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THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW PROCESS

The three member team comprised of Dr. Gary Reichard, Dr. Rodney Smith and Mr. Robert Lovitt was assembled in early August and Ms. Jodi Mauroner and Dr. Steve Landry of the University of Louisiana System were assigned to assist them in the institutional review (see Appendix 2 for biographies). On August 24, the full team held an initial conference call with President Randy Moffett to receive his perspective concerning the status of the University vis-a-vis the UL System and the context for the review as well as other issues that might warrant special attention from the review team.

Following this initial interview, the team opted to conduct telephone interviews with several key individuals prior to the campus visit. These included: two members of the Board of Supervisors (Finance Chair Andre Coudrain and David Guidry, both of whom are members of the Presidential Search Committee); Interim Chancellor Joe King; Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Louis Paradise; Vice Chancellor for Financial Services Linda Robison; Interim Dean of Student Affairs Pam Rault; Athletic Director Amy Champion; University Senate Chair Neal Maroney; Staff Council President Mike Adler; SGA President John Mineo; UNO Foundation CEO Patrick Gibbs; UNO Alumni Association President Brian Glorioso; UNO Foundation members and members of the Presidential Search Committee Gary Solomon and Susan Hess; and LSU System’s Vice President for Academic Affairs Carolyn Hargrave and Vice President of Student and Academic Support Mike Gargano.

Further, a special dedicated webpage was established to provide team members with historical data on the institution including the organizational structure, financial status, academics, student enrollment and persistence, faculty and staff, athletics, and other relevant information.

In addition, Dr. Steve Landry worked with members of the UNO leadership to solicit input from faculty, staff and students through the ULS Institutional Review SWOT Analysis. In response to this online survey over 2,000 participants provided their thoughts on the strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities for the university. The information gleaned from the SWOT analysis helped further highlight issues to be addressed during the campus visit. (See Appendix 3 for a copy of the questionnaire.)

The core of the review exercise, however, was the campus visit conducted by the full team and Ms. Mauroner from Monday, September 26 through Thursday, September 29, 2011. The schedule included a campus tour, interviews with senior administrators and meetings with various groups of faculty, staff, students, alumni, the business community and legislators from
the local delegation. An open forum for members of the campus and the external community was held at the end of the visit on Thursday, September 29. The full schedule for the campus visit, as well as a list of all those with whom the team spoke, may be found in Appendix 1.

Prior to departing from New Orleans, the team outlined the organization of this report and identified the recommendations that appear in these pages (summarized on page 50). The draft was written and revised by all members of the team, and the conclusions and recommendations represent the consensus of the team.
SECTION 1: CONTEXT FOR THE REVIEW AND OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

Although full institutional reviews have become standard procedure for the UL System when one of its institutions is about to conduct a presidential search, the circumstances of this institutional review of the University of New Orleans (UNO) are unique. Since the time of its founding in 1958, UNO has been a constituent part of the Louisiana State University (LSU) System. In spring 2011, following the unsuccessful introduction of legislation to merge UNO with Southern University of New Orleans (SUNO) and move the newly created institution to the University of Louisiana System, the bill (SB 266) was subsequently amended to provide for the transfer of UNO from the LSU System to the UL System. Preparations for that transfer have been ongoing since early summer 2011 and it will become final with the anticipated SACS approval of the change in December 2011. Because UNO has not been part of the UL System, the System office is not as familiar with the issues facing the campus as is normally the case; therefore, this institutional review is an especially important part of the process of selecting UNO’s next leader.

As has been true for the past several years, this review is occurring in a very challenging political and economic environment for higher education in Louisiana—as well as nationally. Across the nation and in Louisiana, state funding for colleges and universities has been steadily declining. In Louisiana, these forces have been accentuated by recurrent natural disasters, starting with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 and their lingering after-effects and compounded by the Deepwater oil spill in 2010. Although the full budget implications of these massive dislocations are still unfolding for Louisiana, undoubtedly the state’s higher education institutions will continue to experience severe financial pressures into the foreseeable future, creating strong pressures to increase student fees and tuition.

The administration of Governor Bobby Jindal, as well as state legislators, has been sharply focused on higher education issues for the past few years. In February 2010, the Postsecondary Education Review Commission (also known as the Tucker Commission) issued an influential report including recommendations for tying higher education funding to performance indicators such as improved student retention and completion rates, enhancement of inter-institutional cooperation, strengthening of the community college system with improved articulation and transfer between two- and four-year institutions, and regular governing board review of academic programs for quality and cost-effectiveness. In July 2010, many of the commission’s recommendations were enacted in the Louisiana Granting Resources and Autonomy for Diplomas Act (LA GRAD Act), which offers the state’s colleges and universities autonomy to raise tuition incrementally over the next few years if they enter into (and deliver on) multi-year agreements with the state to increase program graduation and retention rates, increase completers at all levels, eliminate programs with low completion rates that are not aligned with economic development, ramp up online (distance) education programs, and address a number of other
goals first proposed by the commission and later contained in the LA GRAD Act. UNO, like all other senior institutions in Louisiana, submitted its yearly targets and six year goals to the Board of Regents for approval in August 2010.

In the context of the state’s focus on increased efficiencies in higher education, the University of Louisiana System and its current eight constituent institutions have been engaged in almost continuous planning during the past two years. This “planning-mode” is likely to continue during the current academic year and beyond. All UL System institutions face the necessity of further reducing expenditures in the face of declining resources at the same time they make progress toward the goals expected of them under the LA GRAD Act. For UNO, which suffered greater physical and enrollment disruption as a result of Hurricane Katrina than any of the current member institutions of the UL System, these budgetary and operational challenges will be greatly magnified.

A considerable degree of administrative flux at UNO during the past decade has also intensified the pressures within and upon the institution, as two successive chancellors have had their tenures cut short. In the most recent instance, when Chancellor Timothy Ryan was removed from office in September 2010, LSU sent two senior administrators to the UNO campus to oversee day-to-day operations, before finally deciding in February 2011 to designate then-Provost Joe King as Interim Chancellor. The tensions surrounding the removals of two chancellors and the interregnum of external leadership of the campus exacerbated longstanding resentments on the part of UNO faculty and staff that their institution lacked basic rights of self-determination and that the university’s fate was subject to the whims of a distant administration that may not have had its best interests at heart.

An inevitable consequence of the flux at the top of the university has been instability throughout most of UNO’s upper administration. The review team found a pervasive concern – indeed, angst – throughout the institution that “stability” is desperately needed under a new president. There has also been a highly problematic tendency at UNO, particularly in the most recent years, for decisions to be made without adequate consultation and for those decisions not to be well communicated within the university—even to those most directly and immediately affected. Traditional forms of shared governance do not seem to exist at all. The new president will have to take a serious and critical look at UNO’s administrative and organizational structures, consult throughout the university about the matter, and make immediate decisions about how to improve decision-making and communication processes within the university.

Demographic changes in New Orleans present a major challenge to UNO’s recovery—particularly in terms of enrollment. Prior to Hurricane Katrina, the university had an enrollment of 17,142 (13,075 undergraduate and 4,067 graduate); by the following fall (2006), that figure had shrunk to 11,747 (9,156 undergraduate and 2,591 graduate). Perhaps more alarming than the
initial drop, is the slide that has continued since that catastrophic disruption. Once having aspired to be a university of more than 20,000 students, UNO has experienced slow but steady enrollment decline since 2006. In Fall 2011, enrollment has fallen below 11,000 for the first time since 1969: 8,263 undergraduates and 2,640 graduates, for a total of 10,903. Moreover, UNO was one of only two New Orleans-area four-year institutions to decline in enrollment from 2010 to 2011, presenting the institution’s new leadership with a very significant challenge.¹ Part of UNO’s problem seems to be that neighboring institutions—in particular, Southeastern Louisiana University—have competed successfully for students on the Northshore, which once was an important source of UNO enrollment. Additionally, census data reveal that there are approximately 60,000 fewer school-age children in New Orleans than there were ten years ago.² A severe looming problem for UNO, as for many of the UL System institutions, is that when stricter admissions standards are implemented in Fall 2012, the pool of high school graduates eligible for direct admission is expected to shrink significantly. As this report discusses, turning this situation around will require major improvements in UNO’s marketing and student recruitment practices. Without such a turnaround, given the political and economic realities already described, UNO will continue to face very difficult decisions about its optimum size and program mix.

During these years of declining enrollment, UNO has also experienced a not-quite-commensurate reduction in the number of faculty, from 549 full-time faculty in 2005 to 418 in 2010 (nearly a 24 percent decrease). Most of the decrease has been in the ranks of non-tenure-track faculty, whose numbers have declined by 18 percent over the past three years, while the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty has remained almost steady (228 in 2010-2011, compared to 229 in 2008-2009). This erosion in overall numbers, however—coupled with anecdotal reports to the review team that many “movable” research-oriented faculty members have left UNO in recent years—calls into question the viability of a central goal in UNO’s current Strategic Plan: to become “an urban research university with Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Four-Year 1 status.”³ As part of the strategic planning that the university should undertake under a new president, it should examine the impact on budget and faculty workload of striving to achieve such status, and decide whether this remains a viable near-term goal.


³ The University of New Orleans Strategic Plan, 2007-2010: 4.
Faculty, administration, staff, and students at UNO all look forward with enthusiasm to the pending transition into the UL System. This optimism is fueled by hope for greater autonomy, which is likely to be realized, and for improved funding, which is not likely. In fact, UNO—like other institutions in the UL System—will probably experience continuing downward budget pressures and budget reductions going forward. Since the only possible redress lies in increased student tuition and fees, UNO’s situation could be further compromised by its continuing decline in enrollment. It will be imperative for UNO, under new leadership, to find a way to reverse the slow downward enrollment spiral at the undergraduate level, as well as to improve its troublesomely low student persistence and completion rates, if it is to stabilize and begin to grow within the UL System.

A more positive context for UNO’s future is the ongoing revitalization of the Greater New Orleans area. Although Katrina left the city and its suburbs with a substantially smaller population base than before the storm and massive flooding, it is clear that the region is on the economic rebound, with unemployment rates significantly lower than the national average and impressive performance in terms of economic growth and development. In this period of regional revitalization, the local business community, led by the Greater New Orleans Regional Economic Alliance, represents a potentially strong partner and source of support for UNO under a new president. Indeed, UNO can and should link its own revitalization with that of the surrounding city and region; a new president who takes this as an uppermost priority can play a major role in achieving this goal.

As discussed in this report, another issue that will confront new leadership at UNO is the future of intercollegiate athletics at the institution. At the time of this writing, the university has asked the NCAA to allow it to move, by July 2012, from Division I to Division II status, and planning with respect to scholarships has occurred within that context. In recognition of the role a new president must play in reaching a decision on this question, however, the university has recently suspended any movement toward Division II. There are reasonable arguments on both sides of this issue. Since the participation requirements for student-athletes depend upon the division in which the university will be competing, deciding this matter will need to be a top priority for the new president.

Lest the overall tenor of this institutional review be misunderstood, it should be emphasized at the outset that, despite the catastrophic disruptions in UNO’s development resulting from Hurricane Katrina and the major challenges the institution still faces in terms of rebuilding its

---

4 2010 U.S. Census Bureau figures reflect a 29 percent decline in the city’s population since Hurricane Katrina hit—from an estimated 455,000 just before the flooding in August 2005 to 343,839 in 2010. Pilkington, “New Orleans Population Falls 30 % in 10 Years.”
enrollment (and its vision), this is a moment of tremendous opportunity for the institution and for a new president. The surrounding community is eager to embrace UNO as a full partner—and a stimulus—for the revitalization that is already underway in the region. Nearly all of those with whom members of this review team spoke seek a new president who will lead and implement a full re-engagement of the university with the city and surrounding community. There is a real sense throughout the university community and among its external supporters that this presidential search represents a potentially defining moment in the life of the institution—and perhaps the life of the city. The members of this review team are honored to have had a small part in helping to ensure that the university makes the most of this great opportunity and hope that the recommendations offered in this report will help to bring about a bright future for UNO in the University of Louisiana System.
SECTION 2: ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

The University of New Orleans, originally the Louisiana State University in New Orleans (LSUNO), experienced phenomenal enrollment growth for several decades until 2005 when the area was devastated by Hurricane Katrina. Based on several earlier organizational charts (2005, 2006, 2007, 2009 and 2011), along with a “UNO Restructuring Plan” letter of memorandum dated August 12, 2009 from Chancellor Timothy P. Ryan, it appears to the review team that the administrative organizational structure and the reporting relations between the university and the LSU System never adapted to the institution’s status as an autonomous branch campus. Instead, the administrative organizational structure that was originally designed for a commuter branch campus never seemed to catch up to the rapid growth in enrollment that it had experienced since inception. The administration attempted to balance itself while remaining under the supervision of the LSU System. In addition, senior administrators were appointed from within the institution and UNO has experienced even more “flux” in recent years, as demonstrated in the Chancellor’s August 2009 memo, which announced among other changes:

- “The position of Vice Chancellor for Advancement was eliminated.
- The entire Office of Development will be moved to the UNO Foundation.
- The Office of Alumni Affairs has been shifted to the Vice Chancellor of Government and Community Affairs.
- Metropolitan College has been completely eliminated as a unit within UNO. The Dean’s position has also been eliminated.
- Testing Services have been consolidated under … our Registrar.
- The position of Vice Chancellor for Technology and Economic Development has been eliminated.
- The Office of Academic Affairs has been streamlined by having the Director of Admissions, the Registrar, and the Director of Financial Aid report directly to the Provost.
- The Office of Student Affairs has been streamlined and organized around student support, student success, and student advocacy … and is now the home of the initiatives that come out of Student Persistence and Recovery Initiatives (SPRI).”

In streamlining Marketing, Public Relations, Creative Services, the radio station and Institutional Research and Data Management, the Chancellor described as his rationale “bringing them closer to me” and “in keeping with the corporate model.”
These significant structural changes at the senior level appear to have been in response to continued cuts in state appropriations and what was viewed by UNO as lack of support from the LSU System Office, as well as reflecting the Chancellor’s own corporate approach to managing the institution. Even though these changes might have been viewed as necessary at the time, it should be noted that for both immediate- and long-term higher education institutional planning and effectiveness, they resulted in minimal focus on such areas as institutional fund-raising, efficient and effective academic program and services coordination, student development (including residential) and student support services components, all of which are necessary for institutional growth and development. This same inadequacy of structure is reflected in the significantly under-developed athletic program.

In contrast to other extension and/or branch University campuses established to meet specific regional higher education needs, UNO never became autonomous. Further compounding the ability of this campus to grow and stabilize was the fact that for many years its senior leadership was promoted from within, causing the university to stagnate due to the lack of infusion of modern managerial and leadership principles. Furthermore, the administrative structure grew disproportionately due to efforts to navigate the somewhat restrictive approval process for hiring and academic program development as exercised by the LSU System administrative leadership, compounded by rapid uncontrolled growth in student enrollment. To quote the former Associate Provost (1998 to 2008) and coordinator of UNO’s SACS-COC reaffirmation efforts in 2005:

“…when LSUNO in the mid-1960s argued that there was a need for public, graduate education in New Orleans, LSU offered to send its graduate faculty to New Orleans to teach graduate courses…….[In 2011] UNO is still met with extensive delays in getting programs approved. Our proposed Ph.D. in Materials and Nano Science was first sent to the LSU System Office approximately 10 years ago. We are convinced that our Advanced Materials Research Institute is a strong group qualified to offer the Ph.D. Many of its faculty are Chemists and UNO’s Chemistry Department was our first department to offer the Ph.D. and has been doing so since the 1960s.”

Thus, over the years, UNO has resorted to internal promotions and the creation of a top heavy administrative structure in an effort to meet the growing needs of a heavily enrolled “branch campus,” to provide salary increases for long serving managerial staff, and to create an avenue to attract prospective employees.

Because the university has been without permanent leadership for the past year combined with the fact that faculty and staff positions have been left vacant, many mid-management leaders have had to, in effect, fend for themselves. Without the benefit of frequent institutional communication regarding the status of the university, revised policies and/or changes in
administrative procedures, staff members have reported receiving information through the “grapevine,” while students have complained that “an occasional email message from the administration is not enough.”

The administration and day-to-day management of the university needs to be stabilized.

**Recommendation:** UNO should initiate a participatory process both campus-wide and with the community in re-affirming the purpose and vision for the future of the institution which should be widely disseminated and broadly and continuously communicated.

## Institutional Planning and Development

What can be described as “administrative flux” has not been conducive to institutional strategic or long-range planning with ensuing institution-wide implementation. The university reportedly engaged in extensive institutional planning under the leadership of Chancellor Ryan immediately following 2005, subsequently producing the *University of New Orleans Strategic Plan 2007-2010*. It is the understanding of the review team, however, that this plan was never fully vetted by campus constituents and approved by the powers that be. Despite this, portions of the plan were and still are being implemented.

The 2008-2011 Strategic Planning Committee first met on December 18, 2008, and received the following charge from the Chancellor:

> “The 2008-2011 Strategic Planning Committee is charged with updating the 2007-2010 University Strategic Plan. The Committee should prepare the 2009-2012 Plan. The Committee should analyze the entire 2007-2010 plan and recommend changes in the plan as appropriate. In particular, the Committee should focus on the proposed Formula for Higher Education Funding currently under development by the Louisiana Board of Regents, changes in the external environment that may change the focus of the 2007-2010 Plan, and the increased emphasis on student recruitment and retention.”

This mandate was given to the 12-member Committee (the Chancellor, Provost, University Counsel and Assistant to the Chancellor were also identified as ex-officio and non-voting members of the committee). It was reported to the review team that subcommittees were subsequently established to “define objectives, identify measurements, and craft action plans that

---

5 From the document “Charge to the 2009 Committee Membership” posted on the UNO Intranet/Strategic Planning.
were reasonable for a three-year period.” The plan was posted for public review and comment in July 2009. Subsequently, a likert-type survey questionnaire listing numbers of responses to the “Goals” was shared with the team as evidence of the campus having had an opportunity to review the strategic plan and provide input.

There were a total of 192 responses: 4 administrators, 14 alumni, 33 faculty, 42 graduate students, 19 staff, and 80 undergraduates. It is unknown if there were any open forums or if the draft plan was distributed to the entire campus community.

Examination of the documentation of the process indicates that several meetings were scheduled in 2009; however, minutes could only be located for the following dates: 12/18/08, 01/09/09, 01/22/09, 02/20/09, 04/03/09, 04/17/09, 05/01/09, 05/21/09, 05/29/09, and 06/12/09. There is no evidence that meetings were held at other times in 2009, 2010 or 2011.

However, within one week after the review team left the campus it was reported that the university had revised its strategic plan to reflect the 2011-2014 timeframe, and considered it to be finalized. This revised plan has since been posted on the university’s official website.

In a review of the above minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meetings several statements stand out:

- “The Committee agreed to morph the old strategic plan into a new plan using existing Key Performance Indicators. Resources will be identified as needed.” (12/18/08)
- “…the Committee will review the old plan, discard those components that cannot be done, modify and update the 2007-2010 plan into a new plan for 2009-2012. The Committee is responsible for the immediate planning to guide re-budgeting decisions next year. Subcommittees will recommend longer range planning that extends into 2012.” (01/09/09)
- “…said that several errors in UNO’s calculations and reporting have been corrected and should improve our formula by $11-12 million.” (01/22/09)
- “…there is a mismatch between the alignment of designated goal champions and administrators who are in charge.” (02/20/09)
- “…said that, following Katrina, he assigned specific department chairs to talk to the media and they became the “Go To” people when the media had questions.” (02/20/09)
• “There was a discussion about the pros and cons of performance reviews: Good reviews raise expectations for pay raises and bad reviews have no mechanism for corrections.” (02/20/09)

• “There seems to be disparate organizational reporting regarding several university units. Should they be rearranged and who should be the champions for the Strategic Plan?” (02/20/09)

• “The final document will include goals, objectives and measurables. The long version will be a separate implementation document.” (04/03/09)

• “Mr. _____ noted that one difference is the reporting line. At UNO there are different – not central – reporting units.” (04/17/09)

• “Fund raising was not addressed in the current Strategic Plan but a discussion addressed whether it should be included. … the committee agreed that it would lose its importance as a university focus if it were not part of the plan.” (04/17/09)

• “This initiative [Honors College] was not addressed last year. …it hinges almost entirely on outside support. He would like to remove it from the new plan but to continue to look for a benefactor.” (05/01/09)

• “Many UNO constituents want to help but are not sure of the University’s priorities.” (05/01/09)

• “…expressed concern that there is no voice on the Committee for fund raising and said that the committee must consider the impact of imposing measurables on staff who had no say into how reasonable the objectives might be.” (05/01/09)

• “Champions will be identified to be accountable for the success of the objectives. They will not necessarily be senior administrators. Champions will have an opportunity to review and comment before the Strategic Plan is finalized. This Committee will continue meeting on a regular basis to provide oversight and will be the reporting mechanism.” (05/21/09)

• “Dr. _____ explained that this “second strategic plan” is directly linked to the UNO budgeting process and has performance indicators. In the past this has never been tied to the University Strategic Plan but is a separate report that Financial Services submits. This should be associated with a realistic plan and the projected numbers on enrollment, retention, etc. should come from the new UNO Strategic Plan.” (05/29/09)
The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs agreed to serve as the Goal 2 Students Champion. Dr. ____ will designate responsibility to the directors in charge of enrollment, recruitment, and retention.” (06/12/09)

These comments suggest that the institution was engaged in what could easily be termed “reactive planning,” based on non-predictive but definite budget cuts. Unfortunately, this committee seemed to be in control of decision-making with responsibility for “plan implementation” and “budgetary planning” residing elsewhere. The highlighted comments from the 2009 minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meetings confirm the review team’s analysis concerning problems in the current organizational and administrative structure.

Furthermore, the appendices to the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan use baseline data from 2009-2010 and do not indicate actual projected numbers associated with any of the Key Performance Indicators. Nor do they include dates by which goals are to be achieved or action-steps completed, signifying attainment of objectives.

It should be noted that the organizational restructuring in the years immediately following Chancellor Ryan’s August 12, 2009 “restructuring” memorandum, left administrators, faculty and staff with considerably more uncertainty about who would be responsible for specific aspects of the institutional plan. Without the necessary stability in management and an institution-wide needs assessment based on economies-of-scale, implementing a strategic plan across multiple years in this manner will be difficult if not impossible. There will be far too many uncertainties associated with personnel, infrastructure and operational costs. Forward and backward linkages are unknown and unpredictable under the current situation. Therefore, implementation of what might be seen as an institutional academic agenda might not be feasible. There is an immediate need to conduct longitudinal studies on 1) faculty teaching hours, 2) faculty workloads, 3) student credit hours, and 4) faculty/student ratios. These should be completed by school/college, by department and by major at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Moreover, changed circumstances may well require revisiting some objectives originally developed in the 2007-2010 Strategic Plan. For example, the current strategic objective of achieving SREB Four-Year 1 status may need to be revisited.

Recommendation: UNO should re-examine the impact on budget and faculty workload of striving to achieve SREB Four Year-1 status as a part of revisiting the current University Strategic Plan.

The review team is also concerned about the timing of the most recent updating of the strategic plan. The new president needs to be able to lead a reconsideration of what has just been “finalized” in this time of continued administrative flux.
Recommendation: UNO should conduct a full institutional evaluation of current strategic planning goals, strategic initiatives, objectives, measurable outcomes, established completion dates and responsible units/divisions. These should be reviewed and coordinated with newly established priorities and include broad based campus participation throughout.

At the end of the process, the entire campus community needs to be in agreement with a broadly disseminated “institutional agenda.” This campus consensus on principles should be the basis for prioritization and budgeting of programs and services.

Recommendation: UNO should implement a campus-wide, criterion-based prioritization of all academic and non-academic programs and services, followed by re-budgeting in accordance with established priorities using master planning simulation projections.

These steps would allow UNO to establish and foster shared institutional ownership while implementing a system of integrated strategic planning that would incorporate the use of budgetary planning and key performance indicators in assessing continuous improvements based on unit level annual operational plans. This approach will assure plan implementation under managerial reinforcement at annual administrative retreats.

Strong capacity for institutional research and planning is necessary in order to maintain cohesive planning and implementation.

Recommendation: UNO should review and assure that it has a functional Institutional Research and Planning Office.

Shared governance must be the modus operandi for UNO to move forward under new leadership. Institution-wide committees and task forces should include adequate representation from faculty, staff and student organizations. The Institutional Research and Planning Office, therefore, should be the unit with responsibility for institutional data management, monitoring the implementation of the strategic plan, assessing all academic and non-academic units (using an institution-wide data-management and assessment system), and providing logistical support for respective faculty/staff committees charged with producing institutional plans in the areas of enrollment management; institutional technology; facilities management and maintenance; campus development (infrastructure); athletics program development and expansion; corporate/community partnerships; higher education partnership plans (including articulation and partnership agreements); and faculty and staff re-structuring and remuneration.
In the years immediately following transition to the UL System and under new leadership, UNO will need to establish parameters and procedures that guard against managerial uncertainties in the face of attrition.

**Recommendation:** UNO should establish standard operating procedures for all academic and non-academic units and these should be well coordinated with policies and procedures of the Board of Supervisors for the University of Louisiana System.
SECTION 3: FINANCE AND BUDGET

The State of Louisiana, along with most other states in the U.S., is facing serious financial problems, mandating budget cuts for all state agencies, including institutions of higher education. As a result, when the review team held its meetings and telephone conferences, a major topic of discussion was the financial structure of the university and how it has worked for the institution as it has dealt with budget cuts, budget planning, and hiring freezes. As noted in other sections of this report, communication from and with the senior administration is inconsistent, at best. These times of financial stress mandate more and better communication so that all managers of operating units are aware of their resources and can use them as needed to carry out the vision of the university.

Budget Process

The steps for assembling an institutional budget for any future period are fairly standard.

- Typically a budget planning exercise begins with the senior administration (as defined by the president). Additionally, the president and the provost may want the academic deans to participate at this stage. In this step, resources are linked to the institution’s strategic plan. If the institution has a budget committee, that group, also, might participate at this early stage. The review team was told that, while UNO has such a committee, it is not functional at this point. This committee should be activated to ensure better communication and broader cross-campus participation in basic budget discussions and decisions.

- Once the resources are determined for the next fiscal year the president and key staff will establish the priorities, with the president deciding how the final allocations will be determined.

- Once the allocations are determined, this information is given to operating units for use in their departmental planning.

- The final budget stage is the actual spending of the allocation and tracking of expenditures so departments do not overspend their budget.

UNO’s budget planning process appears to be badly broken. The simple process described above can be adapted and expanded to cover individual campus needs.

Recommendation: UNO should re-examine its budget processes and make such changes as necessary to improve communication and strengthen participation across the campus. Expenditure control is a very significant part of the budgetary cycle and, as such, timely financial information needs
to be provided to the campus operating units so appropriate decisions can be made to increase efficiency and effectiveness.

During discussions with campus constituencies, the review team heard the following comments about UNO’s institutional finance and budget processes:

- We have a budget committee but it only has 3 members and it is not functional.
- Supposed input on the budget is merely lip service.
- Academic areas “keep their own books” as they don’t trust the financial system and are not comfortable with what the finance area distributes.
- It’s 3 months into the fiscal year and we have not gotten the financial information for my units.
- Budget changes are made by the finance area without communicating with the affected unit.
- An automated system is in place for processing of forms, such as personnel actions, but it is not working well per the departments. The process doesn’t appear to be working the way it should for departments.
- At times, forms get stopped for no apparent reason and the department is not informed of why they were not being processed.

**Recommendation:** UNO should review the online personnel approval process to ascertain whether the current flow is the most efficient method, while maintaining the necessary internal controls.

In reviewing the organizational structures for both the financial and campus services divisions, the team feels that several staffing efficiencies might be possible. The review team heard from individuals on campus that the current staffing levels in these two areas probably reflect a lack of appropriate “right-sizing” from the time when UNO had 17,000 students pre-Katrina as compared to 11,000 currently.

**Recommendation:** UNO should review the current organizational structure to determine if there might be possible efficiencies in the structures of the Financial Services and Campus Services units.

The review team feels that, in addition to these three recommendations, communication between Financial Services and the campus needs to improve dramatically.
SECTION 4: ENROLLMENT, RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS

Enrollment

The University of New Orleans first admitted students in 1958 as LSUNO. Approximately twice the expected numbers were enrolled (1,460 undergraduate students) with a faculty of 63. By the following year there were 2,207 undergraduate students enrolled. The number of faculty was nearly 140 by 1961. LSUNO did express concern at the demand without additional state financial support, but by directive from LSU and legislative resolution was told to continue admitting all qualified students. By 1963, five years later, the numbers had climbed to 3,389 undergraduate students. In just six years of existence, this “branch” campus with 4,476 undergraduate students admitted its first class of 12 graduate students; then growth continued as summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATES</th>
<th>GRADUATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>10,343</td>
<td>9,599</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>14,732</td>
<td>12,703</td>
<td>2,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>15,559</td>
<td>12,609</td>
<td>2,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15,868</td>
<td>11,872</td>
<td>3,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of graduate students climbed from 12 to 375 by the second year of the graduate program. The undergraduate numbers reached a high of 14,106 in 1984 before experiencing gradual declines to 11,672 in 1994 followed by increases beginning in 1999 until the undergraduate number stood at 13,075 in 2005 prior to Hurricane Katrina.

In 2006, post-Katrina undergraduate enrollment stood at 9,159, similar to the 1969 enrollment. However, the numbers of undergraduates have continued to decline, falling to 8,345 in 2010 and to 7,891 in Spring 2011 – only slightly more than enrollment stood in 1967.

The number of graduate students, on the other hand, beginning with 12 in 1963 increased to 1,037 by 1973, to 2,537 by 1983, to 3,769 by 1993 and eventually 4,125 in 2004. In 2006, post-
Katrina graduate student enrollment stood at 2,591. Unlike the undergraduate numbers, graduate enrollment continued to climb to 2,931 by 2010 then declined slightly to 2,621 by Spring 2011.

It is safe to say that UNO experienced massive enrollment growth before it began leveling off in 2001 and that recruiting students was never an issue. The rapid growth in enrollment was accompanied by low retention and graduation rates among the undergraduate population while the number of graduate students increased. Given the significant and seemingly uncontrolled growth rate in the university’s earlier years, it would be difficult to imagine how the institution would have been in a position to adapt and maintain quality programs and services. Yet the growth rates in graduate enrollment and the rapid expansion of graduate and professional programs clearly indicate the level of faculty and staff attention to these programs.

The current picture of undergraduate recruiting trends confirms statements made above. In Fall 2005 there were 4,232 applications for the freshman class. The acceptance rate was at 70.5 percent, an exceptionally high figure. In the same year, there were 2,093 transfer applications and the acceptance rate was 69 percent. In Fall 2006, the number of applications for the freshman class dropped to 2,383 and transfer applications to 1,274. In Fall 2010 there were 3,446 applications for the freshman class and the acceptance rate was 55.4 percent. The number of transfer applications (Fall 2010) was 2,293 and the acceptance rate was 58 percent. The yield rates for the two applicant pools were 30 percent and 37.5 percent, respectively.

In Fall 2011, both freshman and transfer applications declined slightly. Freshman applications numbered 3,322 with an acceptance rate of 55 percent; the yield rate (enrolled) was 33.3 percent of those who applied and 60 percent of those accepted. Transfer applications in Fall 2011 totaled 2,273, with an acceptance rate of 59 percent and a yield rate of 40 percent of those who applied and 67 percent of those accepted.

Given the potential capacity of the university and the onset of the new admission requirements mandated by the Board of Regents, the University should explore and implement several best practices to increase its qualified applicant pool, regionally, nationally and internationally. Effective Fall 2012, admitted freshman students must have a composite ACT of 23, SAT of 1050 or a 2.5 GPA; require no remediation; and meet academic core requirements. Transfer students must have 24 transferrable hours above remediation, English and Math credit earned, and at least a 2.25 GPA.

---

6 In Fall 2005 UNO implemented the admissions standards required by the Louisiana Board of Regents’ Master Plan for Post Secondary Education: 2001. Up until this period, UNO admitted students with an ACT composite of 21. In the Master Plan, the university was designated a “Selective II Institution” and admitted students who had to meet certain criteria, including a composite ACT of 23 (SAT 1070).
The enrollment data along with a review of demographic issues suggests several things to this review team: 1) there is a growing local market for transfer and graduate students, 2) demographic shifts in the New Orleans population are affecting the number of applications to the freshman class, and 3) the university is not maximizing efforts in marketing and recruiting.

According to the UNO Graduate Enrollment Management Plan-2010, although overall undergraduate enrollment was down by 811 in Fall 2010, graduate enrollment was up by 340 students. In Fall 2010 UNO had the highest percentage of graduate students of any university in the state with 26 percent of its enrolled headcount in graduate programs. Graduate enrollment decreased, however, by 1.6% between Fall 2009 and Fall 2010. The Louisiana Board of Regents changed the funding formula for higher education in 2008 to remove the SREB doctoral completers quartile structure. The new funding formula, according to the 2010 plan, provides incentives based on federal research grants, total masters and doctoral completers, certificate completers and SREB category. UNO’s University’s Strategic Plan includes objectives related to those measures, including a primary objective of reaching SREB Four-Year 1 status.

In the Fall 2011, there were slightly more undergraduate males (50.5%) than females (49.6%); 91.7% undergraduate in-state students; 4.2% undergraduate out-of-state; and 4.2% international undergraduates. Of the graduate students, 40.4% are males while 59.6% are female; 78.5% are in-state residents while 12% are out-of-state; and 9.4% are international.

**Undergraduate Students**

Over the years the high quality of academic programs in combination with the low cost of attendance have proven beneficial in the institution’s recruiting of students regionally, nationally and internationally. At the same time, the university’s flexibility in class scheduling encouraged large numbers of non-traditional students to access higher education at UNO. The UNO story was spread by word of mouth and supported by its location and the high quality of its teaching and research faculty. UNO has become one of the most diverse institutions of higher education in the state of Louisiana emphasizing interdisciplinary teaching and research, multi-cultural exposure, experiential learning, and global education. Unfortunately, however, the institution has not placed significant emphasis on marketing these qualities within the immediate New Orleans region since attracting first-time, degree-seeking, full-time students has never been an issue. Moreover, until recently, very little if any attention has been given to student retention and persistence to graduation.

After the massive enrollment drop in fall 2005, post-Katrina overall enrollment rose steadily until 2010 when uncertainty about leadership and widely publicized budget cuts were compounded by negative press that affected all academic and non-academic programs and services. These areas were severely affected by faculty and staff attrition, followed by unilateral
top-down decision-making about budget cuts that resulted in vacant faculty and staff positions being left unfilled. Like other unilateral decisions, these budget cuts resulted in a reduction in the number of courses creating over-enrollment in lower level courses. A part of the chain reaction resulting from these administrative practices was lower enrollment in upper level courses as students transferred out of the institution due to rumors and fears that the institution might be closing, that courses would not be offered to complete a major, or that staff and faculty were being let go and would not be replaced.

Even though the number of applications for admission have not been extraordinarily high over the past few years, the yield rate for first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students enrolled has steadily increased up to Fall 2011. The overall decline in enrollment, however, reflected problems associated with retention and persistence to graduation which could also have been a result of the extreme uncertainty associated with institutional leadership.

In order to prepare for the higher Board of Regents’ admission standards while counteracting the impact of negative press over the past few years, UNO should greatly improve its marketing and recruiting efforts.

**Recommendation:** UNO should engage in campus-wide “institutional branding and imaging” via surveys and focus groups. This should be followed by coordination of recruiting, marketing and admissions practices that support the institution’s mission, while taking into full consideration the requirements of the LA GRAD Act.

Significant ingredients in UNO’s previous success and the key to its future are the tremendous diversity within its student body and its capacity to address the widely different needs of its constituent groups. In addition, UNO has obviously embraced the mantra of being an Urban Research University and all aspects associated with that title, as its educational, social, research and service mission. The institution has met the needs of its urban constituents through economic participation and applied social and scientific research; through expansion of evening and online courses leading to the attainment of degrees in career fields that serve the development and growth of the region; and through attracting international faculty and students who have enriched and strengthened the uniqueness of New Orleans.

Even with unstable leadership, the university community has been endeavoring to address issues associated with low retention and persistence to graduation. According to the students with whom the review team met, the university’s advisement system works well; the tutoring and academic support system is also of tremendous support; and the newly introduced Student Success Center will be of invaluable service. The retention initiatives that are underway suggest recognition that students are not doing well academically and require academic support in order to succeed and persist to graduation. Yet the admission standards are being met and the
An increase in the numbers of local and regional transfer applications plus applications from a broader market, domestic and international, may result in a larger pool of students that meet or exceed admissions criteria followed by a lower acceptance rate and a higher yield rate of those accepted. Thus, every effort must be made to address the diverse needs of the student body.

As one student stated to the review team, “once they get you here they leave you alone.” This is reflected in the organizational structure in which student affairs units have been treated as a secondary issue. The entire organization of student affairs appears to be dysfunctional. For instance, residence life reports to physical facilities (auxiliary services); university health services has been in disarray and the pharmacy has been closed down; the judicial system is disorganized and requires volunteers in order to have an administrative hearing; new student orientation is left to the Office of Admissions rather than an office of freshman studies located in the student affairs division. This past August (2011) was the first time there was a new student orientation just before classes began and only this year will all freshman students be required to take the freshman-oriented course, University Success 1001 (UNIV). The various factors, organizationally, that contribute to student retention are still widely dispersed and need far better coordination. UNO has several categories of students: commuter, residential, traditional, non-traditional, international, in-state, out-of-state, graduate and undergraduate and will shortly face a potential increase in the numbers of veterans under the new post 9-11 GI-Bill and the Wounded Warriors Program. In order to fully address the needs of these students and design retention initiatives all the way to graduation, the university must have a better understanding of the needs of these diverse subgroups of students and do a much better job of addressing their ever-changing needs. In other words, the university needs to implement a four-to-six year “learner-centered needs assessment system” designed to keep the institution informed of the needs of these students with the ultimate goal of continuous improvement of all academic and social aspects of retention initiatives.

**Recommendation:** UNO should engage in a rigorous campus-wide coordination of programmatic curricular, academic support, and student affairs services that fully supports the University’s mission and aids in the transition of students from recruitment to admission to persistence to graduation.

**Graduate Students**

According to the **UNO Graduate Enrollment Management Plan-2010**, jointly approved by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, and the Director of Admissions, the Graduate School at UNO houses 31 master’s degree and 12 doctoral degree programs.
As reported in this 2010 plan, two initiatives began targeting doctoral student production: a 1:3 Program and a Graduate Enhancement Program, both administered by the Graduate School. The programs were successful and the number of doctoral completers increased to a high of 79 in 2001-2002 with graduate enrollment peaking at 4,131 in Fall 2002. As noted earlier, after Katrina actual Fall 2005 graduate enrollment fell to 2,033. In Fall 2006, there were 2,591 graduate students enrolled.

Due to budget cuts and in the aftermath of the hurricane, the Graduate School became decentralized. Three colleges remained in the Graduate School and the two professional colleges elected to manage their own graduate programs (Business and Engineering). In Spring 2010, all programs agreed to move back under the oversight of the Graduate School. Prior to that, in Spring 2009, the Coordinator of Graduate Scholarships resigned and the Graduate Dean shifted responsibilities to another staff member and hired a Graduate Admissions Coordinator. In Fall 2010, graduate admissions were moved from the Office of Admissions to the Graduate School. The Office of Admissions, however, continues to process online graduate and undergraduate applications and receipt of transcripts which could cause confusion and unnecessary delays in application processing.

In the future, the Graduate School plans to take a more active role in graduate recruiting, working with its Office of Admissions. The plan is to work with each graduate program to identify its enrollment maximum and how and where to recruit the best students. The Graduate School also intends to reinitiate program reviews including fiscal analysis, according to the UNO Graduate Enrollment Management Plan-2010. Tracking graduate student retention may be challenging, however. The university cannot provide metrics for graduate student retention because most graduate programs do not require continual enrollment for non-scholarship students.

Based on enrollment data for comparative dates, both graduate applications and the number of graduate students admitted dropped between Fall 2010 and Fall 2011. Most alarming, however, is the steep increase in the number of new graduate student withdrawals for the same period, from 37 withdrawn in Fall 2010 to 168 withdrawn in Fall 2011.

In summary, UNO experienced uncontrollably rapid growth and was unable to manage the growth by providing equitable administrative support and student services. It appears, to the review team, that there was a determination to grow a vibrant urban research university using the ever-increasing enrollment numbers and resulting academic demands as justification.
SECTION 5: FACULTY AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The review team’s conversations with faculty during the campus visit, including with department chairs and Senate leaders, as well as faculty responses on the survey administered by UNO’s Office of Institutional Research, were consistent in revealing a dedicated, capable, and hard-working faculty that is strongly committed to a successful transition into the UL System. Although there is optimism about forward motion for the university once the transition to the UL System is complete, frustrations linger from years of chafing under what most faculty considered to be an unsupportive LSU System administration. Rebuilding faculty morale and confidence in the institution’s future will be an important challenge for UNO’s new president.

Faculty Morale

Faculty morale at UNO is understandably low at the present time. Most faculty still feel the effects of the disruptions brought on by Hurricane Katrina, including the sizable attrition in faculty numbers since that event. There is widespread understanding that the enrollment decline that has caused this attrition must be reversed if there is to be any hope of rebuilding the faculty to its former size and stature, but also deep concern that rebuilding may be difficult in any event. Of 235 faculty who had responded to the SWOT analysis at the time the review team saw its results, 195 (83 percent) responded affirmatively to the statement, “UNO should increase its undergraduate student enrollment.” An even higher number, however—207 (88 percent)—agreed that “UNO has a decreasing ability to compete for and retain top faculty.”

In addition to these challenging enrollment and faculty retention/recruitment problems, at least three other factors adversely impacting faculty morale will not be automatically resolved by UNO’s transition to the UL System: distrust of the university’s leadership as a result of years of inadequate communication about decision-making; a near-total lack of traditional forms of shared governance; and salary levels that have remained primarily stagnant since Katrina and that are widely considered to be noncompetitive with UNO’s peer institutions. In fact, according to the most recently available salary data for the UL System (IPEDS data for 2010), UNO’s average salary for all full-time instructional faculty of $66,197 ranks ahead of Louisiana Tech (LTU) and below only the University of Louisiana at Lafayette (ULL) in the UL System. At both the Associate Professor and Assistant Professor ranks, however, UNO salaries trail both ULL and LTU. Faculty anticipate and expect that the new president will give high priority to addressing the critical issues of internal communication, shared governance, and salary issues.
Faculty Attrition and Faculty Workload

As noted earlier, UNO has experienced an overall enrollment decline of 36.3 percent since before Hurricane Katrina, almost equally at the undergraduate and graduate levels (-36.8 percent at the undergraduate level and -35.1 percent at the graduate level). Understandably, the size of the full-time faculty has also decreased significantly in that time, though not to an extent equal to the decline in enrollment (a 24 percent decline to 418 from the pre-Katrina total of 549). A major part of this reduction has been intentional, resulting from the elimination of several academic programs (including one department) and the downsizing of many others. Some of the decline, however, reflects the individual decisions of relatively more mobile faculty members, apparently including many highly productive research faculty, to seek employment at other institutions. This erosion in faculty numbers (and perhaps quality) has had a negative impact on morale, even if the erosion is less than the enrollment decrease might warrant.

Recruitment and hiring of new tenure-track faculty has been almost non-existent in the past few years. In 2010-2011, no new full-time tenured faculty were added, although fourteen (14) visiting faculty members and one (1) full-time instructor were hired. For academic year 2011-2012, as of the time this report is being written, thirty-three (33) faculty searches have been authorized. Given the recent history of state hiring freezes that have led to wholesale cancellation of searches; faculty (notably including department chairs), are not sanguine about the chances that most or many of these searches will be carried to successful conclusion.⁷

Remarkably, UNO’s generally declining fortunes over the past six years do not seem to have produced extreme inflation of faculty workload. Although faculty told the review team that class sizes have steadily increased, there does not seem to have been any general escalation in the number of classes faculty are expected to teach. The traditional 12-unit workload at UNO was in fact confirmed in the university’s 2010 Policy on Faculty Workloads. It is the review team’s general impression that patterns of faculty work—particularly the balance between instruction and research—is not a major faculty complaint, with the exception of the rising class sizes and diminishing numbers of graduate assistants available to assist in very large classes.

---

⁷ Like other public institutions in Louisiana, UNO has been constrained by state hiring freezes over the past four years. Governor Jindal instituted a six-month hiring freeze by executive order in January 2008 followed by a one-year hiring freeze effective July 2009 that has twice been extended. The most recent extension on July 6, 2011, is effective until June 30, 2012.
Distrust and Lack of Communication

As discussed in Section 2, communication from senior administrators to faculty, staff, and students has been consistently poor and sometimes non-existent. Besides creating massive operational dysfunctions, this administrative failure has resulted in widespread distrust among the faculty about the way decisions are made that affect academic programs. Faculty responses to the SWOT analysis underscore the observations of the review team about these matters. In addition to numerous harsh comments about poor communication in the open-ended portions of the analysis,

- 211 of 237 faculty respondents (89 percent) agreed that “Communication across the campus needs to be strengthened”; and
- Only 69 of 237 respondents (29.1 percent) agreed with the statement, “UNO administration provides excellent leadership.”

To repeat a sentiment expressed earlier in this report, the review team believes it to be critically important that the new president immediately improve channels of communication throughout the institution. Especially in an environment where academic programs are being reduced and, in some cases, eliminated, it is crucial that faculty, as well as staff and students, understand how such decisions are being made and who is making them.

Shared Governance

Whereas most universities display information about shared governance prominently and clearly, such information is almost impossible to find on UNO’s official website At [http://www.uno.edu/FacultyStaff](http://www.uno.edu/FacultyStaff) there is a listing of multiple entities under the title, “Governance.” Included are a number of administrative units (e.g., Administration, Chancellor’s Office, Compliance Office, etc.), along with “Faculty Handbook,” “Staff Council,” “Use Policy for Information Technology,” and bodies that represent faculty input to decision-making: “Policy Committee,” “Faculty Council” and “University Senate.” Tellingly, however, the home pages for the latter two links contain no information about the role and scope of either body. In the judgment of the review team, this presentation says volumes about the weakness and invisibility of traditional forms of shared governance at UNO.

During the campus visit, the team was led to believe that there has been slight improvement in forms of consultation under the current Interim Chancellor, but there is a palpable sentiment among the faculty that, as one Senate leader put it, a “legacy of powerlessness” continues to prevail. Currently, there are eight administrators on the forty-two member University Senate. Faculty leaders told the review team that they wish to “reshape the Senate and reclaim [Senate] prerogatives.” Clearly, a new president will benefit from restoring vigor to shared governance,
as part of a general effort to bring greater transparency and a sense of collaboration across campus.

**Recommendation:** UNO should re-examine its policies and practices with respect to shared governance, with the objective of improving and strengthening collaborative approaches to University decision-making.

**Faculty Salaries**

Low faculty salaries and a lack of salary increases for the past six years are routinely cited as the main reason for UNO’s problems in retaining and recruiting faculty—not to mention as a cause of low faculty morale. In the difficult budgetary times that will surely continue in Louisiana for at least the next few years, it is unlikely that the State will provide meaningful funding for faculty/staff salary increases. Even if this is so, however, many faculty expressed the hope that the new president will give attention to internal inequities, including salary compression and inversion, that have seriously harmed faculty morale.

**Recommendation:** UNO should conduct a salary study to determine the extent of salary compression and inversion, and use the results to inform development of a comprehensive faculty salary policy.

**Academic Programs**

For the past few years, pre-dating the LA GRAD Act, the Louisiana Board of Regents has used the academic program review process to improve “efficiency, streamline delivery, and achieve an overall re-balancing of the postsecondary system.” Specifically, the program review process includes focused examination of “low-completer” degree programs, and calls upon the institution either to terminate the program with a phase-out period, consolidate it with one or more other programs, or to offer a compelling justification for continuation with a plan for increasing productivity. At UNO, this process has led to the termination or planned termination of ten (10) degree programs, including: B.S. in Middle School Education; B.S. in Health and Physical Education, K-12; M.Ed. and M.A. in Human Performance and Health Promotion; B.A. in Biology; B.A. in Chemistry; B.A. in Economics; B.A. in Geology; B.S. in Economics/Business Economics; and B.S. in Business Entrepreneurship. Only one department,

---

8 “Low-completer” programs are defined as associate/baccalaureate/post-bachelors programs with an average of fewer than eight graduates per year over a three-year period; master/post-master/specialist programs with lower than five per year; and professional/doctoral/post-doctoral programs with fewer than two. Louisiana Board of Regents, “2011 Academic Program/Low Completer Review” (January 20, 2011), p. 1.
Health and Human Performance, has been completely eliminated but nearly all departments have experienced a significant decrease in faculty size. Nonetheless, UNO continues to offer a wide array of programs, several of which are very distinguished (Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering; Accounting; and Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism were frequently cited to the review team as examples of outstanding programs). The UNO website lists forty (40) baccalaureate degrees, thirty-one (31) Master’s degrees, and twelve (12) doctoral degrees.

A deserved point of pride for the faculty is that all of UNO’s programs that are eligible for professional accreditation are accredited; this is, of course, an important aspect in marketing academic programs to prospective students at all levels. The review team was concerned to learn, however, that the College of Business Administration was placed on review by AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) in its last accreditation cycle, and to be told by Engineering faculty that there is a strong possibility, unless staffing is increased in the College of Engineering to match growing enrollment, that college, too, may be put on watch at the time of its next ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) re-accreditation exercise. To avert the damaging impact that losses of accreditation could have on student recruitment and retention, the new president should review the status of UNO’s accredited programs to determine which, if any, accreditations may be at risk, as well as the steps necessary to maintain desired program accreditations.

As an SREB Four-Year 2 institution (a status shared by only the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and Louisiana Tech within the UL System), UNO has a very significant graduate studies mission. Moreover, given Louisiana’s funding formula for higher education, maintaining strong graduate enrollment is important to mitigating further downward budget pressures for UNO. As already noted, graduate enrollment has declined by about the same percentage as undergraduate enrollment in the time since Hurricane Katrina. This is and must be a concern for the new president, even as UNO struggles to improve recruitment of first-time freshmen.

The new president will also have to deal with the widely shared expectation among some faculty that the transition to the UL System will improve the likelihood that UNO will move to SREB Four-Year 1 status. Given the current and likely future constraints confronting the university, the review team does not share this expectation. As noted earlier, the team believes the new president should undertake a collaborative re-examination of that goal. Even if the goal of achieving SREB Four-Year 1 status is ultimately revised, however, at the very least UNO

---

9 In 2009, UNO drew up a new proposed list of peer institutions that seems to the review team to be inordinately challenging. New to the list are four large and very strong research institutions (The University of Texas at Dallas, University of Central Florida, University of Maryland-Baltimore County, and University of North Carolina at Charlotte). At the time this report is being written, the Board of Regents has not yet approved this aspirational list.
should, through energetic marketing and recruitment activities, seek to rebuild graduate enrollment levels—especially in fields that might help feed the economic revitalization of the Greater New Orleans area.

Online and Technology-assisted Instruction

Like most states, Louisiana has strongly urged its post-secondary institutions to expand their online (distance) instructional programs. The LA GRAD Act, while not mandating additional distance learning, cites increasing the use of technology to expand distance learning as a specific performance goal for four-year institutions. This general guidance has been made more explicit by the Board of Regents, which has set three distance learning goals to be tracked as part of performance agreements with individual institutions under the LA GRAD Act: 1) number of course sections with 50% and with 100% instruction through distance [i.e., online] education; 2) number of students enrolled in courses with 50% and with 100% instruction through distance education; and 3) number of programs offered through 100% distance education. At UNO, Hurricane Katrina provided a strong initial impetus to accelerate distance/online learning. It is a point of great pride among faculty, administrators, staff, and students that UNO was the first among New Orleans higher educational institutions to reopen in Fall 2005; this was largely accomplished through almost overnight development of online classes. After resumption of normal (or near-normal) on-campus instruction in the 2006-2007 academic year, online instruction continued to flourish. Such instruction was the responsibility of the free-standing Metropolitan College until its demise in 2008, when oversight for online instruction was transferred to Academic Affairs. In college year 2008-2009 (i.e., fall, spring, and summer terms), a total of 492 online classes were offered, with a (duplicated) total enrollment of 11,306. Numbers have since declined, but only slightly: total number of online classes and enrollments in such classes for college year 2009-2010 were 425 and 10,494, respectively; totals for college year 2010-2011 were 412 and 9,704, respectively. Since online instruction moved into Academic Affairs, all such instruction is done as part of normal faculty workload; no changes in this practice are currently planned.

The development of UNO online programs has been limited, in part because of the unavailability of a 24-hour Help Desk. The Director of Distance Learning indicated to the review team that the university hopes to increase online instruction, but acknowledged that a Help Desk is available only during normal daytime office hours. Although UNO does not yet offer any fully online programs, the Director of Distance Learning indicated that at least three online Master’s degree programs (M.Ed., M.A. in Arts Administration, and Master’s in Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism) are in the planning stage. If UNO wishes to increase its online offerings, the hours when Help Desk assistance is available to faculty and students will have to be expanded.
For the past several years, UNO has strongly encouraged faculty to use the university’s Learning Management System (LMS) in teaching their classes. Until June 2011, the LMS was BlackBoard; when the university’s contract with BlackBoard expired, the administration announced a switch to Moodle Rooms, reportedly with little consultation and little explanation to faculty for the change (many faculty believe that Moodle Rooms, an open source system, was chosen solely for budget reasons; the Director of Distance Learning confirms that savings amounted to approximately $500,000 per year). In addition to confusion and operational problems created by the lack of communication surrounding the change, the transition to Moodle Rooms was greatly complicated for faculty because the BlackBoard system administrator resigned suddenly and the only technical staff member in Academic Affairs available to train and assist the faculty in the use of the new LMS was himself still learning the system late in the summer. Needless to say, the transition to Moodle Rooms has been a bumpy one, and the review team heard numerous complaints from both students and faculty about difficulties in using it. (On the survey, only sixty of 237 faculty respondents (25%) agreed with the statement, “UNO’s technology to enhance student learning is excellent”; among student respondents, approximately 40 percent—409 of 905—agreed that “UNO’s technology to enhance student learning is excellent.”) Clearly, more training and support are necessary if the new LMS is to be accepted and used by more faculty, and to be beneficial to student learning.

Recommendation: UNO should increase the availability of training and assistance to faculty in the use of the new Learning Management System (Moodle Rooms).

Faculty Research

UNO has a strong, continuous history of faculty research. The university’s Mission Statement, as approved by the Board of Supervisors for the LSU System in 2004, describes UNO as “the urban research university of the State of Louisiana,” and states that the institution’s “[r]esearch and graduate programs focus on fields of study in which UNO is nationally competitive or responding to specific state or regional needs.” The review team heard strong statements of support for the institution’s research mission—especially community-based, applied research—from a number of sources, including business leaders, legislators, and Foundation Board members, as well as UNO administrators and faculty members. Moreover, active engagement of faculty in research is of fundamental importance to maintaining strong graduate degree programs. Whatever revisions may occur in UNO’s strategic directions under a new president, it seems to the members of this review team unlikely (and undesirable) that this aspect of the institution’s mission would be downgraded in importance in the future.
In carrying out its research mission, UNO has developed over the years a number of specialized centers and institutes, most of which provide the bases for community and regional collaboration and economic development. These centers and institutes include:

- Institute for Economic Development & Real Estate Research
- Division of Business & Economic Research
- The Hospitality Research Center
- Louisiana International Trade Center
- Advanced Materials Research Institute (AMRI)
- Center for Hazards Assessment Response and Technology (CHART)
- Center for Information Assurance
- Merritt C. Becker Jr. University of New Orleans Transportation Institute
- National Center for Advanced Manufacturing
- New Orleans Jazz Institute
- Pontchartrain Institute for Environmental Sciences
- Energy Conversion and Conservation Center
- Maritime Environmental Resources and Information Center
- Robert E. Nims Center for Entertainment Arts, Amusements & Multimedia Industries
- Simulation Based Design Center
- Small Business Development Center at UNO
- Survey Research Center
- UNO-Northrop Grumman Maritime Center of Excellence
- Center for Urban and Public Affairs

Collectively, these research-based bodies provide a strong basis for a re-energized commitment by UNO under a new president to collaborate with business and government entities in the revitalization of the Greater New Orleans area and to re-cement the university’s identity and fortunes to those of the city and region.

As a public research university, UNO has depended heavily on funding derived from research and sponsored programs. Even in the difficult economic environment of the past several years,
the university has had a good record in this area—perhaps aided by the one positive that came out of the Katrina devastation: federal recovery funds that have been made available for the physical and economic rehabilitation of the New Orleans area. From fiscal year 2007 through fiscal year 2011, UNO’s total funding for grants and contracts has averaged over $28 million per year; the amount of such funding in fiscal year 2011 was the highest in that period: $32,362,836. This performance bodes well, generally, for the future, although it is possible that some of the shifts that are becoming apparent in the region’s economic development focus may result in fewer contracts and grants for some of UNO’s previously most productive centers and institutes (e.g., those related to manufacturing and marine engineering). It will be important for the new president to engage actively with local and regional business and governmental leaders in order to identify those areas where UNO’s centers and institutes may play a prominent and, for the university, profitable role.

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs seems to have exercised a strong positive influence within the university over the past two decades, although the review team has some concerns about current formulas for distributing indirect costs within the university. The team was told by the Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School that the current distribution formula for such monies is 10 percent to the colleges, 25 percent to Centers and Institutes, and 65 percent to fund the salaries and operations of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, with nothing going back to the Principal Investigator(s) and/or academic departments. This formula seems to offer little incentive to faculty to engage in sponsored research under the aegis of the university, especially in light of complaints the review team heard (and that appear in the open-ended comments section of the SWOT analysis) about difficulties in navigating the campus bureaucracy to apply for and administer external grants and contracts.

**Recommendation:** UNO should re-examine policies and practices concerning distribution of indirect costs from sponsored research and contracts, with the objective of maximizing incentives for faculty and staff participation in such activities.

As the review team heard from virtually all sources and as confirmed by the SWOT analysis of students, faculty, and staff, one of UNO’s greatest assets is its strong, committed faculty. Clearly, there are academic programs of excellent quality and an ongoing research agenda that can serve as keystones for the revitalization of the university under the new president. As outlined in this section, however, there are problems that must be addressed in order to assure a strong academic future for UNO. In addition to a strong president who can recognize and act upon opportunities for linkage between UNO’s academic programs and the greater community, the university would also greatly benefit from strong, visionary leadership from the Office of Academic Affairs in carrying out the academic vision of the new president.
SECTION 6: STAFF

The review team met with members of the University’s Staff Council, and senior administrative staff, among various others during the campus visit. A member of the team also conducted a telephone interview with the President of the Staff Council. As a whole, the team found the staff to be dedicated and very loyal to the university as demonstrated by the fact that most with whom the team spoke have been UNO employees for a significant amount of time. When asked what they considered the strengths of their University, a strong faculty and quality research programs topped the list. The staff seem to be very proud to work at the institution and want to be involved in implementing the new president’s vision. However, lack of communication was frequently cited as a critical issue and there were concerns that staff needs and concerns were not adequately represented. Further, cumulative budget reductions have created short staffing in many parts of the university. Many staff members commented to the review team that they were “wearing several hats” to help UNO get through the budget cuts that UNO has faced over the past several years.

Staff Morale

Staff morale seems surprisingly good despite the stress that has accompanied the university’s efforts to recover from Hurricane Katrina. Indeed, 82% (230 of 279) of the staff responding to the SWOT analysis agreed that UNO has a significant positive impact on the regional community—educationally, economically, and culturally. But while members of the staff with whom the review team spoke say that they very much want to promote the university to help the recovery, they indicated there is inadequate communication from the senior administration of the university on such matters as goals, achievements, and issues that are important to the general welfare of the university. An overwhelming 90% of the staff survey respondents (252 of 279) indicated that “communication across the campus needs to be strengthened and streamlined”. In addition, some indicated that poor interdepartmental communications also strain recruitment and retention initiatives because students have difficulty finding the information they need when faculty and staff don’t know what happens in other offices.

Recommendation: UNO should designate an individual from senior management to be the liaison with the Staff Council for improved communication with the staff.

Business Practices

Recurring budget reductions have negatively impacted staffing and campus resources, although some expressed the opinion that impacts could have been less severe if the reductions had been
more strategic in application and based on long-term goals. The current budget-driven policy for filling vacancies in the departments creates staffing imbalances. Some departments have not lost any people and others have lost several, which leads to workload inequities.

In addition, it appears that the university is not requiring departments to conduct personnel evaluations. Staff understands that evaluations are critical and are important for both the employee and the employer. Evaluations help the employee to understand what a supervisor thinks is needed to improve a staff member’s job performance. Staff also told the review team that there have not been salary increases since 2006 and when they do occur, evaluations should be in place.

**Recommendation:** UNO should review its policy on personnel evaluations to ensure that all employees are being evaluated on an annual basis.

Environment

Significant rebuilding has occurred since the damage incurred by Hurricane Katrina. Student Housing projects are set to re-open, as is the student activity center The Cove. Final repairs are also underway at the University Center which will afford student organizations meeting rooms and office space. However, the upkeep and cleanliness of the facilities have become serious issues. In order to conserve resources to help balance the budget, the university has failed to fill many custodial positions leaving the buildings poorly maintained. According to the staff, some are even bringing bathroom supplies so the facilities are usable by students, faculty, staff, and visitors to the campus. The seriousness of this was captured in the statement; “Most buildings are not only “not clean” but actually dirty! What does this say about the university? As a parent who toured many universities last spring, I was embarrassed when I looked at UNO through a different set of eyes.”

As a whole, UNO staff seem to be remarkably loyal to the institution and view themselves as customer service agents for the students, faculty, visitors, and other staff. However, there need to be improvements in all levels of communications in order to ensure more efficient internal management processes and a more effective delivery of services as they help to market the university to both the internal and external communities.
SECTION 7: STUDENTS

In the executive summary of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) entitled First Year Initiative at UNO: Strengthening the Foundations for Academic Success, submitted to SACS-COC in 2005, it was indicated that “UNO continues to retain and graduate students at rates below that of our peer institutions. In addition, implementing new admissions standards in 2005-06 will shrink our traditional application pool. The goal of the UNO retention initiative is to encourage student persistence by improving the learning environment for all students, including those perceived to be at risk, while maintaining academic standards.”

In appendix A of the same document, under Driving Forces, it was stated that: “Eighteen percent of the student body is currently receiving the Louisiana full tuition scholarships (TOPS).”

In the same appendix, under Restraining Forces, it is stated that: “Demographics are a serious threat. The projected decline in the number of high school graduates in Louisiana as well as their academic profile in terms of achievement/readiness seems at odds with changing standards of admission across the state.”

Within the same section of the same document, the following is written:

“Higher achieving students are students with choices, and they respond to institutions that deliver information and services in a timely and consistent fashion. UNO has traditionally lacked the resources to compete successfully for the attention of these higher achieving students, particularly in the late phases of the enrollment process.”

In this document, the author(s) described the “bleak economic future facing New Orleans,” the “inadequate state financial support to support the real costs of operation across the board,” and the fact that “approximately 25% of full-time, first-time students at the University of New Orleans will earn initial GPAs below 2.0.”

These and other statements written in the spring of 2005 indicate that the kinds of issues facing the UNO student in 2011 existed prior to the onset of Hurricane Katrina. They were detrimental issues that were recognized then but further exacerbated after Katrina.

In 2011, as in 2005, the students of UNO are varied in ages, are of diverse cultural backgrounds, are loyal and committed to UNO, are very supportive of the faculty and want to see UNO thrive and survive. Of the students who volunteered to meet with the review team, not one student expressed regret at having chosen UNO. However, they did report inadequate staffing, insufficient faculty to teach courses, inadequately cleaned buildings and restrooms, difficulty transferring credits into UNO, poor communication from the Office of Financial Aid, inadequate
recruiting by the Office of Admissions, low level of customer service, poorly prepared food and severe over-pricing by the Aramark Food Services, low level of health care services on campus including no pharmaceutical services, constant campus run-around and inadequate communication from the administration. Unfortunately, these and similar issues existed prior to Hurricane Katrina and reflect the fact that enrollment was allowed to grow, uncontrolled, for far too long for this institution. Programs and services designed to meet the needs of students clearly could not and did not keep pace with the growth rate.

Staff echoed these sentiments and added that many times students receive the run-around because they (staff) do not know the answers to their questions since they are not told when changes are made, such as “who is responsible for what.” They reported that the changes have been too frequent and have not been communicated. The review team feels that the administration needs to take immediate steps to reach out to the student body, listen to their ideas and make every effort to respond to their needs.

**Recommendation:** UNO should designate an individual from senior management to establish regular monthly meetings with the student leaders and create an atmosphere of shared planning for the development of the institution.

In the recent campus SWOT analysis designed to receive input on institutional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats or challenges, students listed *strengths* as: location, diverse and intelligent student body, dedicated faculty and staff, affordability, and high quality academic programs. They listed *weaknesses* as: weak leadership, marketing, not student-focused, and lingering shadows of a “junior division” mentality. Under *opportunities* they listed: collaborations and partnerships, the move to the UL System, new leadership with innovative ideas, and expansion of recruitment.

Additionally, during the review team’s campus visit, students reported the following as some of the positives:

- “UNO has the simplest and easiest way to get back into college.”
- “Every major accountant in the city is a graduate of UNO.”
- “UNO took all my credits from out of state.”
- “UNO fits my work schedule.”
- “UNO has a broad spectrum offered academically.”

Some of the perceived negatives were:
• “The Non-traditional student needs are not being adequately addressed – much of the system and services are not addressing needs of traditional students, even though they corner the market.”

• “There was no or extremely limited contact with Admissions Counselors.”

• “Heard about UNO by word of mouth.”

• “Found out about UNO program through Google.”

• “UNO has a terrible PR problem and they are not addressing it.”

• “Academic departments are reaching out to the high schools and are recruiting that way.”

It is of interest to note that there seemed to be proportional per capita representation from the student body at the meeting with the review team; namely, by classification, by ethnicity, by gender and by nationality.

UNO has one of the most diverse constituent student bodies in the entire state. This level of diversity carries benefits as well as challenges. One of those challenges lies in the adequate recruitment of and processing of paperwork for transfer, out-of-state, non-traditional and international students. Another challenge is the need to provide adequate services and programs that address the varied needs of these students, thereby greatly contributing to improved retention and persistence to graduation. This is, of course, further complicated by the fact that local non-residential students also have unmet needs due to inadequate services and programs.

All of these categories represent inadequately tapped markets for both recruiting and retaining students. Not only has UNO not fully tapped into these markets, but little effort has been made to accommodate the needs of all constituent student populations with the aim of retaining and graduating more students. Unfortunately, this seems to have been the situation even before the devastation associated with Katrina. It could be added here that what has been perceived by UNO as “controls and roadblocks” created by the LSU System could also be viewed as by-product of uncontrolled growth and the associated inability of the institution to handle too rapid a growth rate.

**Recommendation:** UNO should explore means of addressing the needs of all student constituent groups (commuter, residential, traditional, non-residential, international, in-state, out-of-state, graduate and undergraduate), including especially the adequacy of flexibility in course scheduling to meet the needs of the non-traditional student population.
SECTION 8: ATHLETICS

Although many events bring alumni and former students back to campus, athletic competitions tend to be one of the bigger attractions in getting alumni to return. These same people, especially those who have moved out of the region, can follow “their team” through various media and online sources. Thus, when evaluating athletics, one should not let costs versus revenue be the only measuring stick. Any evaluation needs to also consider the public relations and fund-raising opportunities that athletics present for the university and how these can offset some of the budget challenges that are presented. They are major “friend raisers” and there should be recognition of their value placed in keeping former students allied with “their school.”

The new president of UNO will have to decide almost immediately in which NCAA Division the university’s teams will compete into the future. UNO was an active participant in NCAA DI until November 2009, when then-Chancellor Ryan announced that the university would explore a move to NCAA DIII, the non-scholarship Division. (This move was predicated on Chancellor Ryan’s decision to totally eliminate general fund support to athletics. He then asked the students to hold a referendum to increase their support of athletics, which failed.) The LSU Board of Supervisors authorized Chancellor Ryan to withdraw from the Sun Belt Conference in December 2009, and begin the process to move instead to NCAA DIII. When Chancellor Ryan left his position in September 2010, the move to NCAA DIII was revisited and in March 2011, the LSU Board of Supervisors approved UNO’s move to NCAA DII. Unlike the proposed move to NCAA DIII, this prospective move had unanimous support from the UNO administration, the Athletic Department, the Privateer Athletic Foundation, the Student Government, and the Alumni Association.

At the present time, UNO is considered a “NCAA DI Independent Transitional” institution. This means that UNO is ineligible for NCAA or conference postseason participation or honors for the two years the institution is in transition. As matters stand now, UNO will be considered a full member of NCAA DII, with postseason eligibility, if it meets the qualification parameters set forth on July 1, 2012. In September 2011, however, the Interim Chancellor announced that the transition to NCAA Division II would be put on hold until the new campus president was named in order to allow that person to make the very important final decision.

If UNO were to revert to NCAA DI, it would face the following challenges:

- UNO would need to increase the size of the Athletic Department by four (4) sports.
- UNO would need to provide the appropriate Athletic Department staffing infrastructure and meet athletic scholarship minimums. Failure to do so could
place the institution on probationary status on July 1, 2012, which means that it would be prohibited from receiving funds from the NCAA, and its teams would be ineligible for postseason competition.

- In light of the Academic Performance Ratings (APR) in Baseball and Men’s Basketball prior to the proposed move to NCAA DII, the institution would likely suffer penalties in those programs.

- In March, 2011, the LSU System conducted a revenue/expenditure analysis for both NCAA DI and NCAA DII. Projections at that time were that remaining in NCAA DI would create a deficit of approximately $1.4 million each year as opposed to a small surplus which could be generated each year by remaining in NCAA DII. The Athletic Director has engaged an independent consultant to conduct a similar analysis and the results should be available by early November 2011.

Continuing uncertainties concerning UNO’s NCAA Division status have created turmoil for most of the coaches. A good example is the Men’s Basketball (MB) program, where all twelve (12) scholarships are full scholarships in NCAA DI. In NCAA DII, the team would have the equivalent of ten (10) full scholarships which could be allocated to multiple athletes as determined by the coach. In other words, in NCAA DI, the team would have more scholarships, but they could not be divided into partial awards. The program currently has nineteen (19) student-athletes with awards. Indecision as to which Division UNO will join leaves these student-athletes uncertain of their awards and makes it difficult to recruit; as student-athletes want to know in which Division they are going to be competing.

As is the case at most institutions, balancing the athletic budget on an annual basis is extremely sensitive. Public institutions across the country have sustained significant reductions in their financial support from their respective state legislatures, and UNO falls into that category. One of the major expenditure items in athletics is the cost of scholarships for student-athletes, which has risen significantly because universities have had to increase tuition and student fees. Thus, as a campus raises tuition and fees in order to meet operating needs, it simultaneously creates difficulties for balancing the athletics budget. At this point in time, UNO is projecting a balanced budget for athletics in the current year.

Because of budgetary constraints, many on campus told the review team that they feel that UNO is not providing all of the academic support that student-athletes should be receiving. Currently, academic counseling for student-athletes is being provided by a single academic advisor and the coaches of some of the teams. While this allows the coaches of the respective teams to be current with their players, it does not provide consistent information for all the student-athletes or academic advice by an advisor who is trained in this area.
Recommendation: UNO should take the steps necessary, as part of the Student Success Initiative, to ensure regular and adequate academic counseling and support services for its student-athletes.

As a result of the various NCAA Division options that have been and are being discussed, the UNO Athletic Department has been in a state of flux for about two years. The situation has created a moving target for the coaches. UNO needs to define where athletics is going and how it will attain the desired end result. Topics addressed may include, in addition to the NCAA Division question, such matters as conference affiliation, staffing needs, facility needs, marketing, fund raising, the question of whether the university will compete in football in the future, and how to achieve the revenue streams that will ensure a balanced budget for athletics.

Recommendation: UNO should develop a strategic plan for athletics, which includes fund raising and marketing plans, to support the expense and revenue projections contemplated in the plan.

This plan should be developed with broad participation both within and outside the university, including students, faculty, staff, Alumni Association, the Privateer Foundation, and supporters from the community. Community support will be extremely critical, especially if UNO decides to remain in Division I. Whatever the decision with respect to NCAA Division status; community interest in the possibility of UNO competing in football is reflected in the recent formation of a community-based Football Development Committee for UNO. Ongoing strong support from such an organization would be important if UNO were to decide to move in that direction.

From meetings with athletic department staff, including the coaches, the review team determined that UNO is not providing overall student-athlete support services that are consistent with schools with which its teams compete. Glaring staff needs have developed as the Athletic Department has tried to operate within the budget constraints the university has been facing. This is understandable, but having trained personnel in areas such as athlete health, academic performance, compliance, and strength training is essential to a successful athletic program and to the sound development of student-athletes. Other positions, such as a Senior Women’s Administrator, marketing staff, and a sports information staff, are also needed. Consultation and guidance could be sought from the NCAA.

Recommendation: UNO should review its staffing to ensure that student-athletes are receiving the assistance they need in such areas as medical support and strength training.

Regardless of the NCAA Division in which an institution competes, the student-athletes devote a lot of time to participate in their respective sport and want to be the best they can be. UNO’s
student-athletes, as representatives of UNO, deserve to receive adequate support to be competitive with their opponents. A new strategic plan for athletics and future funding levels for intercollegiate athletic programs should reflect that commitment.
SECTION 9: INTER-INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS

SB 266, which provided for the transition of the University of New Orleans from the LSU System to the University of Louisiana System, includes a statement on legislative intent (Paragraph 3241) that calls for extensive cooperation and collaboration among the public institutions serving the New Orleans region. This call is consistent with the recommendations of the 2010 Postsecondary Education Review Commission (the Tucker Commission), central points of which were to raise admission standards in Louisiana’s four-year institutions (including banning, beginning Fall 2012, the offering of developmental courses by Tier II institutions) and relying more on the state’s community colleges as points of entry into higher education for high school graduates who are not completely qualified for admission to the senior institutions. A necessary corollary of these recommendations is that there be smooth articulation and transfer policies and processes among and between two- and four-year institutions, particularly those in a single region. These expectations represent the context for assessing UNO’s relations with other post-secondary institutions in the New Orleans region.

During the campus visit, members of the review team met individually (one-on-one) with the Chancellors of Delgado Community College and Southern University at New Orleans (SUNO) and the President of Southeastern Louisiana University, and spoke with various administrators and faculty groups about inter-institutional relations in the region. From these conversations, the team feels confident that UNO is taking seriously the expectations of the Tucker Commission and further embodied in SB 266. In particular, ongoing talks between UNO and Delgado Community College seem to be very promising.

It is in the best interests of both institutions that they succeed in developing smooth and strong articulation for Delgado students who wish to transfer to UNO. As already mentioned, the advent of higher admission standards at UNO in fall 2012 threatens to accelerate an already troublesome decline in undergraduate enrollment. Delgado, on the other hand, with a steadily increasing enrollment that now exceeds 20,000 (in addition to 10,000 non-credit students), could well be overwhelmed by student numbers when those higher admission standards become

---

10 Specifically, Part A of Paragraph 3241 spells out the “intent of the legislature that a comprehensive, integrated regional delivery system be provided for the delivery of public postsecondary education services in the New Orleans region which system will: (1) Provide a world class educational environment that will meet the academic needs and interests of every student, while providing each student with the support, assistance, and guidance necessary to attain his or her educational goals and aspirations; (2) Ensure that students who are academically unprepared are provided the educational resources they need to have a reasonable chance for success in their academic pursuits; (3) Raise the educational attainment of the population, improve the quality of life, and contribute to the economic wellbeing of the New Orleans region; (4) Make optimal use of facilities, faculties, and other academic and fiscal resources associated with the public postsecondary institutions in the region.”
operative at UNO and other regional institutions. In these circumstances, the leadership of both Delgado and UNO are working collaboratively to achieve two goals:

- to develop strong “2+2” articulation agreements, whereby Delgado students who transfer with an A.A. or A.L.S. degree would receive credit from UNO for all sixty units of coursework taken at Delgado; and

- to expand the use of already-available “connection agreements” whereby first-time students who need one or two developmental courses are admitted to Delgado and can transfer seamlessly to UNO after completion of an agreed-upon number of units of coursework beyond the needed developmental course(s).

While “2+2” agreements will surely help students and may increase the flow of upper-division transfer students to UNO, it is the “connection agreements” that may do the most to avert a precipitous decline in freshman admissions at UNO after Fall 2012. As currently being discussed, students in need of developmental coursework would matriculate as Delgado students and would remain such until they complete the prescribed number of units beyond that coursework, but all Delgado courses that they take would be taught on UNO’s campus. Those students, therefore, would do all of their coursework on the UNO campus and would not be visibly different from other UNO students. Moreover, they would matriculate at UNO while still freshmen.

The Interim Chancellor at UNO told the review team that only recently the Chancellor of Nunez Community College (also in the region, on the Westbank of the Mississippi River) indicated an interest in pursuing the same arrangement. Talks between UNO and Nunez are now underway.

**Recommendation:** UNO should continue to negotiate with Delgado and Nunez Community Colleges to expand the use of “connection agreements” for incoming freshmen that will permit first-time freshmen with developmental course needs to receive such instruction from community college faculty on the UNO campus and move seamlessly into UNO after completion of those courses and an appropriate number of additional course units.

UNO should continue to engage in faculty-to-faculty negotiations with Delgado and Nunez Community Colleges to develop articulation agreements to ensure that coursework taken by recipients of Associate degrees at the community colleges will be fully transferable to UNO.

Relations between UNO and the two nearest four-year public institutions, SUNO and Southeastern, are neither as well developed nor as promising as those with the two regional
community colleges. The Chancellor at SUNO has been an active participant in the talks with UNO and Delgado, but apparently no bilateral negotiations between UNO and SUNO have so far resulted from the conversations. Since SUNO confronts the prospect of an even more dramatic enrollment decline than UNO as a result of mandated higher admission requirements (albeit with a 2014 effective date), there may be less disposition on the part of that university to collaborate on programs, but SUNO’s Chancellor seems well disposed to continue discussions and hopes the new UNO president will be interested in promoting collaboration between the respective student bodies and faculties. While the outcomes remain unknown, the three-cornered conversation continues, as the legislation requires. It will be important that the new president of UNO take a leadership role in these talks, particularly where the UNO-SUNO relationship is concerned.

To date, Southeastern has been more of a rival for UNO in the competition for first-time freshmen than a partner in collaboration. The review team received comments from several sources, however, to the effect that it may prove possible and advantageous for both institutions if they can develop some sharing arrangements in programs offered by only one of the two. For example, UNO faculty in Hotel, Restaurant, and Tourism might offer courses for Southeastern students, perhaps even on that campus; conversely, Southeastern faculty in programs not offered at UNO might do the reverse. Despite the lack of a track record of program sharing between the institutions, the possibility might profitably be explored by the new UNO president, since Southeastern’s president seems open to such exploration.

Because SB 266 requires that the Boards of Supervisors for the UL System, Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, and the Community and Technical Colleges, respectively, “adopt by not later than February 1, 2012, a written plan of action” that will meet the goals outlined in the statement of legislative intent (see footnote 10), UNO’s new president will need to take a leadership role in these trilateral conversations immediately upon assuming office.
As discussed earlier, the considerable administrative “flux” that has troubled UNO during the past several years has had significant impact in the area of external relations. Former Chancellor Ryan’s August 2009 reorganization, in particular, had major impact on the whole range of such activities. Those changes included: the positions of Vice Chancellor for Advancement and Vice Chancellor for Technology and Economic Development were eliminated; the Office of Development was moved from institutional operations to the UNO Foundation; the Office of Alumni Affairs was transferred to the Vice Chancellor of Government and Community Affairs; and marketing, public relations, creative services, and the radio station were transferred to report to the Chancellor’s Chief of Staff (and, subsequently, directly to the Chancellor, which is the current situation).

Some of these changes seem to be working relatively well, while others may have had a negative impact on important aspects of UNO’s external relations. As part of the general review of administrative and organizational arrangements recommended earlier in this report, the new president should give careful consideration to the specific areas comprising external relations to determine whether a further reorganization might be beneficial.

Marketing and Public Relations

Fundamentally important to any university’s relations with the external community are the areas of marketing and public relations (including web presence). The issue of marketing, including “branding and imaging,” has been discussed in other sections of this report. Clearly, improvements are needed in this area, as much to assist in student recruitment as to improve UNO’s public image. The review team was told repeatedly, in telephone interviews and throughout the campus visit that UNO has never received the kind of positive attention it merits, a shortcoming that was most obvious in the early weeks after Hurricane Katrina when UNO was the first New Orleans area institution to reopen, yet other regional colleges and universities received more public credit. If the new president is to be as effective in the external community as all hope will be the case, UNO’s marketing and public relations functions will need to be strengthened.

Recommendation: UNO should work to improve relations with local and regional media to ensure strong and positive coverage of the University and its contributions.

Improvement of UNO’s image and marketing capabilities will require special attention to enhancing the university’s website. The review team was encouraged to learn that the Chief
Marketing Officer has strengthened the staff in web strategy and services, and plans to continue to invest, as possible, in this area. The team concurs that this should be an important part of UNO’s communications and marketing strategy under the new president. At this time, the website appears to be underdeveloped and not particularly user-friendly. Significant improvement in the site will help to remedy the endemic problems of internal communication that have plagued UNO as well as to strengthen communication to and with the public.

**Recommendation:** UNO should strive to replicate “best practice” in making the University website user-friendly for students, faculty, staff, and the external community.

**Advancement**

A major change that occurred in 2009 was the transfer of all advancement activities from the direct oversight of UNO’s then-Chancellor to the UNO Foundation, one of the four 501(c)3 operations with which the university has affiliation agreements. The members of this review team believe that this arrangement has had mixed results for UNO. On the positive side, both the current President/CEO and Vice President/CFO of the UNO Foundation previously held senior administrative positions at UNO and are strongly dedicated to serving the best interests of the university. Indeed, former Chancellor Ryan’s decision to move advancement responsibilities to the Foundation was in response to an offer by these Foundation officers to take on the costs and responsibilities for advancement operations, estimated at the time as saving the university approximately $500,000 (currently, according to the Foundation CEO, the UNO Foundation is also contributing $24,000 to augment the interim Chancellor’s salary, approximately $70,000 in operating funds for the Chancellor’s office, $206,000 to support the Office of Alumni Affairs, and $10,000 to support the University Press). All of this represents important non-state revenue for UNO, and the Foundation leadership should be complimented for their contributions in this regard.

On the other hand, the review team has concerns in several areas related to advancement. First, the decision to remove all such operations to a 501(c)3 could potentially weaken the UNO president’s influence over decision-making in this area. Currently, the president is one of three non-voting ex-officio university members of the UNO Foundation Board and, according to the Foundation’s CEO, is able to exercise leadership over strategic and investment decisions (as well as having the right of approval of any gift that might incur obligations on the university). The review team is concerned, however, that if the current Foundation leadership were to be replaced by individuals with lesser ties and/or loyalty to the university, the influence of UNO’s president in advancement matters could be compromised. In addition—and importantly—there appears to be need for an overall review of risk assessment related to UNO’s affiliation agreement with the UNO Foundation (and the other 501(c)3 foundations); it is not apparent to the review team that
such a review has occurred in recent years. The team received assurances that this will shortly be underway.

Recommendation: UNO should ensure that operating agreements with the 501(c)3 foundations operating on its behalf have adequate risk assessment and management safeguards in place.

Another deep concern is the level of fund-raising that is being achieved. In the past year, aside from receiving approximately $10 million in estate distributions, the UNO Foundation raised only $1.5 million in cash gifts. This is a very low standard of performance for any foundation, perhaps a reflection of staffing issues and a lack of presidential leadership. At present, it appears that the Foundation is not staffed sufficiently to undertake the level of fund-raising that UNO will need under a new, energetic president, although the Foundation CEO indicates that there are current plans to add a Major Gifts Officer and a Grants Writer, which should help. In addition to increased staffing, a rejuvenated advancement effort will require broad-based participation across the university and from engaged alumni.

Recommendation: UNO should consider ways to involve alumni, faculty and staff in support of the fund-raising activities coordinated and led by the UNO Foundation Board.

In addition to the UNO Foundation, the university has affiliation agreements with three other 501(c)3 foundations: the Research and Technology Foundation (which operates a Research Park and engages in research and economic development activities), a Property and Housing Development Foundation (which has supported specific construction projects for the University and is slated to be folded into the Research and Technology Foundation), and the Privateer Athletic Foundation (dedicated strictly to the support of UNO Athletics). As suggested above, UNO’s new president should review and assure the risk assessment and management safeguards in the University’s agreements with each of these foundations. The review team has particular concern about the level of contribution to the University by the Privateer Athletic Foundation, as nearly everyone involved with UNO Athletics indicated that little fund-raising has been done by that operation. As the new president reaches a decision concerning the appropriate level of NCAA competition for UNO, the fund-raising potential for Athletics must be an important consideration.

External Affairs

As discussed in Section 5, the procurement of external grants and contracts is considered by many faculty and staff to be one of UNO’s strengths. During the past five years, the university has averaged $29 million in federal and private grants and contracts, with a high of $32,362,836
in 2011. Although this does not seem to the review team to be a particularly strong performance, it does seem that the university has been strategic in identifying opportunities for public funding, and unusually collaborative in developing those strategic directions. Continuing these approaches will be helpful to the new president in enhancing UNO’s public image, as well as in maximizing sources of external funding. If it proves possible, providing additional staffing in this area might be a sound investment.

Alumni Affairs

The 2009 administrative reorganization transferred Alumni Affairs to the Vice Chancellor for External Affairs. The review team is not certain that this is the best arrangement, as it tends to divert an already-overburdened Vice Chancellor from external duties that are vital to UNO. The Office of Alumni Affairs has identified appropriate strategic focus areas (student recruitment and success, communications, donor cultivation, and advocacy), and the director seems to have adequate connections to both the UNO Foundation and the leadership of the UNO International Alumni Association. The team was told that Alumni Affairs has addresses for approximately 35,000 of UNO’s 75,000 alumni. This seems an inadequate basis for building strong alumni support and contributions. Efforts in this area should be expanded.

The new leadership of the UNO International Alumni Association is energetic and enthusiastic. A chapter reorganization is underway that appears to have the potential to energize the Association’s membership further, and its ARC (Alumni Recruiting Crew) program is assisting the university in its student recruitment efforts, not only in the Greater New Orleans area, but in key student recruitment cities such as Houston, Dallas, Atlanta, and Denver. Another of the Alumni Association’s promising partnerships is with Students4Higher, a local non-profit that awards scholarships, as well as mentoring and employment opportunities, to student scholars who are eligible for the State’s TOPS (Taylor Opportunity Program for Students) awards.

As already noted, UNO has an excellent opportunity at this juncture to reconnect with the business community and political leadership of the Greater New Orleans area, and to be part of the region’s economic and social revitalization. The review team’s interactions with legislators and business leaders during the campus visit underscored this opportunity. In particular, the “Foundational” and “Diversifying” focus areas that have been identified by Greater New Orleans, Inc.\(^\text{11}\) include areas that are mostly well aligned with UNO’s existing academic and research strengths. The university’s marketing, public relations, and advancement strategies

\(^{11}\) Foundational (i.e., longstanding) focus areas are international trade, advanced manufacturing, and energy; Diversifying (i.e., new opportunity) focus areas are digital media, medical corridor, and sustainable industries.
could all be linked with these opportunities, creating a synergy that could carry UNO to much greater prominence in the region, as well as produce substantial material benefits. An energetic new president committed to developing existing and potential external relationships could be the catalyst in creating such synergy.
SECTION 11: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1) UNO should initiate a participatory process both campus-wide and with the community in re-affirming the purpose and vision for the future of the institution which should be widely disseminated and broadly and continuously communicated.

2) UNO should re-examine the impact on budget and faculty workload of striving to achieve SREB Four Year-1 status as a part of revisiting the current University Strategic Plan.

3) UNO should conduct a full institutional evaluation of current strategic planning goals, strategic initiatives, objectives, measurable outcomes, established completion dates and responsible units/divisions. These should be reviewed and coordinated with newly established priorities and include broad based campus participation throughout.

4) UNO should implement a campus-wide criterion-based prioritization of all academic and non-academic programs and services, followed by re-budgeting in accordance with established priorities using master planning simulation projections.

5) UNO should review and assure that it has a functional Institutional Research and Planning Office.

6) UNO should establish standard operating procedures for all academic and non-academic units and these should be well coordinated with the policies and procedures of the Board of Supervisors for the University of Louisiana System.

7) UNO should re-examine its budget processes and make such changes as necessary to improve communication and strengthen participation across the campus. Expenditure control is a very significant part of the budgetary cycle and, as such, timely financial information needs to be provided to the campus operating units so appropriate decisions can be made to increase efficiency and effectiveness.

8) UNO should review the online personnel approval process to ascertain whether the current flow is the most efficient method, while maintaining the necessary internal controls.

9) UNO should review the current organizational structure to determine if there might be possible efficiencies in the structures of the Financial Services and Campus Services units.
10) UNO should engage in campus-wide “institutional branding and imaging” via surveys and focus groups. This should be followed by coordination of recruiting, marketing and admissions practices that support the institution’s mission, while taking into full consideration the requirements of the LA GRAD Act.

11) UNO should engage in a rigorous campus-wide coordination of programmatic curricular, academic support, and student affairs services that fully supports the University’s mission and aids in the transition of students from recruitment to admission to persistence to graduation.

12) UNO should re-examine its policies and practices with respect to shared governance, with the objective of improving and strengthening collaborative approaches to University decision-making.

13) UNO should conduct a salary study to determine the extent of salary compression and inversion, and use the results to inform development of a comprehensive faculty salary policy.

14) UNO should increase the availability of training and assistance to faculty in the use of the new Learning Management System (Moodle Rooms).

15) UNO should re-examine policies and practices concerning distribution of indirect costs from sponsored research and contracts, with the objective of maximizing incentives for faculty and staff participation in such activities.

16) UNO should designate an individual from senior management to be the liaison with the Staff Council for improved communication with this group.

17) UNO should review its policy on personnel evaluations to ensure that all employees are being evaluated on an annual basis.

18) UNO should designate an individual from senior management to establish regular monthly meetings with the student leaders and create an atmosphere of shared planning for the development of the institution.

19) UNO should explore means of addressing the needs of all student constituent groups (commuter, residential, traditional, non-traditional, international, in-state, out-of-state, graduate and undergraduate), including especially the adequacy of flexibility in course scheduling to meet the needs of the non-traditional student population.

20) UNO should take the steps necessary, as part of its Student Success Initiative, to ensure regular and adequate academic counseling and support services for student athletes.
21) UNO should develop a strategic plan for athletics, which includes fund-raising and marketing plans, to support the revenue and expenditure projections contemplated in the plan.

22) UNO should review its staffing to ensure that student-athletes are receiving the assistance they need in such areas as medical support, and strength training.

23) UNO should continue to negotiate with Delgado and Nunez Community Colleges to expand the use of “connection agreements” for incoming freshmen that will permit first-time freshmen with developmental course needs to receive such instruction from community college faculty on the UNO campus and move seamlessly into UNO after completion of those courses and an appropriate number of additional course units.

24) UNO should continue to engage in faculty-to-faculty negotiations with Delgado and Nunez Community Colleges to develop articulation agreements to ensure that coursework taken by recipients of Associate degrees at the community colleges will be fully transferable to UNO.

25) UNO should work to improve relations with local and regional media to ensure strong and positive coverage of the University and its contributions.

26) UNO should strive to replicate “best practice” in making the University website user-friendly for students, faculty, staff, and the external community.

27) UNO should ensure that operating agreements with the 501(c)3 foundations operating on its behalf have adequate risk assessment and management safeguards in place.

28) UNO should consider ways to involve alumni, faculty, and staff in support of the fund-raising activities coordinated and led by the UNO Foundation Board.
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Patricia Adams
Faten Ahmad
David Allen
Rose Angeloci
Conrad Appel
Alex Arceneaux
Jonette Aughenbaugh
Austin Badon
Susan Badon
Donald Barbe
Andy Benoit
Darleen Berggren
   David Beriss
   Ashley Bernal
   Lothar Birk
   Gunter Bischof
   Sybil Boudreaux
   Edit Bourgeois
   Rachel Breunlin
   Jane Brooks
   Jim Burgard
   Eileen Byrne
   Debra Carr
   Tammy Causey
   Amy Champion
   Justin Champion
   William Chauvin
   Andre Coudrain
   John Crain
   Lorelei Cropley
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   Susan Danielson
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   Jeanie Decuers
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   Marietta Del Favero
   N Adlai DePano
   Helene Derbigny
   Kraig Derstler
   Nathan DeWeese
   Spring Drake
   Jed Draube
   Brydina Dukes
   Le'Yondo Dunn
   Renia Ehrenfeucht
   Alpha English
   Kenneth Farizo
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   Tom Harrington
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   Marilyn Hayden
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   Susan Hess
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   Jane Hooks
   David Hoover
   Jerome Howard
   Michael Huelshoff
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   Steve Johnson
   Merrill Johnson
   Emily London Jones
   Charlann Kable
   Rachel Kahn
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Christina Keil
Pamela Kennett-Hensel
Judith Kieff
Rachel Kincaid
Joe King
Amy King
Evelyn Kovacs
Susan Krantz
Robert Laird
Enrique LaMotta
Cindy Landry
Steve Landy
Walter (Dub) Lane
Shirley Laska
Lauren Lastrapes
Deborah Lea
Barry LeBlanc
Nick Lorusso
James Lowry
Olie Lundberg
Stephany Lyman
Neal Maroney
Norma Jean Mattei
Christopher McCarter
Kim McDonald
Dennis McSeveney
Alvin Merlin
Pamela Meyer
Billy Miller
Sam Min
Kyrie Miranda
Robert Montjoy
Russell Moore
Norma Jean Mukherjee
Tomas Mulleady
Rosamond Myers
K. Brad Ott
LaJana Paige
Louis Paradise
Erin Patton
Dinah Payne
Bruce Peddie
Steaven Pelous
Adrian Pere
Denise Perez
Albert Peterson
Connie Phelps
Nicole Pottharst
Vincent Prior
Pamela Rault
Johnathan Redmann
Franz Reneau
Anne Boynd Rioux
Mike Rivault
Linda Robison
Catherine Rodgers
Kathy Rodriguez
Paul Rose
Margaret Royere
Becky Rutter
Michael Sapera
Frank Schalou
Paul Schilling
Wendy Schluchter
Peter Schock
Glenn Scorsone
Gregory Seab
Michael Shadders
Robert Shenk
Mirjam Sipos
Mark Slessinger
Tumulesh Solanky
Gary Solomon
Julinana Starr
Emily S Strofe
Denise Strong
Robert Stufflebeam
Edith Talley
Matt Tarr
Charles Taylor
Christopher Taylor
Joanne Terranova
Jim Tucker
Victor Ukpolo
Alexis Vigier
James Vitale
Gerald Whitney
Scott Whittenburg
John Williams
Robin Williams
Carlos Wylie
Sonja Yates
Ron Young
Peter Yaukey
Kenneth Zangla
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME/LOCATION</th>
<th>IR TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>Dr. Joe King</td>
<td>Interim Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>VICE CHANCELLORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Louis Paradise</td>
<td>Interim Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Robison</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Kincaid</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for External Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Whittenburg</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor Office of Research and Sponsored Programs/ Dean of Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-1:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:00</td>
<td>All member</td>
<td>Amy Champion</td>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-2:45</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>Mike Rivault</td>
<td>Marketing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:00</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td><strong>DEANS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Johnson</td>
<td>College of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norma Jean Mattei</td>
<td>College of Engineering (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April Bedford</td>
<td>College of Education (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>College of Business Administration (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Krantz</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon Mader</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4:15-5:15 All members

**UNIVERSITY SENATE**

Andrew Goss  Faculty Senate Chair
Neal Maroney  Vice Chair
Mark Reid  Secretary 10-11
Dinah Payne  Secretary 11-12
Connie Phelps  Chair Policy Committee
Greg Seab  Chair of Committee A
Tammy Causey  Chair of Committee B
Anne Boyd Rious  Chair of Committee C
Christy Corey  Chair of Committee D 10-11
Stephnay Lyman  Chair of Committee D 11-12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME,LOCATION</th>
<th>IR TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td>Bob Lovitt</td>
<td><strong>DEPT CHAIRS</strong></td>
<td><strong>College of Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judith Kieff</td>
<td>Chair of Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lorelei Cropley</td>
<td>Chair of Educational Leadership, Counseling &amp; Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Randall Scott</td>
<td>Chair of Special Education &amp; Rehabilitative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Harmelink</td>
<td><strong>College of Business</strong></td>
<td>Dept of Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walter (Dub) Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Economics and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept Hotel, Restaurant &amp; Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olie Lundberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pamela Kennett-Hensel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Marketing and Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodney Smith</td>
<td><strong>College of Sciences</strong></td>
<td>Dept of Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Schluchter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Tarr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Computer Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahdi Abdelguerfi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Earth &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Kulp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tumulesh Solanky</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory Seab</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Frick</td>
<td><strong>College of Engineering</strong></td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edit Bourgeois</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil and Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donald Barbe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lothar Birk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Schilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tuesday Sept 27

Interview Schedule
as of 9/9/11

Gary Reichard
David Beriss
Peter Schock
David Hoover
Cheyrl Hayes
Eliza Ghil
James Lowry
Andres Goss
Robin Williams
Robert Stufflebeam
Jane Brooks
Michael Huelshoff
David Allen

College of Liberal Arts
Dept of Anthropology
Dept of English
Film, Theater and Communications Arts
Dept of Fine Arts
Dept of Foreign Languages
Dept of Geography
Dept of History
Dept of Music
Dept of Philosophy
Planning and Urban Studies
Dept of Political Science
Dept of Sociology

9:15-10:15  All members  STUDENT LEADERS
John Mineo  SGA President
SGA Officers
Student Life and Leadership
President, Panhellenic
Greeks
Honors

10:30-11:30  All members  SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS
Jeanie Decuers  Vice Chancellor for Campus Services
Jim Burgard  Chief Information Officer
Tiffany Gilmore Soublet  Asst Vice Chancellor of Finance/BUDGET
Michael Dauenhauer  Asst Vice Chancellor of Finance/PROCUREMENT
Jonette Aughenbaugh  Asst Vice Chancellor of Finance/HR
Tom Harrington  Asst. Vice Chancellor for Public Safety
Darlene Berggre  Director Auxiliary Services
Vacant  Asst Vice Chancellor for Facility Services
Becky Rutter  Institutional Research and Data Management
Pamela Meyer  Director of Alumni Affairs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:45</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:30</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>Pam Rault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Dean Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45-2:15</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>Denise Perez, Amy King, Vacant, Adrian Pere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst Dean Student Wellness, Assoc Dean SA/Judicial, Assoc Dean SA/Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Leadership, Asst Dean Counseling and Career Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-4:00</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>FACULTY GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one faculty member from each of the 31 departments who has not already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participated in the interview process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME/LOCATION</td>
<td>IR TEAM MEMBERS</td>
<td>PARTICIPANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td><strong>STAFF COUNCIL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Billy Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marilyn Hayden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Hooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlann Kable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LaJana Paige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy Landry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicole Toussle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Illila Claix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shelita Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sonja Yates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jed Draube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brydina Dukes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dwayne Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-10:15</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUDENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FOUNDATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Gibbs</td>
<td>President and CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eileen Byrne</td>
<td>VP and CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Alvin Merlin</td>
<td>Chairman of the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Exnicios</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barry LeBlanc</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Young</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Lee</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Hess</td>
<td>Community Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-12:45</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>All members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:30</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>Lindsey Hamlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45-2:45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Reichard, Deborah Lea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rodney Smith, Victor Ukpolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Lovitt, John Crain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:00</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>All members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15-5:15</td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>All members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME/LOCATION</th>
<th>IR TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8:00-9:00</strong></td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>Bruce Peddie</td>
<td>Men's Baseball Head Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Slessinger</td>
<td>Men's Basketball Head Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keeshawn Carter</td>
<td>Women's Basketball Head Coach (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Bardsley</td>
<td>Cross Country Asst Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris McCarter</td>
<td>Golf Head Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burzis Kanga</td>
<td>Tennis Head Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Young</td>
<td>Volleyball Head Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:15-10:15</strong></td>
<td>All members</td>
<td>Andy Benoit</td>
<td>Director Office of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emily London Jones</td>
<td>Director Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Arceneaux</td>
<td>Registrar (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Danielson</td>
<td>Director Learning Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:30-11:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PUBLIC FORUM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12:00-4:00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong> &amp; TEAM WRAP UP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
Gary W. Reichard served as Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer for The California State University System from February 2006 until July 2009, with responsibility for leading system-wide academic planning and program implementation, staffing the CSU Board of Trustees Committee on Educational Policy, and working with presidents and provosts throughout the twenty-three-campus CSU system to ensure strong and consistent implementation of system priorities and programs. As Executive Vice Chancellor, Dr. Reichard coordinated the Board of Trustees’ 2006-2008 strategic planning initiative, which produced the CSU’s new system plan, Access to Excellence.

Prior to serving as the CSU system’s chief academic officer, Dr. Reichard held senior leadership positions at California State University, Long Beach, an institution of over 30,000 students. From 2002 to 2006, he served as Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; for the eight years prior, he was Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel, Planning, and Assessment—a position in which he was primarily responsible for faculty affairs and academic labor-management relations. Dr. Reichard’s earlier administrative positions included Director of University Honors (University of Delaware), Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (University of Maryland System), and Dean of Undergraduate Studies (Florida Atlantic University). He has also been a tenured faculty member at each university where he has served, including his initial appointment at The Ohio State University; in addition, he served as History department chair at both Ohio State and Florida Atlantic.

A specialist in recent United States History, Dr. Reichard is widely published in his field, and has contributed numerous papers and presentations on broad topics in higher education. He received his B.A. from the College of Wooster, his Master’s Degree from Vanderbilt University, and his Ph.D. from Cornell University.
DR. RODNEY D. SMITH

Rodney D. Smith received his doctorate of education degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Education in the area of Administration, Planning and Social Policy. In addition, he earned a masters degree in education with a concentration in international development from Harvard University, a master of arts from Fisk University in Educational Psychology and a bachelors in Psychology from Saint John’s University, Minnesota.

Dr. Smith has served in several senior administrative leadership positions, including President of Ramapo College of New Jersey, President of the College of The Bahamas, program coordinator of Harvard’s Institute for Educational Management, vice presidencies in student affairs, administrative services, and planning; as well as, director of strategic planning, dean of the graduate college and professor in the PhD. Program in Educational Management. Dr. Smith has taught graduate courses in Educational Research and Strategy and Strategic Planning.

He has served as trustee, chair or member on several national and international boards, associations and local government committees, (ACE, AASCU, New Jersey Department of Education Board of Examiners, New Jersey Presidents Council, National Association of Student Affairs Administrators, Virginia State Graduate Deans Council, Commerce and Industry Association of New Jersey, Hackensack Medical University Foundation, Council for Adult and Experiential Learning - serving as Chair of the Committee on Lifelong Learning and Higher Education. As Chair, he has led several successful initiatives, including the African-American Jewish Community Relations Symposia. Currently, Dr. Smith is serving on the Board of Directors for the Virginia Peninsula Chamber of Commerce as well as Board Member of the Virginia Peninsula Council for Workforce Development.

Dr. Smith has consulted in areas of strategic planning, fundraising, institutional governance, student affairs, institutional effectiveness, and organizational development. He is currently serving as administrative vice president and chief planning officer with responsibility for leading all strategic and long-range planning efforts, institutional effectiveness, assessment of all academic and non-academic units, enrollment management (admissions, financial aid, and registrar), university athletics (Division 1, NCAA), internal auditor and the office of institutional research (operations analysis and research).
Bob is currently a consultant, specializing in advising colleges and universities on issues relating to the business functions of the entity. Currently he is working on administrative organization issues and privatization on the campus.

Bob served for over 23 years in the role of a Chief Business Officer and CFO at Texas A&M – Corpus Christi and the University of Texas at Dallas before retiring in August, 2008. In those positions, he was responsible for all of the business & finance functions, including capital construction, budget, Human Resources, and Police among other functions. Prior to that, he served in various roles at the University of Houston and the University of Nebraska – Lincoln, while serving Higher Education for over 40 years.

He is a past President of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers (SACUBO) and a former member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO). He has served as a speaker for NACUBO, SACUBO, the Western Association of College and University Business Officers, and the Central Association of College and University Business Officers, among others.
APPENDIX 3
UNO Institutional Review System Transition Survey

Introduction

UNO Institutional Review System Transition Survey

Dear UNO Faculty/Staff/Student:

You have been selected to participate in an important study as part of an Institutional Review that the University of Louisiana System has commissioned in association with the UNO Presidential Search process. Ultimately the results from this survey will help in the transition of the next President of the University of New Orleans.

This particular study has been formulated to discern perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of the University of New Orleans, as well as the opportunities and threats of its environment. This SWOT analysis will be a key resource in shaping the University’s future direction.

We assure you the information you provide will be completely confidential. Only group results will be reported from this survey and at no time will your name be identified with any response. The survey will take about 15 minutes.

Thank you for taking a few minutes to support the University of New Orleans.

Sincerely,

Joe King
Acting Chancellor

Role

Please answer the following:

Your primary role with UNO is (indicate one answer only):

☐ Faculty
☐ Student
☐ Administrative Staff: Academic
☐ Administrative Staff: Non Academic
☐ Non-Administrative Staff

Role Student

If you are a student, please indicate your status:

☐ I am an undergraduate student
☐ I am a graduate student
☐ I am a Post-Baccalaureate student

Section Two

In order to assist the next President of the University of New Orleans, please take a few minutes to outline:

- The top three strengths of the institution.
- The top three weaknesses of the institution.
- The top three opportunities for UNO to become a better institution.

Please outline the top three strengths.

Please outline the top three weaknesses.
Please outline the top three opportunities for UNO to become a better institution.

SWOT

Strengths/Weaknesses

Please indicate whether you “strongly agree”, “agree”, “strongly disagree”, “disagree” or “neither agree or disagree” with respect to each of the following statements. Respond based on your personal experiences — there are no right or wrong answers. If you feel that you cannot adequately respond to any of the statements, please leave that item blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNO has an excellent academic reputation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO offers many academic activities for students such as service-learning, study abroad, undergraduate research, and internships.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has excellent graduate programs.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has excellent undergraduate programs.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO is a friendly campus.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO is a safe campus.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high level of morale is generally exhibited by UNO’s faculty and staff.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has a significant positive impact on the regional community—educationally, economically, and culturally.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has done a good job in attracting quality students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO offers an adequate mix of academic programs.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has well-maintained and attractive classroom and laboratory buildings.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus grounds at UNO are beautiful and well-maintained.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student housing facilities at UNO are attractive.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has a dynamic, exciting student life/co-curricular program for its students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has an effective and supportive teaching and learning environment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has a talented workforce.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has too many graduate students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has low-performing programs that should be eliminated.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO enjoys a positive reputation throughout the New Orleans region.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s students enjoy a strong bond and a high level of interaction with faculty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO is a fiscally sound and well-managed institution.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has effective foundations that contribute to the institution’s mission.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s vision and mission is clear to its stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s vision is appropriate for today and tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO is a multiculturally diverse institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has developed a clear and thoughtful plan to adjust to new admission standards in 2012 required by the Board of Regents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most UNO students have work and family commitments that limit their academic and co-curricular involvement and impact institutional performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has effective and supportive student advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO administrators provide excellent leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has too many undergraduate students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a strong sense of UNO’s academic strengths on-campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has a strong strategic plan with clearly defined goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication across the campus needs to be strengthened and streamlined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO lacks sufficient financial support for faculty scholarship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s budget is insufficient relative to other similar sized institutions in Louisiana.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s tuition, relative to other Louisiana public institutions, negatively impacts student enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and service expectations minimize UNO faculty effectiveness in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s transfer credit policies discourage potential students from attending the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of UNO’s graduation and retention rates negatively impact its ability to attract good students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has inadequate resources for recruitment, retention, and advising of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a strong bond between UNO and local high schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s technology for faculty instruction is excellent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has a strong identity relative to its four-year institutional peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perceived rate of recovery in the city restricts UNO’s ability to attract prospective faculty, staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s technology for faculty research is poor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO collaborates extensively with Delgado Community College.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s technology to enhance student learning is excellent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO collaborates extensively with Southern University at New Orleans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO collaborates extensively with other four-year institutions in its region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Threats/Opportunities

Please indicate whether you "strongly agree", "agree", "strongly disagree", "disagree" or "neither agree or disagree" with respect to each of the following statements. Respond based on your personal experiences – there are no right or wrong answers. If you feel that you cannot adequately respond to any of the statements, please leave that item blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The caché of New Orleans is an important feature on which UNO should capitalize.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO’s location offers opportunities to develop and support programs which could result in increased enrollment in strategically targeted programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A greater focus on excellence with an emphasis on areas in which the campus should grow would be welcomed at UNO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO should do more to enhance the undergraduate experience by using the best practices from throughout the country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative, cross-campus approaches that draw upon the strengths of different faculty and staff are underutilized for instruction, research and service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology could greatly assist outreach efforts to meet the educational needs of place-bound students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology is changing the way on-campus instruction is delivered and represents a significant opportunity to develop new and more effective ways of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO should increase its undergraduate student enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO should become a leader in interdisciplinary and integrated learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More programs that specifically recruit and retain minority students should be developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising admission standards will be good for UNO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets such as Central and South America offer additional opportunities for UNO to recruit academically qualified students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A growing community college system presents a competitive threat to UNO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The growth of on-line universities is something about which UNO needs to be concerned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO has a decreasing ability to compete for and retain top faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a perceived loss of public support towards UNO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today’s high school graduates are not prepared for a university education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local business community stands ready to support UNO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining resources from the state and increasing dependence on tuition revenue will impact UNO’s enrollment and ability to offer excellent degree programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Block 5

Please click the "next button" to complete the UNO Institutional Review Survey. Thank you for completing the survey.
You will be redirected to UNO's webpage.

Role FacStaff

If you are a faculty or staff member, how many years of service do you have at UNO?

- 0 to 5 years
- 5.1 to 10 years
- 10.1 to 15 years
- 15.1 to 20 years
- Over 20 years