

## 2.8 University Policy on Faculty Conduct

### I. Introduction

The University of New Orleans strives to protect academic freedom and academic due process. With freedom come certain obligations for faculty members. This document outlines those privileges and obligations and also details the procedures that will be followed at the University of New Orleans when dealing with alleged faculty misconduct. The most severe sanctions (demotion, suspension, and dismissal) enumerated in Section III, B. 6, 7, and 8 below, must be recommended by the Chancellor to the President of the LSU System. Article VII, Section 4.d. of the Bylaws and Regulations of the Board of Supervisors of the Louisiana State University<sup>1</sup>, provides that "the Chancellor, after consultation with the appropriate academic and/or administrative staff, shall make recommendations to the President ...for appointments, promotions, transfers, suspensions, and dismissals of all academic . . . employees subject to the approval of the President and confirmation of the Board." The procedures described below clarify the "consultation with appropriate academic and/or administrative staff" the Chancellor will use before formulating a recommendation to the President and LSU Board of Supervisors.

At the University of New Orleans, the responsibility to discipline faculty members in appropriate cases derives from the shared recognition by the faculty and the administration that the purpose of discipline is to preserve the University's central function as an institution of higher learning. A major responsibility of the administration is to protect and encourage the faculty in its teaching, learning, research, and public service under conditions hospitable to these pursuits. Such conditions, as they relate to faculty, include:

1. free inquiry and exchange of ideas;
2. the right to present any material relevant to a course of instruction;
3. enjoyment of constitutionally protected freedom of expression as provided for by Article VIII, Section 1, of the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU System;
4. participation in the governance of the University, as provided in the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors, memoranda issued by the President of the Louisiana State University (PMs), administrative procedures issued by the Chancellor of the University of New Orleans (APs), and the UNO Faculty Handbook, including
  - a) approval of academic programs, course content and manner of instruction,
  - b) establishment of requirements for matriculation and for degrees,
  - c) appointment and promotion of faculty,
  - d) selection of department chairs and certain academic administrators,
  - e) discipline of members of the faculty and the formulation of rules and procedures for discipline of students, establishment of norms for teaching

---

<sup>1</sup> Effective date of May 31, 2002;

- responsibilities and for evaluation of both faculty and student achievement, and
- f) determination of the forms of departmental governance;
5. the right to be judged in accordance with fair procedures in matters of promotion, tenure, and discipline solely on the basis of the faculty member's competent and effective performance of appropriate duties.

## **II. Faculty Responsibilities, Ethical Principles, and Unacceptable Faculty Conduct**

The University of New Orleans is a multicultural community composed of diverse students, faculty, and staff. A fundamental principle of the University of New Orleans is that there be an environment of mutual tolerance and respect, which is free of hostility toward, discrimination against, or harassment of any person based on race, color, religion, sex, disability, national origin, age, sexual orientation, marital or veteran status, or any other status protected by law. Every member of the university community is held strictly accountable for his or her behavior with regard to this standard.

Faculty responsibilities, ethical principles, and types of unacceptable behavior bear on the individual faculty member's relation to teaching and students, to scholarship, to the University, to colleagues, and to the community. Since University discipline, as distinguished from other forms of reproof, should be reserved for faculty misconduct that is either serious in itself or is made serious through repetition or its consequences, it may be imposed on faculty members only for conduct that violates ethical principles and therefore impairs the University's function.

The types of unacceptable conduct listed below (A-E) are meant only as examples, and other types of misconduct may also be regarded as unacceptable and deserving of University discipline. University policy regarding sexual harassment is covered specifically in UNO Administrative Policy 8.1 effective March 1, 1989, and is available from the office of the Assistant to the Chancellor for Equal Opportunity.

### **A. Teaching and Students**

Ethical Principles. The professor encourages in students the free pursuit of learning, holding before them the best scholarly standards of his/her discipline. The professor demonstrates respect for the student as an individual, and adheres to the proper role as intellectual guide and counselor, making every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that his/her evaluation of students reflects their true merit. The professor respects the confidential nature of the relationship between teacher and student and avoids any exploitation of students for private advantage, acknowledging any significant assistance from them. The professor protects their academic freedom.

### **Examples of unacceptable conduct:**

1. Failure to meet the responsibilities of instruction, including:
  - a) arbitrary or unwarranted denial of access to instruction;
  - b) significant intrusion of material unrelated to the course;
  - c) repeated failure without legitimate reason to adhere to the responsibilities of the faculty to meet class, to keep office hours, to hold examinations as scheduled;
  - d) evaluation of student work by criteria not directly reflective of course performance;
  - e) undue and unexcused delay in evaluating student work.
2. Use of the position or powers of a faculty member to coerce or cause harm to a student (e.g., use of student services for personal gain or violating confidentiality of student records [Buckley Amendment]).
3. Sexual harassment.
4. Participating in or deliberately abetting disruption, interference, or intimidation in the classroom.
5. Conduct toward students in violation of the University's anti-discrimination policy as stated in the first paragraph of Section II, above.

### **B. Scholarship**

Ethical Principles. The professor, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognizes the special responsibilities which that conviction carries. A professor's primary responsibility to the subject is to seek and state the truth as he/she sees it, developing and improving scholarly competence to that end. The professor accepts the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge, thereby practicing intellectual honesty. Although subsidiary interests may be pursued, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise freedom of inquiry.

### **Examples of unacceptable conduct:**

1. Violations of canons of intellectual honesty, such as intentional misappropriation of the writing, research, and findings of others.
2. Ethical misconduct in research with human subjects.

### **C. The University**

Ethical Principles. As a member of the University the professor seeks above all to be an effective teacher and scholar. Although observing the stated regulations of the institution, the professor maintains the right to criticize those regulations and their administration and to seek their revision. The professor who undertakes work outside the University determines the amount and character of the work with due regard to his/her paramount responsibilities within the University, provided such outside work does not contravene any established rules of the University or the LSU System. The

professor who considers interrupting or terminating his/her service recognizes the effect of that decision upon the program of the institution and gives due notice.

**Examples of unacceptable conduct:**

1. Disobeying or inciting others to disobey University rules, such that the University's functions would be impaired.
2. Unauthorized use of University resources or facilities for personal gain or commercial purposes.
3. Detention, threats of physical harm to, or intimidation of another member of the University community, or otherwise interfering with that person's performance of University duties.
4. Sexual harassment.
5. Conduct toward colleagues in violation of the University's anti-discrimination policy as stated in the first paragraph of Section II, above.
6. Misappropriation or diversion of grant monies.
7. Unauthorized destruction of University property.

**D. Colleagues**

Ethical Principles. As a colleague, the professor has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars, respecting and defending the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, the professor shows due respect for the opinions of others, acknowledging academic debts and striving to be objective when making a professional judgment of colleagues. The professor accepts his/her share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of the University.

**Examples of unacceptable conduct:**

1. Making evaluations of the professional competence of faculty members by criteria not directly reflective of performance of appropriate duties or responsibilities of their position.
2. Breach of established rules governing confidentiality in personnel procedures.
3. Sexual harassment.

**E. The Community**

Ethical Principles. The professor has the same rights and obligations as all citizens. The professor is as free as other citizens to express personal views and to participate in the political processes of the community. When acting or speaking in a personal and private capacity, the professor should avoid creating the impression of representing the University.

**Examples of unacceptable conduct:**

1. Admission of, or conviction for, a felonious criminal act that clearly demonstrates unfitness to continue as a member of the faculty.
2. Representation of personal views as a statement of the position of the University or any of its agencies.

**III. Disciplinary Policies and Procedures**

The University of New Orleans strives to exercise great care in selecting its faculty appointees and to confer tenure only upon those members who have demonstrated their merit in a convincing way. For that reason, a dismissal proceeding involving a tenured faculty member or a faculty member serving a term appointment will be an exceptional event. It is also recognized, however, that a few faculty members may be guilty of offenses that do not justify dismissal, but that must be penalized. The imposition of severe sanctions short of dismissal should be viewed as a serious step undertaken infrequently and only after minor sanctions and other administrative remedies have failed.

While any disciplinary action would be required infrequently, the University must be prepared for such an eventuality so that both the integrity of the University and the rights of the faculty member may be preserved.

**A. Grounds for Disciplinary Action**

With just cause, the University may impose a sanction against a faculty member. "Cause" refers to instances of misconduct such as those outlined in Section II, the nature of which indicates that the faculty member is unfit either to continue as a member of the faculty or to continue to enjoy certain previously held responsibilities or perquisites. All components of "cause" are serious, but not all offenses justify imposition of the most severe sanctions. In accordance with the due process procedures described in Section III-E, a faculty member may be subject to any of the sanctions enumerated below.

**B. Reprimands and Sanctions**

When disciplinary action is required, a written letter of reprimand will be sent to the faculty member and a copy placed in his/her personnel file. The faculty member must be notified in writing of the nature of the charge(s) and of the specific sanction(s) by number and specific penalty(ies) associated with the sanction, corresponding to one of the following:

Sanction 1.	Written reprimand without further sanction.
Sanction 2.	Reassignment to other duties.
Sanction 3.	Suspension of prospective benefits (merit and/or COLA increases) or privileges of rank for a stated length of time

Sanction 4.	Reduction in salary, not to exceed the prevailing promotional increment, for a period not to exceed one year.
Sanction 5.	A permanent reduction in salary, not to exceed the prevailing promotional increment, without affecting tenure or rank.
Sanction 6.	A reduction in rank with loss of salary not to exceed the prevailing promotional increment, without affecting tenure.
Sanction 7.	Suspension without pay.
Sanction 8.	Dismissal

Imposition of any sanction against a faculty member may be initiated by the faculty member's immediate supervisor or by a higher member of the University administration. The imposition of any sanction must be done by the Provost. If the faculty member chooses to appeal the administrative decision by using the Grievance Procedure, sanctions (3), (4), and (5) shall not be imposed until the Grievance Committee has completed its deliberations and the Chancellor has reached his/her decision. Sanctions (6), (7), and (8) can be imposed only in accordance with the procedures described in sections III-D and III-E below.

### **C. Due Process Protection**

A faculty member who wishes to challenge the imposition of sanctions (1) through (5) shall utilize the University Grievance Procedure adopted May 7, 1998. Sanctions (6), (7), and (8) can only be imposed in accordance with the procedures specified below.

### **D. Procedures for Considering the Imposition of a Severe Sanction**

#### **1. Channels**

Allegations against a faculty member originating from any source, from faculty or administrator regarding unacceptable conduct as defined in Section II, A-E, shall be addressed to the appropriate administrator for resolution (e.g., Chair of the faculty member's department, Dean of his/her college, or the Provost) and must be in writing. The written allegations shall name the parties involved, document the allegations, and provide supporting evidence and names of witnesses.

The following steps shall be followed in considering imposition of a severe sanction.

#### **2. Personal Conference**

##### **a. Resolution**

The allegations should be handled through personal conferences at the lowest possible level of administration, if possible. If the matter should extend across colleges, then Deans of those respective colleges should jointly attempt to bring

about disposition of the matter. In the event that it is not possible to achieve a satisfactory disposition, then the Dean(s) shall forward the matter to the Provost, who shall meet with the parties involved to resolve the matter

#### **b. Timeline for Personal Conference**

The chair (or appropriate supervisor) will have ten academic days<sup>2</sup> to attempt to settle the matter after he/she has received the allegation against the faculty member in writing. Then the Dean(s) have five academic days to settle the matter, after which the Provost has five academic days to informally resolve the matter. If the matter is still unresolved at this point, the Provost has five academic days to make a formal complaint in writing.

### **3. The Formal Complaint**

If the matter cannot be resolved, the Provost shall become the official complainant, who shall transmit<sup>3</sup> the formal complaint, a written statement that concisely presents the facts that allegedly constitute a violation of the University Policy on Faculty Conduct. Only one faculty member may be named in a formal complaint. The complaint shall be placed in the "formal file" (see section a below) on the matter and shall contain the names of the parties involved, documentation of the allegations, the names of witnesses and a copy of the original written allegation.

#### **a. Formal File**

The formal file contains the original written allegation, the formal complaint, a written summary of steps taken in the informal process, and the faculty member's rebuttal of these allegations. Each document shall be dated upon its entry into the formal file. The Chancellor or his/her designee shall maintain the formal file.

#### **b. Timeline for Formal Complaint**

The Provost has five academic days to make a formal complaint in writing if no resolution is reached by personal conference. The provost shall transit the formal complaint in writing to the faculty member by certified mail, if hand delivery is not possible. The faculty member has ten academic days to rebut the formal complaint. The rebuttal shall be included in the formal file. The Chancellor shall forward the formal file to the Charges Committee within five academic days of receiving the faculty member's rebuttal.

---

<sup>2</sup> An "academic day" is defined as a day when classes or examinations are scheduled and held in accordance with the official academic calendar of the University, excluding Saturdays and Sundays.

<sup>3</sup> All written statements either must be sent by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, or they may be hand delivered if a signed receipt is obtained providing the date of delivery.

#### **4. Additional Allegations of Misconduct**

Should additional allegations of misconduct be identified after the original charges are filed, these allegations and/or any change in sanction (by number) by the Provost shall be added to the formal file and forwarded to the Charges Committee. The time line for the original set of charges shall be suspended while the Charges Committee considers these additional allegations and changes in sanctions.

The Charges Committee shall then determine if the allegations are additional evidence of misconduct already charged or if the allegations constitute a separate charge. If the allegations are considered to be additional evidence of misconduct, the Charges Committee shall recommend the allegations be forwarded to the Hearings Committee. If the allegations are considered to be a separate charge from the original charge(s), the process on the new charges will start over at the Personal Conference stage.

#### **5. Interim Suspension**

If, after consultation with the faculty member's department, it is the judgment of the Provost that there is a clear probability that the continued assignment of a faculty member to regular duties will be immediately and seriously harmful to the University community, the Provost shall recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be placed on full or partial interim suspension with full pay until the Charges and Hearings Committees have acted. Such a suspension is only a precautionary action and not a form of discipline.

#### **6. Composition of the Charges Committee**

The Charges Committee shall be a committee of the Faculty Council and shall consist of one member elected by each of the degree-granting colleges within the University and of one member elected by the combined faculties of those units not a degree-granting college. Each unit shall also elect an alternate to serve in case a member of the Committee wishes to be recused on grounds of prejudice or involvement or for other reasons deemed valid by the Committee. Any tenured, full-time faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor or above, or of one of the recognized equivalent ranks, exclusive of administrators above the rank of Departmental Chair, shall be eligible to serve on the Committee. Any full-time faculty member, exclusive of administrators above the rank of Departmental Chair, may vote<sup>4</sup>. No eligible faculty member may decline to serve on the committee unless he/she has previously served on a convened Charges Committee or Hearings Committee within the last 5 years. After the first election, the members of the Charges Committee shall draw lots to determine which two members will serve for one year, which two members will serve for two years, and which two for three years.

---

<sup>4</sup> Those serving as staff to administrators above the rank of Departmental Chairperson (e.g., Assistant or Associate Chancellors, Assistant or Associate Deans, etc.) who also hold faculty rank may vote, but may not serve as a member of the Charges Committee.

Replacements for members whose terms have expired shall be elected by the appropriate units and shall serve for three years. Each year the Charges Committee shall elect one of its members to serve as Chair for the year. If a seat on the Committee becomes vacant before a term expires, the unexpired term shall be served by an eligible faculty member elected as described above.

## **7. Responsibilities of Charges Committee**

The Charges Committee shall within twenty academic days of receiving the formal file determine whether any of the allegations in the complaint, if true, would constitute a violation of the University Policy on Faculty Conduct. All deliberations of the Charges Committee shall be in private and a majority of the members (including the Chair) shall determine the decision of the Committee.

## **8. Disposition of Charges Committee's Findings**

The Charges Committee shall forward the formal file, which now includes the Committee's findings and a statement of its numerical vote, and any minority report(s), to the Provost.

**a.** If the Committee determines that the alleged conduct does not violate University Policy on Faculty Conduct, or that any or all of the violations, if true, would be insufficient to justify imposition of a severe sanction, the Committee shall recommend that the matter be terminated. If the Provost agrees with the Committee's recommendation, then the formal file shall be forwarded to the Chancellor with a recommendation that the charges be dropped, and the affected parties shall be so notified. If the Provost disagrees with the findings of the Charges Committee, the Provost shall also state his/her reasons why in writing to the Charges Committee and initiate the proceedings as outlined in E below.

**b.** If the Charges Committee concludes that any or all of the allegations in the complaint, if true, would constitute a serious violation of the University Policy on Faculty Conduct, and the Provost agrees, the Provost shall become the official complainant on behalf of the University, and the proceedings as outlined in Section E below shall be initiated. Only charges that have been reviewed by the Charges Committee may go forward to the Hearings Committee (see Section III.D.4 above). If the Provost disagrees with the recommendation of the Charges Committee, then the formal file shall be forwarded to the Chancellor with a recommendation that the charges be dropped, and the affected parties shall be so notified. If the Provost disagrees with the findings of the Charges Committee, the Provost shall also state his/her reasons why in writing to the Charges Committee.

All documentation from the Charges Committee shall be included in the formal file.

## **E. Procedures for the Imposition of a Severe Sanction**

### **1. Written Notice to Faculty Member**

The Provost shall send the faculty member a copy of the formal file that now contains the charge, rebuttal, the Charges Committee's findings, the Provost's written reasons for the proposed sanctions, and a copy of the most recent version of this document, "University Policy on Faculty Conduct." The letter shall also inform the faculty member that she/he has ten academic days after receipt to request a hearing before the Hearings Committee.

### **2. Failure to Request a Hearing**

If the faculty member does not submit a written statement requesting a hearing within ten days after receiving the specification of reasons, or if the faculty member or his/her academic counsel fails to appear at a duly called meeting of the Hearings Committee (without adequate justification for nonattendance), the sanction may be imposed by letter from the Chancellor without recourse to further institutional procedure.

### **3. Request for a Hearing**

If the faculty member makes a written request for a hearing within ten academic days of having received the Provost's letter, the Provost shall convene the Hearings Committee Pool and make available the charges. The Hearings Committee shall consider only those charges contained in the formal file and which have been reviewed by the Charges Committee. The Hearings Committee shall set a date for the hearing that accords the faculty member twenty academic days to prepare a defense. The Hearings Committee may, upon the faculty member's written request and for good cause, extend this time by written notice to the faculty member.

### **4. Composition of Hearings Committee Pool**

The Hearings Committee Pool shall be a standing Committee of the Faculty Council and shall consist of 21 full-time tenured faculty members holding the rank of Assistant Professor or above, or one of the recognized equivalent ranks. No administrator above the rank of Departmental Chair nor any member of the Charges Committee shall be eligible for service. No eligible faculty member may decline to serve on this Committee, unless he or she has already served on a convened Charges Committee or Hearings Committee within the last five years. The Hearings Committee Pool shall consist of two members elected by each degree-granting college within the University and one member elected by the combined faculties of those units not a degree-granting college. The remaining members shall be elected at a duly-called Faculty Council Meeting from a slate of candidates selected by the Policy Committee of the Faculty Council. The slate shall consist of the number of candidates equal to twice the number of positions to be filled by the at-large election.

Any full-time faculty member, exclusive of administrators above the rank of Departmental Chair, may vote<sup>5</sup>. The term of service on the Committee shall be three years except at the time the Committee is first constituted. The members of the first Committee shall draw lots to determine which seven shall serve for one, two, or three year terms. Retiring members shall be replaced by the same mechanism by which each was elected, except that the Policy Committee shall nominate only twice as many candidates as there are at-large positions to be filled. If a seat on the Committee becomes vacant before a term expires, the unexpired term shall be served by an eligible faculty member elected as described above. If a member takes a one-year sabbatical or leave-of-absence of one or more years, that member shall be replaced for the leave period by election as described above.

## **5. Formulation of a Hearings Committee**

When the Provost convenes a Hearing Committee to deal with a specific disciplinary matter (see E-3 above), the Hearings Committee Pool shall, using procedures that it devises, select five of its members to serve on the Hearings Committee. The faculty member against whom sanction is sought, and the University, shall each have the right to challenge up to five of the proposed members of the Committee. Any challenge to the original composition of the Committee must be made within three academic days of the date the faculty member was notified of the Hearing Committee composition in writing. As each candidate is challenged, a new one shall be selected by the Hearings Committee Pool. Any challenges of replacements must be made within one day of the faculty member's being notified. One member of the duly constituted Hearings Committee shall be selected as Chair by the members of the Committee.

## **6. Access to Hearing**

The hearing shall be closed to the public. At the request of the Committee or of the faculty member, a representative from a responsible and widely recognized educational group may be present as an observer throughout the hearing.

## **7. Powers of the Hearings Committee**

The Hearings Committee shall have full and final control over the proceedings within the restrictions of this document. The Committee shall have complete control over the admissibility of evidence and the standard of proof, and shall have the power to insure that the hearing is conducted in a decorous manner. All evidence deemed admissible must be made available to the faculty member, with sufficient opportunity for rebuttal. The Committee may call witnesses in addition to those listed by the complainant and the faculty member. The Committee may recall any previous witness.

---

<sup>5</sup> Those serving as staff to administrators above the rank of Departmental Chairperson (e.g., Assistant or Associate Vice Chancellors, Assistant or Associate Deans, etc.) who also hold faculty rank may not serve on the Hearing Committee Pool, but may vote in its selection.

## **8. Conduct of the Hearing**

The faculty member shall be assumed innocent unless proved otherwise by the greater weight of the evidence presented. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to be present throughout the hearing and have the right to present the testimony of witnesses and other evidence, to question adverse witnesses, and to examine all documents and other adverse demonstrative evidence. All other examination of witnesses shall be conducted solely by the Hearings Committee. Only one witness at a time shall be present. A verbatim record of all proceedings shall be kept; upon request, a copy thereof shall be furnished to the faculty member at the University's expense.

## **9. Role of Counsels**

The faculty member shall have the right to one legal and/or one academic counsel. If the Hearings Committee requests, the University shall provide one legal counsel to supply relevant legal advice to the Hearings Committee. Such a request and the response either shall be in writing or, if oral, shall be made in the presence of the faculty member or his/her counsel.

If a member of an educational group is present as an observer, the Committee shall also retain the right, subject to the same restrictions, to seek advice from that person. Legal counsels shall be restricted to an advisory role only. Both legal counsels may monitor the proceedings for fairness and either can advise the Committee on any apparent violations of academic due process. The Committee shall rule on any such points. The academic counsel may, at the faculty member's request, present the evidence as described in section E-8 above.

## **10. Committee Deliberations**

In reaching decisions on which its written recommendations to the Chancellor are based, the Committee shall conduct its deliberations in private, and its deliberations shall not be a part of the verbatim record. If a simple majority of the Committee is convinced by the greater weight of the evidence that the charges are true, the Committee shall recommend imposition of a sanction. A simple majority of the Committee shall determine the severity of the sanction, not to exceed that specified in the charges. Individual members of the Committee may submit written minority opinions regarding the Committee findings or the recommended sanction as part of the written record of the hearing, which shall be made part of the formal file.

## **11. Report to the Chancellor**

The Committee shall present to the Chancellor within fifteen academic days after the hearing concludes and the full transcript of the hearing is received by the Committee: (1) its recommendation; (2) the reasons for its recommendation, (3) all

admissible evidence, (4) all excluded evidence with the reasons for its exclusion, (5) a full transcript of the hearing, and (6) all other documents relevant to the hearing and its conduct (as part of the formal file). If the Chancellor concurs with the Hearings Committee's recommendation, then the Chancellor shall notify the parties involved (see E-12 below). If the Chancellor declines to accept the Committee's recommendation, then the Chancellor shall write to the Committee specifying the reasons for disagreement, which shall be made part of the formal file. On receipt of the Chancellor's reasons, the Committee may respond if it wishes and this response shall also become a part of the formal file, which is made available to the faculty member.

## **12. Notification of the Decision**

Within twenty calendar days of receiving the recommendation of the Hearings Committee, the Chancellor shall notify the Committee of his/her decision. Ten calendar days after notifying the Committee, the Chancellor shall send the faculty member a written statement to provide notification of his/her decision and of any sanction imposed. Included in this notification shall be the decision of the Committee, their written reasons for reaching the decision (including any dissenting opinions), and the reasons of the Chancellor if different from those of the Committee. The Hearings Committee, the complainant, and appropriate administrators also shall be notified. If the review proceedings do not result in dismissal or other disciplinary action, appropriate action will be undertaken to ensure that the faculty member is enabled to continue his/her career.

## **13. Right of Appeal**

The decision of the Chancellor may be appealed in the manner set forth in the Regulations and Bylaws of the LSU Board of Supervisors, Chapter II, Section 2-5 "Personnel Actions. Academic Staff<sup>6</sup>," to wit: "All personnel actions relating to faculty and other members of the academic staff shall be initiated by the employee's immediate supervisor after appropriate consultation with faculty, and shall be transmitted through channels to the President, subject to confirmation by the board. If disagreements cannot be resolved by the chief administrative officer of the campus, the personnel transactions shall be referred to the President for consideration. If there be lack of agreement between the head of the department and the dean of a college or a director, or disagreement with either recommendation on the part of the chief academic officer, the recommendation shall so state."

[Original Policy approved by University Senate 4/12/1984; amended 4/18/1991, 2/27/1996, 9/6/1996, 5/2/2000, 3/21/2002, 03/24/2003]

---

<sup>6</sup> Version effective May 31, 2002 <http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/Bylaws?OpenView>