

Policy Statement Number: **PS-111**

Title/Topic: **Consultation with Faculty in Certain Reviews of Administrative Performance**

Effective Date: 02/17/2005

Revision Number: **PS111.R00**

Consultation with Faculty in Certain Reviews of Administrative Performance

Preamble. As faculty members perform central functions of the University, they often can offer pertinent and useful observations and insights about the work of those who serve in administrative positions, to a degree that varies with organizational level and faculty activities. This Policy Statement seeks to assure that communication takes place, between academic officers and their faculty constituencies, that will help improve and advance the work of the University and its several academic divisions.

Like other LSU personnel, administrators will undergo an annual review process.¹ In each case, the reviewing officer will be the administrator's primary supervisor. The process will result in a written report, including the reviewing officer's evaluation of the administrator's job performance, based on job responsibility. The report will be signed by both the reviewing officer and the reviewee and placed on record in the reviewee's file, which is subject to the confidentiality requirements of PS-40.

Definitions. In what follows, for the sake of brevity, certain terms will be used in a broad sense. The definitions are as follows.

- *Dean.* Dean or otherwise-titled chief academic officer of an academic unit which either is, or contains at least one academic unit which is, the direct employer of faculty; who reports directly to the Provost.
- *Chair.* Chair, head, director, or otherwise-titled chief academic officer of an academic unit that is the direct employer of faculty; who reports directly to a dean.
- *Faculty.* All full-time faculty with rank equivalent to that of Instructor or higher, as defined in PM-23.

Annual Report. Every year, each chair, each dean, the Vice-Chancellor for Research and Graduate Studies, and the Provost, if he or she is serving a term of one year or more, will prepare and promulgate a report on the progress and plans of his or her unit; and will invite comments on the report from all faculty of the academic unit of which the administrator is chair or dean; or, in the case of the Vice-Chancellor, all faculty of the University at ranks equivalent to or higher than Assistant Professor; or, in the case of the Provost, all faculty of the University.

Main Provision. For each of the administrators just mentioned, at least every other year the review process will include a systematic consultation and communication between the reviewing officer and the faculty in the academic unit. It will take place after the administrator's annual report, and will include the following steps.

1. The reviewing officer will, in an appropriate systematic manner, collect, consider, and incorporate in the evaluation the pertinent observations and opinions of the appropriate faculty.
 - a. In the case of a chair or dean of an academic unit, the reviewing officer will solicit input from all faculty in the unit, typically using a survey. The tenured faculty of the unit may, at their option, adopt written rules, subject to the approval of the reviewing officer, that specify additional or alternative means of providing faculty input to the reviewing officer, particularly for use in a year when the renewal of the administrator's appointment is under consideration.
 - b. In the cases of the Vice-Chancellor and the Provost, the reviewing officer (the Provost or the Chancellor, respectively) will either conduct a survey or adopt another suitable means to gather representative faculty opinion.
 - c. In drawing conclusions, the reviewing officer will give due consideration to the degree of representativeness of faculty opinions that are obtained, and also to the importance and merits of minority views.
 - d. The reviewing officer will be held responsible for guarding the right of each individual faculty member to keep his or her input confidential.

¹ PM-35 requires annual reviews of all faculty members based on job responsibility.

2. The reviewing officer will report to the faculty of the unit on the evaluation, including a summary of the results of observations and opinions of the faculty which have been collected.

Additional Specifications. The requirement in the Main Provision may be waived at the discretion of the reviewing officer if it is determined that the administrator will depart the position in less than a year. However, the requirement will apply in the first year of service for an Interim, or the equivalent, unless it is established that the administrator will serve for no more than one calendar year.