

Institutional Review



THE UNIVERSITY *of*
NEW ORLEANS

March 1, 2016

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Institutional Review Process	1
Institutional Review Format	1
Context for Institutional Review	2
Recommendations	4
Executive Summary of Recommendations	5
<i><u>Area: Accountability</u></i>	
Recommendation 1: Strategic Plan	8
Recommendation 2: Institutional Research/Effectiveness	9
<i><u>Area: Administration</u></i>	
Recommendation 3: Administrative Positions	11
Recommendation 4: Campus Police and Safety	12
Recommendation 5: Faculty Productivity	14
Recommendation 6: Shared Governance	17
<i><u>Area: Curriculum</u></i>	
Recommendation 7: Distance/Non-Credit Offerings	18
Recommendation 8: Curriculum	19
Recommendation 9: Quality Enhancement Plan	21
<i><u>Area: Finance</u></i>	
Recommendation 10: Budget Process	23
Recommendation 11: Comptroller	25

Recommendation 12: Economic Impact	26
Recommendation 13: Lakefront Arena, Research Centers and Institutes	27
Recommendation 14: Support Organizations	29
<i>Area: Mission</i>	
Recommendation 15: Urban Mission	31
Statement of Appreciation	32
List of Supporting Documents	32
Tables	
1 – Enrollment Summary for Benchmark Years	2
2 – Total Enrollment by College Over Five-Year Period	3
3 – Description of Recommendation Areas	5
Appendices	
A – Background Summary of Review Team Members	34
B – List of Individuals Participating in Interviews	36

Institutional Review Process

A three-member team was appointed by the University of Louisiana System to conduct the Institutional Review. The team included Dr. Randy Moffett, Mr. Robbie Robinson and Dr. William Sharpton and began its work in October 2015. A summary of each member's background may be found in Appendix A. The work of the team was launched by holding a conference call with Dr. Sandra Woodley, former President of the University of Louisiana System, to receive her perspective concerning the status of the University and the purpose of the Institutional Review. A key objective of the review is to provide guidance to the next President of the University of New Orleans (UNO).

The review process included four primary information gathering mechanisms: 1) interviews with key personnel and students, 2) review of existing records and reports as well as documents provided by interview participants, 3) observations related to campus facilities, and 4) participation in administrative, faculty or staff meetings by team members while on campus. Interviews were conducted in both individual and small group format and included representatives from across campus as well as administrators, faculty, staff and students. Additional interviews were held with individuals representing other agencies, higher education institutions and governing boards related to the successful operation of the UNO campus. A list of each individual interviewed to gather information for the Institutional Review is found in Appendix B.

A number of existing records and reports were reviewed to acquire information for this review. The review focused on both internal reports developed by the University as well as reports authored by external groups focused on aspects of University operation. Examples of internal reports include documents developed by working committees (e.g., University Budget Committee, Faculty Governance Committee, Internal audit report). Examples of reports generated by or for external groups include Board of Regents reports required by the Louisiana Granting Resources and Autonomy for Diplomas Act (GRAD Act), the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) reaffirmation on-site review team report, and enrollment reports required by the University of Louisiana System and Louisiana Board of Regents.

Institutional Review Format

Upon examination of Institutional Reviews previously developed for both UNO and other member institutions of the University of Louisiana System, the team decided that the Institutional Review should serve as a tool for the new President to identify priorities and develop specific strategies to implement improvement-related activities. The team also felt that it is critical for the President to access reports and key documents used to inform the recommendations included in the Institutional Review.

The Institutional Review includes a total of 15 recommendations organized into five categories. Each recommendation includes background information, recommended strategies to support improved operation and a list of supporting documents. Links are provided for each supporting document that can be accessed within the Institutional

Review document. All supporting documents are housed within a webpage on the UNO website to facilitate easy retrieval of related information.

Context for Institutional Review

The University of New Orleans was established by Act 60 of the 1956 Louisiana Legislature in the wake of a citizens' movement to bring tax-supported higher education to the New Orleans metropolitan area. The University of New Orleans has been in continuous operation since it enrolled its first Freshman class in Fall 1958. Initially the University began operation as a satellite campus of Louisiana State University (LSU) named Louisiana State University in New Orleans (LSUNO). In February 1974, the Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors approved a name change and the University was renamed the University of New Orleans. In 2011, Act 419 of the Louisiana Legislature transferred governance of the University of New Orleans from the Louisiana State University System to the University of Louisiana System. A brief history of the University is available on the website www.uno.edu.

Table 1 provides a summary of enrollment data for key benchmark years. A more detailed summary of annual enrollment data is posted on the Institutional Effectiveness website.

Table 1: Enrollment Summary for Benchmark Years

Academic Year	Note	Total Enrollment
1958-59	First year of operation	1,460
1969-70	First year enrollment exceeded 10,000	10,343
1973-74	Year of name change to the University of New Orleans	17,350
2005	Pre-Hurricane Katrina (NOTE: 14 th day official enrollment did not occur due to storm)	17,142
2011-12	Year UNO transferred to the University of Louisiana System	10,903
2015-16	Most recent academic year	8,423

As of academic year 2013-14, the University of New Orleans has awarded a total of 83,402 undergraduate and graduate degrees. Each year, the University of New Orleans submits a Preliminary Headcount Enrollment Summary based on the 14th day enrollment to the Board of Regents. According to the Fall 2015 report, the enrollment included 6601 undergraduates and 1822 graduate students. These students were enrolled in 83 degree programs: 38 at the undergraduate level, 34 at the Master's level, and 11 at the doctoral level.

Enrollment data are managed via PeopleSoft and allow academic colleges and departments to produce summaries by program of study. Table 2 presents enrollment summaries over a five year period for each college. Although Interdisciplinary Studies is not a separate college, the table includes enrollment for this group of students.

Table 2: Total Enrollment by College Over Five-Year Period

College	Fall 2011		Fall 2012		Fall 2013		Fall 2014		Fall 2015	
<i>Business Administration</i>	U	2161	U	1934	U	1808	U	1730	U	1538
	G	713	G	601	G	516	G	477	G	399
	T	2874	T	2535	T	2324	T	2207	T	1937
<i>Education and Human Development</i>	U	492	U	433	U	383	U	386	U	365
	G	806	G	693	G	576	G	505	G	406
	T	1298	T	1126	T	959	T	891	T	771
<i>Engineering</i>	U	1017	U	946	U	837	U	955	U	879
	G	191	G	177	G	190	G	199	G	195
	T	1208	T	1123	T	1027	T	1154	T	1074
<i>Liberal Arts</i>	U	1766	U	1625	U	1460	U	1370	U	1161
	G	693	G	695	G	646	G	623	G	581
	T	2459	T	2320	T	2106	T	1993	T	1742
<i>Sciences</i>	U	2191	U	2148	U	2042	U	2089	U	1945
	G	231	G	213	G	247	G	273	G	238
	T	2422	T	2361	T	2289	T	2362	T	2183
<i>Interdisci-Plenary</i>	U	516	U	467	U	451	U	388	U	427
<i>Other</i>	U	120	U	136	U	163	U	234	U	286
	G	6	G	3	G	4	G	5	G	3
	T	126	T	139	T	167	T	239	T	289
Grand Total	10,903		10,071		9,323		9,234		8,423	

U = Undergraduate G = Graduate T = Total

The Board of Supervisors for the University of Louisiana System is authorized by Article VIII, Section 6 of the Louisiana State Constitution to govern the University of Louisiana System. In December 2011 the University of New Orleans became the ninth member of the University of Louisiana System.

Mission

The University of New Orleans is a comprehensive urban research university committed to providing educational excellence to a diverse undergraduate and graduate student body. The University is one of the region's foremost public resources, offering a variety of world-class, research-based programs, advancing shared knowledge and adding to the region's industry, culture and economy. The University of New Orleans, as a global community asset, serves national and international students and enhances the quality of life in New Orleans, the state, the nation, and the world, by participating in a broad array of research, service learning, cultural and academic activities.

Scope

The University of New Orleans, as an urban research university, offers a number of challenging and in-demand programs, many of which are uniquely linked to the rich and vibrant city of New Orleans. The University of New Orleans grants baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degrees in academic colleges, including but not limited to: business administration, education and human development, engineering, liberal arts, and sciences, as well as interdisciplinary studies.

Vision

The University of New Orleans will be recognized as one of the preeminent urban research institutions in the nation, noted for its commitment to excellence in teaching and in student success; its location in a culturally vibrant city; its innovative and relevant undergraduate, graduate, professional and research programs; and its role as a primary engine of social, economic, intellectual and cultural development in the New Orleans region and beyond.

The current Mission Statement was revised by the Strategic Planning Committee in Fall 2013 as the first step toward developing a five year Strategic Plan for years 2015-2020. The Strategic Planning Committee membership included representatives from central administration, college leadership, Faculty Senate, and community stakeholders. Following development by the committee, the Mission was approved in February 2014 by the University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors.

Recommendations

As a first step to developing specific recommendations, the team identified three underlying themes that emerged from an analysis of the information resulting from interviews, record reviews, and observations. These themes include **transparency**, **communication**, and **coordination**. Team members identified numerous instances where information appeared to be available only to certain key personnel rather than all members of a group that should be informed about a given situation (e.g., all Cabinet members). Several individuals interviewed reported that the campus lacked a consistent mechanism for sharing information across the UNO community and/or given groups of key personnel (e.g., faculty). The final theme, coordination, relates to a need for the efforts of key personnel and constituencies to be aligned toward the common goal of improving a specific aspect of University operation.

A total of 15 recommendations were developed by the Review Team based on an analysis of the information resulting from the interviews and document review. The recommendations have been organized in five main areas as shown in Table 3. It should be noted that the broad nature of several recommendations make them candidates for classification in multiple areas. The team elected to categorize each recommendation by the primary area represented. Also, the team has not provided these recommendations in any order of priority. It is recommended that the new President work with the

administrative team and faculty/staff representatives to prioritize the recommendations as part of constructing an implementation plan.

Table 3: Description of Recommendation Areas

Area	Description
<i>Accountability</i>	Issues related to assessment, institutional effectiveness and the use of data to support improved campus operations
<i>Administration</i>	Issues related to the supervision and management of University units and operations
<i>Curriculum</i>	Issues related to academic offerings, degree program requirements, course content, and curriculum modification including the Quality Enhancement Plan
<i>Finance</i>	Issues related to budget, finance and business operations for the campus as well as affiliate and auxiliary organizations/units
<i>Mission</i>	Issues related to the development and support of the University mission, scope and vision

Executive Summary of Recommendations

Accountability

Recommendation 1 (Strategic Plan): UNO should ensure that the UNO 2020 Strategic Plan includes initiatives, objectives, and measurable outcomes with established benchmarks and completion dates and responsible units/divisions. Identification of annual aspirations for each goal, including enrollment gains, should be included in the UNO 2020 Strategic Plan and incorporated in the Institutional Effectiveness process.

Recommendation 2 (Institutional Research/Effectiveness): UNO should establish a single office that is responsible for both Institutional Research and Institutional Effectiveness activities, with the office reporting directly to the President.

Administration

Recommendation 3 (Administrative Positions): UNO should review all administrative positions within the Table of Organization, with particular emphasis on senior level positions, to ensure appropriate resource allocation, organizational efficiency, and effectiveness. The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs should be designated as the second in charge in the absence of the President.

Recommendation 4 (Campus Police and Safety): UNO should engage a consultant to conduct an extensive review of the Campus Police operations and Safety procedures to

ensure that appropriate resources are directed to this function and that procedures ensure the most appropriate response to safety concerns and issues.

Recommendation 5 (Faculty Productivity): There is an immediate need to revise workload policy and practices to ensure consistency in workload approval and documentation. Emphasis should be placed in three areas: 1) defining release expectations for research and administrative purposes, 2) implementing improved procedures for awarding, recording, and reporting release time, and 3) evaluating faculty productivity for teaching and release time efforts.

Recommendation 6 (Shared Governance): UNO should continue its efforts to codify University existing structures, including Committee charges and Faculty and staff roles, to ensure Shared Governance and open communication among faculty, staff, and administrators.

Curriculum

Recommendation 7 (Distance/Non-Credit Offerings): UNO should expand the use of distance learning technologies and formats to increase its enrollment in both degree and non-degree programs of study. Efforts should also be expanded to design and deliver non-credit offerings to meet community and industry needs.

Recommendation 8 (Curriculum): Faculty and key administrative personnel should expand the current program review and curriculum mapping process to determine the most appropriate array of academic program offerings, streamline the delivery of each academic program, and ensure that each course offered supports the learning objectives associated with the related program(s) of study.

Recommendation 9 (Quality Enhancement Plan): UNO should reduce the scale of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to ensure effective implementation in Fall 2016.

Finance

Recommendation 10: (Budget Process): The UNO administration must be more transparent in providing financial information to the University community to encourage teamwork and communication throughout the campus. UNO should continue the work of the University Budget Review Committee to ensure that the budget process is inclusive and transparent. The Budget Process should be aligned with both UNO 2020 Strategic Plan and the Institutional Effectiveness process.

Recommendation 11 (Comptroller): UNO should establish a Comptroller position within the current organizational structure of Business Affairs, with the position reporting directly to the Vice President of Business Affairs.

Recommendation 12 (Economic Impact): UNO and the UNO Research and Technology Foundation should partner to conduct an economic impact study of the region served by UNO using resources within UNO's Division of Business and Economic Research.

Recommendation 13 (Lakefront Arena, Research Centers and Institutes): The UNO Lakefront Arena as well as Research Centers and Institutes should develop financial plans to become sustainable entities with self-generated revenues. In addition the UNO Lakefront Arena should be included in the Auxiliary Fund accounting rather than being included in the Unrestricted Funds of the Operating Budget.

Recommendation 14 (Support Organizations): The University Executive Leadership Team must become proactive in the operations of the University of New Orleans Foundation and University of New Orleans Research and Technology Foundation and should welcome the leadership of these two organizations into the UNO Executive Leadership Team.

Mission

Recommendation 15 (Urban Mission): UNO should maintain and enhance its mission as an urban-focused, research university in order to meet the needs of the greater New Orleans area and the state of Louisiana.

Recommendation 1: Strategic Plan

Current Status

UNO established a broad-based committee to develop a new Strategic Plan in 2013. The plan includes 6 goals that address a variety of areas related to successful University operation including: academic programs, student learning environments, high quality facilities and staff, research and creative activities, campus facilities, and image and community connections. Each of the goals includes specific strategies, each associated with specific action steps. Although the Strategic Plan appears to be a comprehensive document, the format of the plan includes no measurable outcomes or interim benchmarks for any of the 6 goals, 22 strategies or 89 action steps.

The University has an established Institutional Effectiveness process utilizing WEAVE software. The process allows individual units to align specific Institutional Effectiveness objectives with components of the UNO 2020 Strategic Plan. At this time, the process only allows reports to indicate the number of unit plans that are aligned with each specific goal of the UNO 2020 Strategic Plan since no consistent measures have been developed for the Strategic Plan.

Recommendation

UNO should ensure that the UNO 2020 Strategic Plan includes initiatives, objectives, and measurable outcomes with established benchmarks and completion dates and responsible units/divisions. Identification of annual aspirations for each goal, including enrollment gains, should be included in the UNO 2020 Strategic Plan and incorporated in the Institutional Effectiveness process.

The Institutional Effectiveness process in place at UNO was recently reviewed as a part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) reaffirmation for the campus and appears to be robust in terms of the inclusion of all components needed to track campus improvements. It is critical that the Institutional Effectiveness process be linked to the UNO 2020 Strategic Plan in terms of the measures used to demonstrate attainment of each targeted goal.

Supporting Documents

[UNO 2020 Strategic Plan](#)
[Description of Core Requirement 2.5 \(UNO Institutional Effectiveness Process\) in SACSCOC Compliance Certification](#)

Recommendation 2: Institutional Research/Effectiveness

Current Status

Prior to 2014 the University supported a specific unit in central administration dedicated to Institutional Research (IR) with a Director and three staff positions. As part of a budget reduction in 2014, the position of Director of Institutional Research was eliminated. In the same time period, two of the staff resigned to assume positions at other universities in the region. To ensure that Institutional Research functions are completed, the leadership for IR was transferred to the Registrar. Responsibility for the majority of routine reports authored by the office was assigned to the remaining staff member. Responsibilities for ad-hoc requests and other data-related tasks were assigned to key personnel in the Office of the Registrar using stipend payment for additional duties. The responsibility for Institutional Research activities is supervised by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Oversight for Institutional Effectiveness activities is assigned to the Office of Academic Affairs with direct responsibility assigned to the Associate Provost. Until May 2015, the office included a position to direct assessment activities for the campus. Since that time, the position has not been filled.

Interviews with key personnel indicate that the University appears to have a process in place to respond to needs associated with annual and routine reports required by external bodies. The process to respond to internal requests for information appears to be less systematized. For example, some units have worked with Information Technology personnel to develop queries related to specific needs for data resulting in different queries in place for the same type of information rather than the adoption of a standard query available to all campus units. In other circumstances, there appear to be identified needs for information that currently cannot be met.

Recommendation

UNO should establish a single office that is responsible for both Institutional Research and Institutional Effectiveness activities, with the office reporting directly to the President.

Institutional Research and Institutional Effectiveness activities are critical to the success of the university as well as the fulfillment of accreditation requirements. Given the current financial resources of the University, a single office should be established to complete all activities associated with Institutional Research and Institutional Effectiveness. The office should also coordinate assessment efforts in place to support Institutional Effectiveness activities for all academic and non-academic units. It is also recommended that this office report to the Office of the President to ensure that both academic and non-academic units participate fully in Institutional Effectiveness activities. This recommendation is particularly critical given the current monitoring status of the University for two Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) Institutional Effectiveness comprehensive standards.

An effective approach to establish the operations of the office would be to identify the various data elements needed to respond to all required external reports as well as those elements needed to respond to the most frequently requested information from campus units to assist Institutional Effectiveness efforts. This effort would allow the unit to organize the various queries, reports, and reporting schedules that would best serve the needs of both academic and non-academic units. Other key activities for the reorganized unit would be to: 1) assist professional development efforts related to campus personnel, 2) use data to identify needs, 3) develop improvement initiatives and 4) evaluate the effectiveness and impact of implementing those initiatives.

Supporting Documents

[Institutional Effectiveness Webpage on UNO Website](#)
[SACSCOC reaffirmation letter](#)

Recommendation 3: Administrative Positions

Current Status

Currently, the University includes a total of 51 leadership personnel including the President, five Vice Presidents, nine Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents (although the title may vary across units), six Deans and 30 Department Chairs. This total does not include personnel who hold positions as Directors of Research Centers and Institutes. Also, the Vice President of Research position was not filled when Dr. Kenneth Sewell left the position in 2015.

Recommendation

UNO should review all administrative positions within the Table of Organization, with particular emphasis on senior level positions, to ensure appropriate resource allocation, organizational efficiency, and effectiveness. The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs should be designated as the second and hence assume institutional leadership responsibility in the absence of the President.

The team does not offer any specific recommendations for position discontinuation, consolidation or revision. Rather, the recommendation focuses on reviewing all key tasks that need to be effectively and efficiently completed for the University to be successful. The results of that analysis should be used to develop the most appropriate Table of Organization that ensures all key operations are responsibly completed. It is also important to consider the budget constraints imposed by the recent budget reductions as well as the impending reductions that may occur in the coming fiscal year.

Supporting Document

[University Organization Chart](#)

Recommendation 4: Campus Police and Safety

Current Status

The website of the UNO Police Department states that the Department “is dedicated to providing the best protection possible to safeguard the lives and property of the University and its community. In supporting UNO’s mission as a public service institution, all members of the UNO Police Department provide the highest quality of service possible.” University police officers are responsible for the following public safety services: crime reports, investigations, medical and other emergencies, traffic accidents, parking violations, enforcement of laws regulating consumption of alcoholic beverages, the use of controlled substances, weapons and all other incidents requiring police assistance.

Concerns were noted during discussions with the Chief of Police that morale is low within the police force due to the constraints created by UNO’s structural budget deficit. While the inability to provide adequate compensation and salary adjustments is identified as one cause of low morale, funding shortfalls have impacted resources in other critical areas such as training, equipment, and appropriate supervision. Recruiting post-certified officers is becoming more difficult when coupled with the competition for resources by other area law enforcement agencies.

While the UNO Patrol Division is staffed twenty-four hours a day seven days a week, resource limitations have placed great strain on the existing workforce that could impact timely and appropriate response times when a safety issue might arise. During 2015 it was documented by the Chief of Police that at times twenty percent of the officers were unavailable for duty due to medical or other leave, placing strain on the remaining force to provide the necessary law enforcement coverage.

Within the current university environment, nationally there is an ongoing concern relating to random acts of violence against individuals in the campus community, generating safety concerns relative to the timely and appropriate response to such situations, some of which may result in the emergency evacuation of the campus or possibly a need to shelter in place. Students, faculty, and staff should be made aware of and routinely participate in safety awareness and educational programs including practice drills as appropriate to provide confidence that they function within a safe and secure environment.

Recommendation

UNO should engage a consultant to conduct an extensive review of the Campus Police operations and safety procedures to ensure that appropriate resources are directed to this function and that procedures ensure the most appropriate response to safety concerns and issues.

Training, equipping, and maintaining a stable and reliable campus police force has proven to be difficult within the current budget environment. Manpower shortages have

resulted in increased overtime due to strained resources, officer supervision concerns, minimal coverage, and unacceptable response time to events requiring police intervention. While UNO crime statistic reports and daily crime logs do not currently raise immediate concern, UNO should move quickly to ensure that concerns of the Police Department are addressed.

Supporting Documents

[UNO Daily Crime Log](#)

[UNO Crime Statistics for the Past Three Years](#)

Recommendation 5: Faculty Productivity

Current Status

Although the University has a policy on Faculty Workload (AP-AA-22.2), it was not possible to secure a report outlining the existing workload for each faculty member. Interviews with key personnel and a review of an internal auditing report on faculty workload indicate several reasons why an accurate report cannot be generated. Key problems include:

University workload policy allows each academic unit to create its own workload policy. Other than the College of Engineering which developed a college-wide workload policy, policy for workload has been developed by each academic department. This situation has resulted in multiple interpretations of workload assignment.

There is no electronic process in place for recording faculty workload each semester. Faculty positions are recorded in the PeopleSoft system as full or part time; however, assignments for various functions (research, teaching, administration) are not recorded in PeopleSoft by semester. Release time for research appears to be approved in different ways. Externally funded research releases associated with grants and contracts awarded to the University are approved by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. Internally funded research releases are awarded at two levels: university and academic unit. An example of a university release is when a title such as University Research Professor that includes release time is awarded to a faculty member. Other research releases are awarded at the department level based on the procedures in place within the academic unit.

There is no consistent practice in place to define research exemptions for faculty. Research time is described in current workload policies but specific activities for which release time may be provided are not defined. This same problem occurs for exemptions provided for faculty to complete administrative activities such as serving as Department chairs, as graduate coordinators or in key leadership roles (e.g., faculty senate).

Faculty time is not accurately recorded by function (research, teaching, service, administration) in PeopleSoft. Funded releases are processed through a Personnel Action Form which is mediated through SharePoint. Some internally funded releases are processed through a Personnel Action but these actions are approved at the individual level and are not maintained in a spreadsheet that can be reviewed on a university-wide level. Internally funded releases are not necessarily noted in the Personnel Action Form so there is no mechanism in place to generate an accurate report of faculty time.

Currently, it is possible to generate a report in PeopleSoft of faculty teaching activities by semester. This information can be used to infer release time by comparing teaching time with the University of Louisiana System expectation of a 12 credit equivalency for an academic semester. It is not possible to determine the purpose of the release time provided.

Recommendation

There is an immediate need to revise workload policy and practices to ensure consistency in workload approval and documentation. Emphasis should be placed in three areas: 1) defining release expectations for research and administrative purposes, 2) implementing improved procedures for awarding, recording, and reporting release time, and 3) evaluating faculty productivity for teaching and release time efforts.

A potential strategy to address this recommendation involves three actions: 1) adopting some new practices to ensure accurate data entry, 2) using the existing Faculty 180 software to create routine faculty activity reports, and 3) using PeopleSoft data to create routine faculty teaching reports.

Current practices for data entry related to instruction, research and release time need to be reviewed to determine where policy and/or procedural changes are needed. A few areas identified via interviews include: 1) inconsistent updating of instructor of record after the semester begins to ensure that all data are accurate, 2) failure to allocate faculty time by function in PeopleSoft resulting in inflated instructional FTE calculations, 3) inability to document in PeopleSoft faculty activities resulting from added compensation, and 4) inability to determine the accurate instructional FTE of 12 month personnel who also serve as instructors. Additionally, the university policy on workload should be amended to include specific definitions for research, administrative, and service activities eligible for release time.

The University currently uses a software product (Faculty 180) to generate reports related to faculty activities and productivity. Faculty 180 reads some data from PeopleSoft and allows entry by faculty and administrators of other data related to faculty productivity. It is likely that verifying faculty time in Faculty 180 may be the quickest route to producing an accurate faculty workload report. Faculty 180 currently generates reports of faculty scholarly productivity for specific time periods. It would be easy to compare the scholarly productivity of each faculty member with the specific release time provided for a given time period. This review process would assist administrative personnel at the department, college and university levels in assigning release time and evaluating faculty use of release time. The annual report of faculty productivity should be used for multiple purposes including the annual faculty performance review, merit pay determination, support for the promotion and tenure process and post-tenure review.

In recent years, the Office of Academic Affairs has used a number of different approaches to determine the teaching productivity of full and part time faculty. It is

important that UNO adopt a consistent reporting method to document the key measures of instruction such as total credit hours and total student credit hours by faculty member, department and college by semester and academic year. Initial work with the Office of the Registrar to develop a template for such a report is found in the Supporting Documents.

Supporting Documents

[2015 Internal Audit – Faculty Workload](#)
[Sample Faculty Workload Reporting Template](#)
[Faculty Workload Policy \(AP-AA-22.2\)](#)

Recommendation 6: Shared Governance

Current Status

In preparation for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) visit in 2015, an extensive review of the various committees in place at UNO to support shared governance was undertaken by the Office of Academic Affairs. The status of key committees varied widely. Some committees met consistently while others had not met since the interruption of campus operation by Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Several meetings with key faculty and staff groups were held by the SACSCOC Liaison to gather evidence (e.g., Committee charges, membership, minutes) for the Compliance Certification. Although sufficient evidence was gathered to be judged by the off-site SACSCOC review Committee as being Compliant, there appear to be major gaps in how committees actually operate at UNO. Examples of gaps include: clearly delineated responsibilities for Committees, assurance that a shared governance mechanism is in place for all key issues of University operation, lack of a consistent mechanism for the dissemination of Committee work to appropriate stakeholders in the UNO Community, and demonstrated evidence via the Institutional Effectiveness process that the various Shared Governance committees collect and use data to implement improvements for academic and student services, administrative support, research, service and academic program delivery.

Recommendation

UNO should continue its efforts to codify University structures in place, including Committee charges and Faculty and staff roles, to support Shared Governance and open communication among faculty, staff, and administrators.

It is critical that the University continue its efforts to clarify roles and responsibilities for key activities related to the successful operation of the University. Specifically, the end result of this work should include, at a minimum, a single document that outlines each key committee in terms of charge and composition as well as how each committee reports its work to the entire University Community. The committee structure should ensure that work is not duplicated and that all key activities are jointly stewarded by administration and faculty/staff. It is also recommended that UNO adopt a process to support the dissemination of all committee work to appropriate stakeholders.

Once the structure for all key committees is finalized and adopted, efforts should be taken to ensure that all faculty and staff become aware of the Shared Governance committee process, procedures and opportunities at UNO.

Supporting Documents

[Description of Comprehensive Standard 3.7.5 from SACSCOC Compliance Certification](#)

Recommendation 7: Distance/Non-Credit Offerings

Current Status

Although UNO offers a number of on-line courses in each academic college, a total of only 4 degree programs are offered exclusively in an on-line format. These programs include the B.A. in Philosophy, B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies, M.S. in Hotel, Restaurant, Tourism, and M.A. in Romance Languages. The one on-line program delivered through a consortium model (B.S. Organizational Leadership) was not successful in terms of enrollment and is now only offered by one of the participating University of Louisiana System schools (University of Louisiana – Monroe). One problem noted by the General Education Committee is that some of the required general education coursework in the sciences is not offered in an on-line format. Thus, it is often impossible for a student to complete an undergraduate program totally on-line unless the student transfers the required science coursework from another institution offering the necessary coursework in an on-line format.

The University has the technology available to offer courses in both synchronous and asynchronous formats. Currently two positions are dedicated to supporting on-line coursework and programs of study: one to direct online and non-credit learning and the other to support faculty in the use of Moodle and other on-line technologies such as Adobeconnect. Recently the Office of Academic Affairs engaged an external consultant to analyze UNO's current practices related to on-line and non-credit offerings. The report provides a number of recommendations to increase the number of on-line and non-credit offerings as well as to improve the quality of such programs.

Recommendation

UNO should expand the use of distance learning technologies and formats to increase its enrollment in both degree and non-degree programs of study. Efforts should also be expanded to design and deliver non-credit offerings to meet community and industry needs.

The Office of Academic Affairs should carefully consider the recommendations provided in the report on on-line and non-credit programs. It is critical that faculty be provided sufficient support to design, deliver, and evaluate on-line courses and programs of study. It is recommended that the University invest its resources on a limited number of program start-ups that will result in the greatest gains in enrollment. Focusing efforts on a smaller inventory of programs at this time will improve the University's ability to provide sufficient support to involved faculty and increase the likelihood of a successful outcome.

Supporting Documents

[External Consultant Report of Distance/Non-Credit Learning](#)

Recommendation 8: Curriculum

Current Status

A review of the curriculum offered by the University began in 2013 primarily through the efforts of the Faculty Governance Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs. The initial work of the committee focused on the identification of a common set of key data elements to guide the work of the committee and the assignment of all academic programs to one of four categories based on program scores on the identified elements. The four categories included: 1) Enhance, 2) Sustain, 3) Restructure, Merge or Otherwise Transform, and 4) Close. Reports addressing two categories of programs were authored by the committee and recommendations were used to assist in identifying a set of academic programs to discontinue. A proposal related to program discontinuation was approved by the University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors in 2014. Following the approval to discontinue programs of study, the Faculty Governance Committee continued to review the remaining programs in Category 3. The ad-hoc committee was disbanded in Fall 2015. The Office of Academic Affairs is in the process of developing a procedure to complete academic program reviews on a regular schedule.

Another curriculum-related initiative, focused on curriculum mapping, was launched in Fall 2015. The first phase of this initiative identified all of the coursework offered in each academic discipline over a defined period of time (five years). Faculty are being asked to review a set of materials to determine if each course is needed and to consider the schedule for offering key required courses to ensure that students can finish a program in a reasonable period of time. The set of materials for each undergraduate program of study includes: 1) the curriculum, 2) the 4 year plan, 3) a Student Learning Outcome map, 4) a list of courses taught, and 5) observations about the curriculum.

Recommendation

Faculty and key administrative personnel should expand the current program review and curriculum mapping process to determine the most appropriate array of academic program offerings, streamline the delivery of each academic program, and ensure that each course offered supports the learning objectives associated with the related program(s) of study.

The President and the Office of Academic Affairs should review the recommendations provided by the Faculty Governance Committee to determine the specific academic programs that should be maintained, revitalized, combined and/or transformed or discontinued. The Office of Academic Affairs should also develop and disseminate guidelines to assist faculty in determining the appropriate number of courses to offer in each academic discipline. The primary purpose of these guidelines is to ensure that each program of study is offered in the most efficient model possible. Finally, the Office of Academic Affairs should assist faculty in completing the curriculum mapping process to ensure that the learning objectives for each program of study and course are identified. The primary purpose of this process is to ensure that all academic program learning

outcomes are addressed by the required courses in the program and that any duplication or gaps in addressing learning outcomes is addressed by modifying the program of study requirements.

Ideally, these recommended activities would be completed in a manner that results in two outcomes: 1) an immediate revision in the complement of academic programs offered and the number of courses required to meet the learning outcomes of each program of study offered, and 2) adoption of a process that can be followed systematically to ensure that the inventory of academic programs and coursework offered is reviewed and adjusted on an ongoing basis.

Supporting Documents

Program Review Guideline - Draft

[Sample Curriculum](#)

[Sample 4 Year Plan](#)

[Sample Student Learning Outcomes Map](#)

[Sample List of Courses Taught](#)

[Sample Curriculum Observations](#)

[Proposal to UL System Board of Supervisors](#)

[Faculty Governance Report](#)

[Program Review Guidelines Draft](#)

Recommendation 9: Quality Enhancement Plan

Current Status

In accordance with guidelines established by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), UNO involved a broad group of campus stakeholders in the selection of a topic for the Quality Enhancement Plan. UNO's Quality Enhancement Plan is focused on Global Learning and Engagement and is titled "Bringing the World to UNO". A QEP Committee with representation of all academic colleges was established to develop the proposal submitted as part of the SACSCOC reaffirmation process. The proposed project involves five phases, each roughly corresponding to a one year timeframe. Phase one focuses on beginning the redesign of courses in two core areas of the general education curriculum to include a focus on global learning and engagement. Year two expands the redesign efforts to include the remaining core areas of the general education curriculum. Year three and four involve redesigning upper level coursework in five major areas of study, one per academic college. Year five is focused on sustainability activities and provides an opportunity for faculty to redesign coursework in other major areas as selected by each participant college.

Overall, the review of the QEP by the on-site SACSCOC team was extremely positive. No formal recommendations for modifying the QEP were provided; however, the committee did note that the scale of the plan appeared to be ambitious. The committee also found that the design of the assessment plan was suitable for the academic focus (global learning) of the project but that further work was likely needed to properly assess the global engagement focus of the QEP.

The timeline of the project included the completion of a number of planning activities in academic year 2015-16 to prepare for launching the QEP in Fall 2016. In Fall 2015 the Office of Academic Affairs distributed a call for faculty members to apply for the position of QEP Director but to date no one has been selected to lead this effort. Thus, no additional planning activities have been completed.

Recommendation

UNO should reduce the scale of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to ensure effective implementation in Fall 2016.

This recommendation is primarily supported by three findings: 1) a lack of faculty leadership in place at this time to lead the QEP effort, 2) the notation by the SACSCOC on-site committee related to the large scale of the project, and 3) the potential that the budget outlined in the QEP Proposal may not be realistic given the financial constraints of the budget for next fiscal year. It is recommended that the scale of the project be reduced in such a way that the project still serves as a transformative effort for the campus. An example of a way in which the scale could possibly be reduced is focusing QEP efforts exclusively on the general education coursework component of the undergraduate curriculum. This modification would reduce the number of students and

faculty participating in the QEP, yet still affect the curriculum of all undergraduate programs offered at UNO. If the project were focused exclusively on the general education component of the curriculum, lead responsibility for QEP implementation could be assigned to the General Education Committee, a structure that is already in place. Although the membership of the committee may need to be adjusted, this action would result in a more efficient use of faculty resources.

Supporting Documents

[Bringing the World to UNO: Quality Enhancement Plan Proposal](#)
[SACSCOC Onsite Review Team Report](#)

Recommendation 10: Budget Process

Current Status

Interviews and a review of records indicate that no consistent mechanism for the development and implementation of the University budget is in place, nor has a transparent process existed for several years. In particular, no documentation is in place to ensure that budget planning occurs with appropriate input from the University community. Due to recurring budget reductions resulting from declining enrollment and decreased state funding, the budget has been compiled through the actions of Business Affairs and the Office of the President. While the process might be construed to be practical during times when there is no new revenue, the practice lacks transparency and has created mistrust within the University community.

Since Fiscal Year 2011, UNO's Operating Budget has decreased approximately \$21 million, a 20% decrease during the five year period, with even more reductions currently pending in Fiscal Year 2016. Management has had to significantly reduce expenditures across the board to maintain a balanced budget. Salaries and Related Benefits, which currently account for approximately 65% of UNO's Operating Budget, have contributed significantly to the budget reductions through academic restructuring, employee layoffs, and the use of privatized contracts. While the budget for salaries has decreased, employee benefits (health care and retirement) have increased preventing management from directing any resources towards salary increases since July 2007. These conditions have led to low employee morale and a misunderstanding within the University community as to how certain budget decisions are made.

A University Budget Committee (UBC), which included employees and student representation from across the University community, met throughout the 2014-15 year to review the budget process and develop an extensive set of recommendations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the budget process at UNO. UBC's charge included: (1) review and assess all potential action plans related to the institution's budget, (2) help provide clear communication and feedback to the University community regarding the budget actions being considered; and (3) encourage the University community to share ideas on how to cut costs, operate more efficiently, increase revenue and more effectively fulfill the University's urban research mission. On June 15, 2015 a final report was presented to the President with multiple recommendations, primarily focused on making the budget process more transparent. The President accepted a majority of the recommendations, including establishment of a standing University Budget Review Committee that would meet throughout the year.

Recommendation

The UNO administration must be more transparent in providing financial information to the University community to encourage teamwork and communication throughout the campus. UNO should continue the work of the University Budget Review Committee to ensure that the budget process is inclusive

and transparent. The Budget Process should be aligned with both UNO 2020 Strategic Plan and the Institutional Effectiveness process.

While budgetary authority rests with the President, a more inclusive and transparent process will help the University community understand how management budgets for the impact of declining enrollment and decreased state funding. The recommendations of UBC provide strategies to include the University community in the budgetary process and encourage participation in offering solutions on how management can best direct its resources to meet budgetary challenges.

Supporting Documents

[University Budget Committee Recommendations](#)
[UNO Initial Budget FY 2009-2016](#)

Recommendation 11: Comptroller

Current Status

Within higher education institutions a financial comptroller directs and manages the accounting functions of the university. This position generally directs, coordinates, and oversees the institution's various financial, accounting, and treasury operations and is instrumental in establishing and monitoring the internal controls that safeguard University assets. This person coordinates financial audits, ensures compliance with state and federal regulations, and oversees and supervises the multi-fund accounting systems, including the operating fund, auxiliary funds, restricted funds, loan funds, and various plant funds.

Comptrollers report to Chief Financial Officers or Vice Presidents of Business Affairs at every institution within the University of Louisiana System, except for the University of New Orleans. Similar to other areas of the University, the Office of Business Affairs has felt the impact of UNO's 20% budget reduction over the past five years and has had to reduce its workforce. While various individuals within Business Affairs have assumed certain duties inherent to the comptroller position, there is no Comptroller within the current organization structure of Business Affairs.

Besides the financial complexities associated with managing University operations that exceeded \$180 million in expenses in Fiscal Year 2015, UNO also has two unique support organizations possessing assets that essentially equal assets of the University. Operations of these support organizations result in significant and complex financial transactions between UNO and the two support organizations relative to endowments and property management. A Comptroller would be a valuable advisor to both the Vice President of Business Affairs as well as the President in navigating the complex financial relationships presented by the operations of the support organizations.

Recommendation

UNO should establish a Comptroller position within the current organizational structure of Business Affairs, with the position reporting directly to the Vice President of Business Affairs.

In creating this function and identifying applicable funding, UNO could work with other universities in the University of Louisiana System in establishing the comptroller job description, qualifications, and salary consideration.

Supporting Documents

N/A

Recommendation 12: Economic Impact

Current Status

In 2008, prior to the University of New Orleans' 2011 transition into the University of Louisiana System, a System-wide Economic and Community Impact Study was released by the System benchmarking the economic impact of the eight universities in the System. In summary, the study provided that “institutions of higher learning have a direct impact on the economic success of a state and region, and there is a direct correlation between higher education and the positive outcomes on quality of life measures.”

This study of the economic and community impact of the eight universities in the System identified that investments in higher education have a ripple effect on the economic vitality of the entire state and the quality of life of its citizens. Universities provide jobs, train future workforces, incubate businesses, create and bolster new industries, enrich the lives of residents through the arts and humanities, and sustain the financial stability of communities where they are located.

The University of Louisiana System Economic and Community Impact Study focused on the impact of four components: (1) spending, (2) teaching (3) research and service, and (4) quality of life. Information and data included in the report addressed the quantitative and qualitative economic and community impact of each component. Louisiana State University, Tulane University, and Loyola University have conducted similar economic impact studies since the release of the University of Louisiana System report in 2008, but no current report exists addressing the impact of the region served by UNO. The University employs over 1,000 personnel while the 30-acre UNO Research and Technology Foundation houses over 2,000 tenants. Conducting an economic impact study will give UNO and the State of Louisiana valuable information to better understand the impact of UNO and the UNO Research and Technology Foundation on the local and regional community.

Recommendation

UNO and the UNO Research and Technology Foundation should partner to conduct an economic impact study of the region served by UNO using resources within UNO's Division of Business and Economic Research.

An economic impact study would reflect the direct, indirect, and induced effects of UNO on the local and regional community and could become a powerful tool to build stakeholder support for the University.

Supporting Documents

[University of Louisiana 2008 Economic Impact Study](#)

Recommendation 13: Lakefront Arena, Research Centers and Institutes

Current Status

In Fiscal Year 2009 UNO was appropriated \$74 million of State Funds, which was 59% of the total Operating Budget, the unrestricted funds of the University. In Fiscal Year 2009 41% of the Operating Budget was funded with Self-Generated Funds derived from tuition and fees. In Fiscal Year 2016 UNO is funded by 69% of Self-Generated Funds and 31% of State Funds. As the state funding formula evolved over this seven year period and the state contribution decreased, UNO's Operating Budget decreased by over \$23.4 million. State Funds are derived from the Board of Regents student funding formula that allocates State Funds to the University based on a funding model that places values on components such as class size, the level of courses taught, and credit hours earned by students. The factors include instructional cost plus operations and maintenance of the campus.

The UNO Lakefront Arena is an 8,933 seat multipurpose facility, which can accommodate a wide variety of events. Operations of the UNO Lakefront Arena are accounted for within the unrestricted funds of the UNO Operating Budget. In Fiscal Year 2015 financial information provided by management of the UNO Lakefront Arena reflects that expenditures exceeded revenues by \$759,839 for the period. Since operations of the arena are included within the Operating Budget, UNO used funds derived from the student formula as well as student tuition and fees to cover this operating loss.

Similarly Centers and Institutes within the University have been created for special purposes within various colleges. Many of these institutes have no visible funding sources and are included in the unrestricted funds of the UNO Operating Budget. Similar to the UNO Lakefront Arena, when funding sources are not sufficient to cover the cost of operations, UNO must use Operating Budget dollars generated by the student formula as well as tuition and fees to cover these operations. With the \$23 million Operating Budget decrease since 2009, UNO is challenged to fund these operations with the dollars generated.

Recommendation

The UNO Lakefront Arena as well as Research Centers and Institutes should develop financial plans to become sustainable entities with self-generated revenues. In addition the UNO Lakefront Arena should be included in the Auxiliary Fund accounting rather than being included in the Unrestricted Funds of the Operating Budget.

Auxiliary Funds are reported outside of the Operating Budget and include student service operations such as student housing, food services, bookstores, etc. Charges are established to cover the cost of services provided so that the Operating Budget is not required to use State Funding sources and tuition/fees for such services. Consideration

should be given to reporting the UNO Lakefront Arena as an auxiliary operation, with charges covering costs of operations. Similarly, Research Centers and Institutes that are funded with State Funds and/or tuition and fees should seek external sources of funding.

Supporting Documents

[UNO Initial Budget FY 2009 – FY 2016](#)

Recommendation 14: Support Organizations

The University of New Orleans (UNO) Executive Leadership Team must become proactive in understanding and guiding the operations of its two significantly-complex support organizations. The University of New Orleans Foundation (UNOF), a traditional support organization, focuses on fund raising and development activities. The activities of the University of New Orleans Research and Technology Foundation (UNOR&T) primarily relate to real estate and building development, construction, financing and debt service, management services, investment and endowment management.

These two support organizations operate under affiliation agreements approved by the University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors. Jointly these support organizations manage assets totaling approximately \$200 million (book value) as of December 31, 2014. For comparison, the University of New Orleans manages assets totaling approximately \$300 million (book value) as of June 30, 2015.

While certain members of the UNO Executive Leadership Team serve as ex-officio members of each support organization's Board of Directors, we learned during our review that there was a general lack of understanding within the UNO Executive Leadership Team relative to the business practices of these support organizations. Management of UNO needs to catalog and understand the following practices of the support organizations: (1) sources of receipts, including those paid to the support organizations by or through UNO, (2) disbursements, including amounts paid by the support organizations on behalf of UNO, and (3) all contractual agreements between UNO and the support organizations.

Recommendation

The University Executive Leadership team must become proactive in the operations of the University of New Orleans Foundation and University of New Orleans Research and Technology Foundation and should welcome the leadership of these two organizations into the UNO Executive Leadership Team.

As part of this review, UNOR&T offered the following suggestions to foster the partnerships with UNO.

UNO should improve awareness of UNO's vision and stated initiatives among University administrators and faculty representatives to ensure buy-in, facilitate project completion and avoid miscommunications.

UNO should track collaborations with industry and governmental entities located in the Research Park and the economic value resulting from those partnerships. Metrics may include the quantity and/or value of the following:

- a. Sponsored projects awarded (research & service contracts)

- b. Endowed Eminent Scholars (Chairs, Professorships and Scholarships)
- c. Adjunct teaching appointments, guest lecturers, entrepreneurs-in-residence
- d. Student internships, part-time employment, graduate assistantships
- e. Scholarships offered/awarded
- f. Post-graduation employment offers; average salaries
- g. Alumni employed by Research Park tenants
- h. Enrollment of Research Park employees in academic programs
- i. UNO attendance at Park events
- j. Economic impact on the region

UNO should fully integrate into its communications plan the opportunities available for researchers and students through Research Park collaborations. Specifically, UNO should consider the following actions:

- a. Ensure prospective and current students are informed of the availability of experiential learning and employment opportunities in a wide range of industries present in the Research Park.
- b. Directly market graduate, certificate and short-courses to the more than 2000 tenant employees.
- c. Develop flexible/customized course offerings to meet the needs of unique tenant populations.
- d. Appoint more Research Park tenant leaders as entrepreneurs-in-residence to advise students and start-up and emerging companies.
- e. Encourage faculty participation in networking opportunities through promotion of Research Park activities.

UNO should establish an advisory committee to evaluate prospective tenants seeking occupancy in the Research Park and to recommend companies and governmental agencies for approval as a Research Park member.

UNO should evaluate potential opportunities for further collaboration with the UNOR&T to fully leverage the capabilities of UNOR&T in performing beneficial functions for UNO.

Supporting Documents:

[UNO Foundation Audited Financial Statement](#)

[UNO Research & Technology Audited Financial Statement](#)

Recommendation 15: Urban Mission

Current Status

The current mission statement of the University of New Orleans clearly states that the campus is an urban research university. UNO serves a unique role within the state as it is the only university in the state with an urban mission. The University of New Orleans was recently reaffirmed as a Doctoral University with Higher Research Activity (R2) by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. UNO is one of two universities in Louisiana with this designation, the other being the University of Louisiana – Lafayette.

In 2014, an initiative was developed by the Office of Academic Affairs to identify the total number of urban focused initiatives in place campus wide. Due to the resignation of the staff member assigned to this task, the initiative was not completed.

Recommendation

UNO should maintain and enhance its mission as an urban-focused, research university in order to meet the needs of the greater New Orleans area and the state of Louisiana.

The Office of Academic Affairs should continue the efforts to identify and analyze the urban-focused initiatives currently in place campus wide. This activity should involve a focus on academic, research and service programs and activities. Completion of this activity should assist the campus in: 1) determining the extent to which the campus currently focuses on urban needs, 2) assisting the campus in identifying specific features that define an urban mission, and 3) identifying potential areas of growth for urban focused academic, research or service initiatives.

Efforts should also be taken to market the unique urban focus of the University of New Orleans within the greater New Orleans area and the state of Louisiana. It is critical that the University strengthen existing partnerships and develop new alliances with both public and private community organizations to ensure the University is meeting the economic, cultural, and educational needs of the greater New Orleans community. Opportunities to partner with other urban focused public Universities in the region and country should also be explored.

Supporting Documents:

[UNO Mission Statement](#)

[Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education](#)

Statement of Appreciation

The Review Team would like to extend its appreciation to the many faculty, staff, students and other parties who participated in interviews to support the development of this document. Individuals were generous with their time and in many cases, provided additional documents to those included in the text to support their recommendations and input. The team members were impressed with the sincerity of the individuals interviewed and the high level of their dedication to the University.

Comprehensive List of Supporting Documents

[Bringing the World to UNO QEP Proposal](#)

[Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education](#)

[Description of Comprehensive Standard 3.7.5](#)

[Description of Core Requirement 2.5](#)

[External Consultant Report on Distance/Non-Credit Learning](#)

[Faculty Governance Committee Report](#)

[Faculty Workload Policy \(AP-AA-22.2\)](#)

[Institutional Effectiveness Webpage](#)

[Internal Audit 2015 – Faculty Workload](#)

[Program Review Guidelines Draft](#)

[Proposal to ULS Board of Supervisors](#)

[SACSCOC Onsite Review Team Report](#)

[SACSCOC Reaffirmation Letter](#)

[Sample Curriculum](#)

[Sample Curriculum Observations](#)

[Sample Faculty Workload Reporting Template](#)

[Sample 4 Year Plan](#)

[Sample List of Courses Taught](#)

[Sample Student Learning Outcomes Map](#)

[University Budget Committee Recommendations](#)

[University of Louisiana 2008 Economic Impact Study](#)

[University Organization Chart](#)

[UNO Daily Crime Log](#)

[UNO Crime Statistics – Three Year Period](#)

[UNO Foundation Audited Financial Statement](#)

[UNO Initial Budget FY 2009-2016](#)

[UNO Mission Statement](#)

[UNO Research & Technology Foundation Audited Financial Statement](#)

[UNO Strategic Plan](#)

Appendix A

Background Summary of Review Team Members

Randy Moffett is President Emeritus of Southeastern Louisiana University and served as President of the University of Louisiana System from 2008 until his retirement in September 2012. Dr. Moffett currently serves as Interim President at the University of New Orleans. Dr. Moffett holds a doctorate in educational administration from Louisiana State University and received an honorary doctorate from the Ibero-American Council for Excellence in Education in 2007. He has also completed studies at the Institute for Educational Management at Harvard.

Robbie Robinson is a Certified Public Accountant and the former Vice President of Business and Finance for the University of Louisiana System, having retired in 2015. Prior to November 2010, he served four years as the Director of Internal and External Audits for the University of Louisiana System. Formerly he was First Assistant Legislative Auditor with over 28 years of governmental auditing experience with the Louisiana Legislative Auditor's Office, plus 5 years of governmental accounting, budgeting, and financial experience with the Department of Health and Hospitals and Teachers Retirement System of Louisiana. He is a graduate of Louisiana State University.

William Sharpton served as a long-term faculty member and administrator at the University of New Orleans prior to his retirement in July 2015. Dr. Sharpton holds a doctorate in special education from Georgia State University and taught in the Department of Special Education and Habilitative Services in the College of Education and Human Development. He served as an Associate Dean in that college prior to assuming the position of Associate Provost in the Office of Academic Affairs. His most recent appointment was as Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Appendix B

List of Individuals Participating in Interviews

Name	Position/Title/Affiliation
Amsberryaugier, Laura	Interim Dean & Librarian, Earl Long Library
Athey, Amanda	Director, Graduate School
Bergez, Sarah	Director, Marketing
Bevolo, Emily	Student Leader/Alpha Xi Delta Sorority, Major - Management
Bourgeois, Edit	Interim Associate Dean, College of Engineering & Professor of Electrical Engineering
Bourgeois, Elizabeth	Director, Internal Audit
Boykin, Celyn	Director, Career Services
Brauninger, Mike	Director, Student Housing
Bush, Jeffrey	Director, Development
Butler, Rykeda	Student Leader/First Generation College Student, Major – Biology
Byrne, Eileen	CEO, UNO Research & Technology Foundation
Cassell, Brett	UNO Bursar
Chapuis, Nora	Director, Student Support Services
Cot, Alea	Assistant Provost, International Education
Cunningham, Lacey	Director, Service Learning
Dandridge, Susan	Director, Admissions
Davis, Joan Y.	Chancellor, Delgado Community College
Davis, Warren	Associate Vice President, Facilities Services
Dupree, David	Chief Information Officer
Eason, Bobby	UNO Founders' Club
Flynn-Wilson, Linda	Chair & Professor, Special Education & Habilitative Services
Fos, Peter	President, University of New Orleans
Gaeta, Devin	Student Leader/ Student Activities Council, Theta Xi, Unity, Major – Sociology
Gonzalez, Daniel	Director, Online & Non-credit Instruction
Graves, Kevin	Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Green, Amanda	Staff Council President
Gregorio, Anthony	Executive Director, University Advancement
Guillory, William A.	Staff Council Recording Secretary

Harrington, Thomas	Chief, UNO Police
Huelsoff, Michael	Chair & Associate Professor, Political Science
Johnson, Steven	Dean, College of Sciences
Kapowski, Lenny	State Government Liaison
Kemker, Brett	Vice President, Student Affairs
Kenett-Hensel, Pamela	Chair & Professor, Management & Marketing
Kincaid, Rachel	Vice President, External Affairs, UL System
King, Amy	Director, Advocacy & Accountability
Lambour, David	Staff Council Vice President
Lapeyrolerie, Rene	Former UL System Board Member
Lassen, Gregg	Vice President, Business Affairs
Linn, C. Patrick	Director, Auxiliary Services
Lockridge, Ann	Director, Student Financial Aid
Lunn, Carol	Associate Director, Research & Sponsored Programs
Macari, Emir	Dean, College of Engineering and Interim Director, Research & Sponsored Programs
Maestri, Ron	Baseball Coach (Retired)
McDonald, Brian	Staff Council Corresponding Secretary
McLin, Kevin	Vice President, Marketing, Communications & Public Relations
McSeveney, Dennis	UNO Founders' Club
Meyer, Pamela	Director, Alumni Affairs
Mokhiber, James	Faculty Senate/Associate Professor of History
Montet, Ranzy	Assistant Vice President, Human Resources
Moore, Matthew	Interim Provost, Registrar, Enrollment Services & Institutional Research
Morel, Derek	Director, Athletics
Neupane, Samip	Student Leader/Nepalese Student Association, Soccer, Major – Computer Science
Nicklow, John	Provost & Vice President, Academic Affairs
Norris, Adam	Director, Public Relations/University Spokesperson

Payne, Dinah	Faculty Senate/Professor of Management & Marketing
Pere, Adrian	Director, Counseling
Perez, Marco	General Manager, Keifer UNO Lakefront Arena
Phelps, Connie	Faculty Council/Chair, Services & Librarian, Library
Rick, Steven	Faculty Senate/Research Professor of Chemistry
Roussev, Vassil	Faculty Senate Senate/Professor of Computer Science
Sarwar, Abu Mustafa	Assistant Provost, University Honors
Scaramella, Laura	Chair & Professor, Psychology
Schilling, Paul	Chair & Professor, Mechanical Engineering
Schock, Peter	Faculty Senate/Chair & Professor, English
Solanky, Tumulesh	Chair & Professor, Mathematics
Solomon, Gary	UNO Foundation Board Member, UL System Board Member
Soublet, Tiffany	Assistant Vice President, Budget & Finance/Staff Council Treasurer
Speaker, Richard	Faculty Senate/Interim Chair & Associate Professor, Curriculum & Instruction
Steele,Ladajah	Student Leader/Residential Life/UNO Ambassadors, Major – Human Performance and Health Promotion
Taylor, Charles	Chair & Professor, Music
Torres, Antonio	Student Leader/Progressive Black Student Union/Student Government Association, Major – Business Administration
Trumbach, Cherie	Faculty Senate President/Associate Professor, Management & Marketing
Whitley, Norman	Interim Associate Provost
Williams, John	Dean, College of Business Administration
Williams, Kim	Chair & Associate Professor, Hotel, Restaurant & Tourism
Woodley, Sandra	President, University of Louisiana System