis of strengths/weaknesses of course material and delivery;
- Analysis of student achievement of course objectives;
- Statement of goals for improvement;
- Participation in teaching workshops or other improvement activities.

Peer-evaluation:

- Peer critique of course materials;
- Peer critique of classroom teaching.

Student satisfaction:

- End-of-semester student ratings of instruction;
- Mid-semester questionnaires;
- Exit interviews.

Student outcomes:

- Evidence of student growth over the semester;
- Student performance in current and/or subsequent courses;
- Placement of graduate students in academic or professional positions;
- Publication of graduate student thesis;
- Employer reports of student performance.

RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS

Includes research, creative activities, and all other forms of scholarship and creative intellectual work that is validated by peers and is communicated.

Indicators of Satisfactory Performance may include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of scholarly book(s);
- Publication in refereed journals;
- Receiving major fellowship or research award;
- Frequent citation of publications;
- Member of review panel for national research organization;
- Presentation of invited papers at international and national meetings;
- Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research;
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations;
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book;
- Editor of a scholarly book or professional journal;
- Presentation of papers at national or international meeting of appropriate disciplines;
- Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals;
- Continued public activity in fine, performing or diverse arts;
- Juried works in creative activities plastic, performing, or diverse arts;
- Awards for or publication of peer reviewed fiction or creative activities;
- Significant self-development activities, such as a Faculty Development Leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness;
- Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields;
- Publications with teaching focus in refereed journals.

SERVICE

Includes extension, outreach, clinical service, service to the department or unit, service to the University, advising (may also be included as a teaching activity where, appropriate) and professional service.

Indicators of Satisfactory Performance may include, but are not limited to:

- Officer or committee chair of national or international professional organization;
- Officer in regional or state professional organization;
- Service on a major governmental commission, taskforce, or board;
- Administrative leadership role at the University of New Orleans;
- Program chair or similar position for an international, national, regional or state professional organizational meeting;
- Service as an active member of the University Senate;
- Active service on University, college, and department committees and taskforces;
- Service as consultant;
- Advisor to student organization;
- Administrative roles within the department;
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large, including required clinical work or extension service;
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.

Appendix 2
EVALUATION FORM

BIENNIAL FACULTY EVALUATION

_____ **Academic Year**

Name: _____

College: _____ **Department:** _____ **Rank:** _____

	Prior Biennial Chair's Evaluation (Circle one)		Current Biennial Chair's Evaluation (Circle one)	
Teaching Comments:	Satisfactory	Deficient ¹	Satisfactory	Deficient ¹
Research Comments:	Satisfactory	Deficient ¹	Satisfactory	Deficient ¹
Service Comments:	Satisfactory	Deficient ¹	Satisfactory	Deficient ¹
Overall² Comments:	Satisfactory	Deficient ¹	Satisfactory	Deficient ¹

Chair		Reviewed:	
Date		Approved³: Y or N	Dean
			Date

		Received:	
			Faculty Member
			Date

¹Deficient evaluations must be justified orally and in writing. Additional comments may be on an attached page.

²Excellence in one area can balance deficient performance in another area, with the exception of teaching.

³The dean's decision will be considered final.