



Louisiana State University System

3810 West Lakeshore Drive
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808

Office of the President

May 23, 2000

225 / 388-2111
225 / 388-5524 fax

Memorandum to: Chancellors Cavanaugh, Costonis, Emmert, Marsala, Nunez, O'Brien, Richardson, Trail, and Executive Director Bouchard

Subject: Revision of PM-35

This memorandum supercedes PM-35 dated November 22, 1999.

REVIEW OF FACULTY RANKS

A nationally recognized university depends on faculty excellence in research, teaching, 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 PM is to provide a set of guidelines for each of the LSU 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.

The extent to which this policy will be applied to conduct occurring prior to its effective date may be determined by the Chancellor. 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 reviewed at least annually by the Department Chair/Head. The reviews should be based on the faculty member's job responsibility.
2. Provision for review by tenured faculty members (at or above the faculty member's rank) 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 reviewed by tenured faculty in the department. If the number of departmental faculty is insufficient, tenured faculty members from outside the department shall be selected to participate in this review. Appointments of faculty from outside the department require the approval of the Chief Academic Officer.

3. Referral of the matter to a higher administrative level if both the Department Head/Chair and the tenured faculty evaluators find the performance unsatisfactory. If the faculty evaluators concur with the assessment of the Department Chair/Head the matter should be referred with a recommendation for remediation through the Dean to the Chief Academic Officer. If the faculty evaluators do not concur with the Department Chair/Head, the Department Chair/Head may reconsider and revise his/her assessment or refer the matter through the Dean to the Chief Academic Officer with a recommendation for further review and remediation.
4. Development by the faculty, in consultation with the Department Head/Chair and the faculty member, of a plan for improvement. If the Chief Academic Officer concurs with the recommendation for remediation, she or he will appoint a committee of peers numbering three (3) to five (5) to assist the faculty member in developing a positive plan to improve those areas where there are deficiencies. The plan should be mutually agreeable to the faculty member and it should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction. Resources adequate to support the performance improvement plan should be provided by the campus administration.
5. Provision for review by the Department Chair/Head and tenured faculty in the department after a reasonable period under the plan for improvement. After two (2) years of assistance by the peer review committee, the faculty member will be reviewed again by the Department Chair/Head and tenured faculty (at or above the faculty member's rank). The peer review committee's assessment of the faculty member's performance should be considered in this review. If this review is negative, the Chief Academic Officer shall recommend that the Chancellor or his/her designee institute proceedings for removal for cause including proper due process.

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 Chancellor must exercise discretion as to whether to refer the matter to the performance review policy developed under PM-35 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.



William L. Jenkins
President