

Title: Faculty Other Than Tenure-Track and Tenured: Appointments, Reappointments, Promotions, and Annual Reviews
 Number: PS 36NT.09
 Functional Classification: Faculty & Staff Employment
 Monitoring Unit: Office of Academic Affairs
 Initially Issued: 12/1/1976
 Last Revised: 8/3/2018
 Last Reviewed: 8/3/2018

CONTENTS

I. PURPOSE..... 5

II. DEFINITIONS 6

III. GENERAL POLICY 10

IV. PROCEDURES 11

 A. General Procedural Provisions 11

 1. Confidentiality 11

 2. Meetings..... 11

 3. The Role of Line Officers 11

 4. Conflict of Interest, Recusals, Exclusions, and Other Restrictions 11

 5. Peer Advisor..... 12

 6. Provost's and Deans' Advisory Committees 12

 7. Required Notice of Nonreappointment..... 12

 B. Bylaws of a Department or Other Unit 13

 1. Requirements for a Unit's Bylaws 13

 2. Approval Procedure 14

 C. Eligible Voting Faculty 14

 1. When Faculty Review and Voting Is Required 14

 2. Eligibility to Vote 15

a. Members Added by the Department's Bylaws..... 15

b. The Role of the Unit Leader in Voting 15

c. Members Added by Appointment..... 15

 3. The Manner of Voting..... 16

 4. The Report of a Unit Recommendation 16

D. Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Job Performance	16
1. Scholarship.....	17
<i>a. Illustrative Examples of Scholarly Contributions.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>b. Illustrative Factors and Evidence of Quality.....</i>	<i>18</i>
2. Teaching.....	19
<i>a. Illustrative Examples of Teaching Contributions.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>b. Illustrative Factors and Evidence of Quality.....</i>	<i>20</i>
3. Service.....	21
<i>a. Illustrative Examples of Service.....</i>	<i>21</i>
E. Initial Appointments	22
1. Procedure	23
<i>b. Recommendation to Appoint.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>c. Documentation of Academic Credentials.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>d. Approval Procedure; Official Offer.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>e. References and Background Checks.....</i>	<i>25</i>
2. Qualifications for Appointments.....	25
3. Requirement of an Interview and Faculty Review	25
<i>a. Interview.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>b. Need for Faculty Review.....</i>	<i>25</i>
4. Joint Appointments	25
<i>a. General.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>b. Unit Roles.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>c. Review Processes</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>d. Split Recommendations.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>e. Multicampus Appointments.....</i>	<i>27</i>
F. Annual Departmental Reviews for Faculty	27
1. General Guidelines.....	27
2. Responsible Parties and Duties	27
3. Procedure	28
<i>a. Timetable.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>b. Steps within the Unit.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>c. Acknowledgement of Receipt of Evaluation.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>d. Steps beyond the Unit.....</i>	<i>29</i>
G. Reappointment Reviews	29
1. General Guidelines.....	29

2. Procedure	30
<i>a. Timetable</i>	30
<i>b. Advanced Working Titles</i>	30
<i>c. Steps within the Unit</i>	30
<i>d. Acknowledgement of Receipt of Evaluation</i>	31
<i>e. Approval Process</i>	32
H. Promotion Reviews	32
1. General Guidelines.....	32
2. When a Review Will Be Conducted	32
3. Concurrent Reappointment and Promotion Reviews.....	32
4. The Review Committee	33
5. Evaluation by Experts Outside LSU	33
<i>a. Confidentiality</i>	33
<i>b. The Use of Letters of Evaluation</i>	33
<i>c. Procedure for Selection</i>	34
<i>d. Requirements for Evaluators</i>	34
<i>e. Communications with Evaluators</i>	34
6. Review Committee Report.....	35
7. Recommendation by the Unit	35
8. Notification and Response	36
9. Steps beyond the Unit	37
10. Consideration at Additional Administrative Levels	37
11. Late Events and Evidence	38
12. Disposition of Supporting Material	38
I. Appeals	38
1. Grounds.....	38
2. Procedure	39
V. APPENDIXES	41
Appendix A: Full-Time Faculty Appointments and Terms Covered by PS 36NT.....	42
Appendix B: Eligible Voting Faculty* and Final Approval Authorities**	43
Appendix C: Sample Letter for Notice of Nonreappointment.....	46
Appendix D: Sample Letter to External Evaluator	47

Appendix E: C. V. and Supporting Documentation for PS 36T and PS 36NT	49
1. Documentation.....	49
<i>1.1 History of Assignments</i>	49
<i>1.2 Teaching</i>	49
<i>1.3 Scholarship</i>	50
<i>1.4 Service</i>	51
2. Supporting Material	52
Appendix F: Statement on Academic Freedom	53

I. PURPOSE

These policy statements (PS 36T and PS 36NT), subordinate to applicable federal and state law, the [Bylaws and Regulations](#) of the LSU Board of Supervisors, and [Permanent Memoranda 23](#) and [69](#), seek to articulate the context within which faculty members are evaluated and advance across an academic career at LSU. These policies provide a framework for the appointment, reappointment, evaluation, and promotion of faculty. A mechanism for appeals is also provided. Recognizing the diverse nature of academic disciplines, colleges, schools, and departments, academic units are encouraged to develop their own bylaws pursuant to and within the provisions of these policies.

By means of these policies and procedures, the University seeks to employ and maintain a faculty with superior qualifications to advance its mission and to nurture and support the work of those faculty members, while observing the principles of academic freedom and the tenets of the tenure system. ([Refer to Appendix F.](#))

II. DEFINITIONS

Appointment or Initial appointment: LSU's agreement to employ a person in a faculty position for a specific term.

Bylaws: The rules and procedures adopted by an academic unit for implementation of this policy, which may not contradict campus policy statements or University-wide permanent memoranda.

Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors: The most recent version of the Bylaws and Regulations adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.

College: College, school, or otherwise-named unit that reports directly to the Provost.

Dean: Chief officer of a college.

Department: Academic institute, school, center, college, or otherwise-named unit to which faculty members are assigned to perform their duties. If the unit reports directly to the Provost, then policy references to administrative levels situated between the unit and the Provost are inapplicable. Synonymous with "unit" for the purpose of this policy.

Departmentalized college: A college is said to be departmentalized if it has one or more subdivisions that serve as the home units for faculty.

Eligible voting faculty: The group of faculty constituted to consider and determine, by majority vote, the unit's recommendation with regard to a given decision under this policy.

Executive Vice President & Provost: The chief academic officer of the University, commonly referred to as Provost. For the purpose of this policy statement, the position will be referred to as "Provost."

Faculty (Faculty members): The Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors, 1-2.2.a., state that "full-time members of the academic staff having the rank of instructor or higher (or equivalent ranks) shall constitute the faculty of the campus on which they are appointed." PS 36NT applies only to non-tenure-track faculty.

Faculty member's file: The documents maintained by the academic unit to which the employee is assigned to perform their duties including, where applicable, a current CV and supporting material; the faculty member's annual reports; reports from all reviews conducted under PS 36NT; all annual evaluations; and an index of the file's contents. The faculty member will have access to the file in accordance with [PS 40](#) and applicable law, and may update its contents or add appropriate material at any time.

Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA): Leave granted to eligible employees which enables employees to take up to twelve work weeks for qualifying events. It provides for continuation of

health care premiums when the employee has and wishes to continue health care coverage during the period of approved leave.

Full-time, Part-time: A faculty member at LSU is full-time if employed for 100% of effort, considering the total of their appointment at LSU and LSU-recognized joint appointments, if any, at other institutions; for example, at other LSU campuses. A faculty member is part-time if employed for anything less than 100% of effort. When a faculty member is separately hired by multiple departments for the same or overlapping periods, the appointments will be treated as part-time in each department even if the sum of the part-time appointments equals 100%. If concurrent appointments are concurrently initiated by separate departments and the overall percent effort equals 100%, the appointments will be considered joint appointments and the faculty member will be treated as full-time and will be subject to this policy statement.

HRM: The LSU Office of Human Resource Management.

Job description: A description of a faculty member's duties and work assignments, which at least initially should be in written form but may be modified through, for example, changes in assignment, feedback on annual report of activities, and work plans provided as part of the annual review, and input from the unit leader concerning current expectations. Any changes in the job description must be shared in writing with and acknowledged in writing by the faculty member.

Line officer: President, Provost, dean, or unit leader who supervises the faculty position.

LSU: The flagship campus of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Majority vote: A vote resulting in more affirmative votes than dissenting votes, disregarding abstentions.

Minimum vote: For a vote to be valid, votes must be cast by more than half of the eligible voting faculty on the question, excluding blanks or abstentions.

Part-time: See Full-time, Part-time above.

Peer advisor: A tenured LSU faculty member who serves in an advisory capacity to another LSU faculty member.

Primary appointment, primary/home unit: A faculty member may be employed in two or more units. The primary unit has the responsibility for any review process.

Provost: The chief academic officer of the University, who holds the title Executive Vice President & Provost. For the purpose of this policy statement, the position will be referred to as Provost.

Quorum: A simple majority of faculty entitled to vote on a matter.

Reappointment review: The formal review process used to determine whether a faculty member will be reappointed.

Recuse: To withdraw from a process, or to disqualify oneself from a process, in order to avoid any appearance of bias or impropriety.

Review committee: Either (1) the committee charged with investigating the case for a promotion or (2) the committee charged with a role in the annual review process of an untenured faculty member.

Secondary appointment, secondary unit: A faculty member may be employed in two or more units. Secondary units have obligations in all review processes if there is at least a 25% effort appointment.

Semester: A regular fall or spring semester; not a summer term or intersession.

Supporting materials: Supporting materials are documents that may reasonably be contained in the faculty member's file to demonstrate the faculty member's expertise and effectiveness. Such materials may include teaching portfolios, comments and letters of commendation from students or peers, appointment letters to commissions or review panels, copies of papers and evidence of other scholarly activities, examples of creative and artistic work, CVs, and annual and activity reports.

Tenure: As defined in the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors, tenure is the status of a faculty member who is appointed "indefinitely," or for "indeterminate terms." The Bylaws and Regulations further state that tenure is not a guarantee of lifetime employment but does ensure that the employee will not be dismissed without adequate justification and without due process.

Tenure-track: A tenure-track faculty member is one who is untenured, but who has been appointed to a position for which tenure can be considered and granted.

Terminal degree: The advanced degree offered in a given discipline that is ordinarily the highest qualifying degree required for a faculty position.

Unit: Academic institute, school, center, college, or otherwise-named entity to which faculty members are assigned to perform their duties. If the unit reports directly to the Provost, then policy references to administrative levels situated between the unit and the Provost are inapplicable. Synonymous with "department" for the purpose of this policy statement.

Unit leader: The administrative position with department oversight responsibilities including chair, department head, director, dean or otherwise-titled chief officer.

Year, years: In references to duration of employment service for purposes of PS 36NT, a *year* ordinarily means either (1) two consecutive semesters of full-time service, for a person with an

academic-year appointment; or (2) twelve months of full-time service, for a person with a fiscal-year appointment. For each faculty member, years will be counted from the beginning of the initial appointment.

III. GENERAL POLICY

This policy statement exists within the context of the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors and Permanent Memoranda 23 and 69, and it codifies procedures for faculty members at LSU's comprehensive, research-intensive flagship institution. This policy statement mandates a process for faculty appointments, reappointments, promotions, tenure (when applicable), and annual reviews. Faculty are to be evaluated based on the merits of their performance as productive scholars, teachers, and members of the academic community. The personnel actions described above are approved at appropriate administrative levels as delegated by the Board to the President and outlined in University policy.

The present policy statement (PS 36NT) does not increase or diminish legally enforceable rights of the University or of its employees that may derive from applicable law, LSU policies and procedures, regulations, contracts, or written commitments.

PS 36NT applies to all persons holding a full-time faculty appointment that is not eligible for tenure. See [Appendix A](#) for the pertinent position titles and terms of appointment. Provisions for these appointments, as well as for adjunct faculty and other part-time academic rank positions, are stated in [PM 23](#), entitled *Ranks, Provisions, and Policies Governing Appointments and Promotions of the Academic Staff*. This policy statement does not apply to those positions described in PS 36T.

A person who holds a rank covered by PS 36NT may apply for any available University position, including tenured or tenure-track positions, for which they qualify. That person will be considered in accord with the policies that govern an initial appointment to the position. Any promotion to any faculty rank must adhere to campus process on promotion and tenure matters.

IV. PROCEDURES

A. General Procedural Provisions

1. Confidentiality

Every effort should be made to ensure confidentiality in the processes of PS 36NT. The files generated in connection with these processes are governed by PS 40, entitled *Employee Records Confidentiality*, as well as applicable law.

2. Meetings

For each provision in PS 36NT that calls for one person to meet with another, or for a group to meet, a face-to-face conference is preferred when practical. However, a meeting by telephone or other means is acceptable as long as it allows discussion.

3. The Role of Line Officers

The Provost or the Provost's designee will ensure that all policies and procedures are observed. The Provost will also promulgate pertinent timetables and mandate the form and content of documents needed to comply with this policy.

It is the responsibility of the dean and unit leader to promulgate information regarding any deadlines and procedures required by the policies of a unit. This will include establishing deadlines to ensure that the applicable notice requirements of the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors are satisfied.

The unit leader will ensure that with regard to each decision made pursuant to this policy, all appropriate members of the faculty, including those who are on leave and/or absent from campus, will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to be informed, to express views, and to cast votes.

4. Conflict of Interest, Recusals, Exclusions, and Other Restrictions

A conflict of interest will require recusal from all PS 36NT processes. A faculty member will be presumed to have a conflict of interest with regard to a decision affecting the faculty member's own employment or a candidate who is a member of the faculty member's immediate family as defined in PS 25. If there is a question as to whether a conflict of interest exists, the issue will be referred through the unit leader and dean to the Provost, who will make a final determination with the advice of HRM.

Line officers who have a conflict of interest with regard to a decision must not be involved with that decision process. Whenever a line officer does not participate in a given decision, the officer to whom that person reports will designate a replacement for the purposes of that decision.

Faculty members who make a recommendation pursuant to this policy at any level above the department must recuse themselves from votes and deliberations on the issue at the department level.

A faculty member who serves in an advisory capacity on a decision at any level above the department will participate in the process at the department level but must, at the later stage, disclose the previous participation and refrain from any advisory vote.

A faculty member who has received notice of nonreappointment or termination is ineligible to participate in the PS 36NT process.

5. Peer Advisor

When conferences are held as a part of the annual review process or for purposes of notifying the faculty member of a decision made pursuant to this policy, the faculty member may invite an LSU faculty member to serve in an advisory capacity to the faculty member and to attend the conference. Conference attendees at the department level are the unit leader and the candidate (with peer advisor, if desired). The same group and the dean constitute the attendees at the college level.

6. Provost's and Deans' Advisory Committees

To help ensure rigorous and thorough reviews, advisory committees, established in advance and composed of senior faculty, will be employed by the Provost and by the deans of departmentalized colleges when considering recommendations for promotions.

- a. The Graduate Council will annually appoint, subject to the Provost's approval, the Provost's Advisory Committee from its membership.
- b. In each departmentalized college, an advisory committee or committees will be established as determined by the dean unless the college rules provide otherwise.

While deans' advisory committee recommendations will not become part of appointment or review files, the dean will incorporate the vote and comments by the advisory committee in the dean's recommendation. Each dean (or line officer) is solely responsible for writing evaluations and making the recommendations at the college level, using criteria consistent with the criteria for evaluating faculty job performance enumerated in this policy.

7. Required Notice of Nonreappointment

A decision not to reappoint a faculty member may be reached through a reappointment review process or as otherwise authorized by the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors (Chapters II and V). Such a decision requires no further administrative or Board of Supervisors' approval. Except when the action is due to financial exigency, written

notice of the decision will ordinarily be provided in accordance with the following schedule as provided in Chapter II, Section 2-7 of the Bylaws and Regulations:

- a. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service in the current appointment, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination;
- b. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service in the current appointment, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during the academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination; or
- c. At least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service on that campus.

A decision of nonreappointment will not be suspended during an appeal. Upon expiration of a term appointment, the former faculty member is a free agent to whom LSU has no obligation.

B. Bylaws of a Department or Other Unit

To establish the most effective faculty governance and to make due provision for the varying characteristics of departments and other units, their disciplines, and their circumstances, PS 36NT grants an important role to bylaws that a unit may adopt to further specify and regulate the policies and procedures dealt with by PS 36NT. Bylaws must be written, voted upon by eligible voting faculty, and disseminated to all constituents.

1. Requirements for a Unit's Bylaws

As a general rule, all faculty (tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenured) vote on matters in the unit's bylaws. An exception is any unit bylaw pertinent to the subject matter of PS 36T. Bylaws related to promotion and tenure must meet the following requirements:

- a. A unit's bylaws may not conflict with the bylaws of its college or with any University policy statements, permanent memoranda, the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors, or otherwise applicable state or federal law.
- b. Unit bylaws specific to PS 36T may be made or amended by majority vote of the eligible voting faculty appropriate to that action, including the unit leader or dean, who serves as the presiding officer.
- c. The Provost may designate additional LSU faculty members to serve, on an ongoing basis, on a unit's rulemaking body when there are fewer than six faculty with tenure in the unit.

Designations that may be adopted by a unit to make distinctions as to functions performed or reviews completed among faculty members within the unit (for example, senior instructor and other working titles) which are not defined in PM 23 (*Ranks, Provisions, and Policies Governing Appointments and Promotions of the Academic Staff*) will not be recognized as University ranks or titles and will not grant the faculty member any additional rights and/or responsibilities.

2. Approval Procedure

The unit leader or dean of each unit must promulgate the unit's bylaws, and in particular must provide the current version of the unit's bylaws to the dean, the Provost, and the Faculty Senate. The Provost may require a change in the unit's bylaws, based on a finding that they are inconsistent with the bylaws of an administrative unit to which it reports, inconsistent with a University policy, or contrary to the interests of the University.

C. Eligible Voting Faculty

The tenured and tenure-track faculty in each department have a steward's role in the University's governance and leadership. Faculty members should engage in meaningful, rigorous, and comprehensive evaluations when making key personnel decisions to ensure that the interests of the department are considered in broad perspective. See [Appendix B](#) for a table illustrating the composition of the eligible voting faculty for various decisions and final approval authorities.

1. When Faculty Review and Voting Is Required

- a. A faculty review and vote is required for each initial appointment to the rank of professional-in-residence, or to any rank within the research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series.
- b. A department's or college's bylaws may specify that a faculty vote is also required for some or all initial appointments to other ranks covered by the present policy.
- c. A faculty review and vote is required for every promotion to a rank covered by PS 36NT. Whenever a promotion review is undertaken at the same time as a reappointment review, a faculty vote to address the reappointment question may also be required depending on length of reappointment and years of service, as provided in this policy statement.
- d. Every appointment or reappointment in which the term will be for a period longer than one year requires a faculty review and vote.
- e. A faculty review and vote is required for a reappointment in which the working title of senior instructor, senior general librarian, distinguished instructor, or distinguished general librarian is being considered.
- f. A department's or college's bylaws may specify additional conditions under which a faculty review and vote will be required for a reappointment.

g. In addition, the unit leader may require a faculty review and vote to be part of any initial appointment or reappointment decision.

h. Faculty review and vote will not be required for personnel actions in the Laboratory School except as may be specified in the school's bylaws.

2. Eligibility to Vote

If a faculty review and vote is required by the department's or college's bylaws, but is not mandated by the present policy, or in any case of an initial appointment, those bylaws may define the eligible voting faculty differently and may, for example, designate a committee to represent the larger group of eligible faculty voters. For those decisions for which a faculty review and vote is mandated by PS 36NT, the eligible voting faculty is defined in [Appendix B](#).

a. Members Added by the Department's Bylaws: A department may determine that certain faculty members have suitable rank (same rank or above) and expertise to participate in making a given kind of decision. Accordingly, the bylaws of the department may provide which categories of faculty will be enfranchised and for which decisions. For example, the bylaws may provide that faculty who hold secondary appointments in the department, and who otherwise qualify, will be eligible to vote. If this provision results in a faculty member having membership in more than one department on the same decision, voting will be allowed in only one department.

b. The Role of the Unit Leader in Voting: The unit leader will be a member of the review process at meetings of the eligible voting faculty regardless of faculty rank or tenure status. As the presiding officer, the unit leader has the duty to be impartial. The unit leader does not take part in the discussion other than providing requested factual information, nor does the unit leader take part in the faculty voting because the unit leader must make an independent evaluation and written recommendation.

c. Members Added by Appointment: For a decision that is to be made in a primary or secondary unit, the number of eligible voting faculty as determined by the provisions above will sometimes be fewer than six in number. In such a case, it may be desirable and practical to improve the range of expertise of the committee, for the decision in question, by adding members. The unit leader, the eligible voting faculty, or (in the case of a reappointment or promotion) the candidate may ask the line officer to whom the unit leader reports to appoint additional members. If the line officer receives such a request or believes additional members are needed, then after consulting the unit leader and the present members of the committee, the line officer may elect to appoint additional members, bringing the total number up to as many as six. Written explanation of the relevant qualifications will be submitted to the dean, who will make the final decision and appointment. In all cases, a minimum of three members is necessary for a review and vote to occur. The appointees must hold rank and tenure status at LSU as required to vote on the

particular action and may not already be a member of the faculty on the same decision in another department. The appointments will be subject to approval by the Provost.

3. The Manner of Voting

To establish a decision or recommendation on a PS 36NT matter, ordinarily the unit leader must call a meeting of the faculty, hold a discussion, take a vote by written ballot, and provide a reasonable opportunity for participation by all eligible voting faculty members. A quorum must be present at the meeting. The unit leader will establish and carry out procedures and practices to ensure that, to the extent possible without excessive delays, all members of the eligible voting faculty, including those who are on leave and/or not in residence, will be afforded a reasonable opportunity to be informed, to express views, and to cast votes. Every count will be made and attested to by at least two members of the eligible voting faculty. The tally, including separate counts when taken, will be reported to the voting faculty. The confidentiality of each faculty member's vote will be maintained.

4. The Report of a Unit Recommendation

Whenever the eligible voting faculty arrive at a recommendation—with regard to initial appointment, reappointment, or promotion—the report of the recommendation will include:

- a. A tally of the vote;
- b. The number of eligible voting faculty members who did not vote;
- c. The eligible voting faculty report, written and signed by a faculty member who is not the unit leader, which includes:
 - i. An account of the important factors underlying the faculty's recommendation, including minority views discussed at the meeting; and
 - ii. Analysis and explanations, as needed, with regard to letters from outside experts, in cases when those are included. The identity of the external reviewers and their institution should not be included in the report.
- d. The unit leader's report and recommendation with regard to the decision.

Unless the bylaws of the department or college require otherwise, the unit leader will assemble the report of the unit recommendation.

For recommendations/decisions made without broader faculty participation, the report will consist solely of the unit leader's independent judgment and recommendation with regard to the decision.

D. Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Job Performance

These guidelines will govern every evaluation of a faculty member's job performance and every decision with regard to initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion.

Declaration of financial exigency and changes in existing and prospective needs, resources, and other conditions may affect decisions regarding faculty members governed by PS 36NT. In the absence of such factors, these guidelines will be observed in the evaluation of every faculty member's job performance with regard to initial appointment, reappointment, or other personnel action.

The appropriate considerations are those that are pertinent to the faculty member's job responsibilities, which will consist of a supporting role in one or more of the three traditional areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The weight to be accorded each will be consistent with the department's mission and with the faculty member's job duties and work assignments. The extent and nature of expectations may also be described in the bylaws of the department and in approved written contracts.

Essential to every evaluation and decision are the fundamental expectations of intellectual honesty; cooperative, ethical, and professional conduct; respect for others' rights and safety; and the avoidance of disruptive or combative behavior that interferes with the work of the unit. A failure to meet these fundamental expectations must be considered, and will have a negative effect, whenever a faculty member is evaluated.

No provision in PS 36NT will be used or interpreted to suppress freedom of speech or the right to dissent.

1. Scholarship

Scholarship is an essential purpose of the University and of every unit. The term scholarship is used here in a broad sense to signify contributions to knowledge, in the disciplines appropriate to the department, including traditional, contemporary, hybrid, and interdisciplinary scholarship. The candidate's scholarship must be at a level of quality and significance that is competitive by national or international standards.

In every case for appointment, reappointment, or promotion, when scholarship is part of the job requirements, achievement is essential, and quality is of the essence. In every case it is the responsibility of the appropriate group of faculty to arrive at a judgment of the importance, originality, influence, persistence, and future promise of the candidate's program of work. It shall be the general policy of the University to utilize evaluations by experts outside LSU in the formation of this judgment.

a. Illustrative Examples of Scholarly Contributions: Examples of scholarship that are valid and will be recognized, depending on the unit, include the following. This list is not exhaustive.

- i. Books, essays, articles, or bulletins reporting the results of original research

- ii. Books, essays, articles, or bulletins contributing to research, including pedagogical research
- iii. Novels, poetry, plays, exhibitions, or musical compositions performed at local, regional, national, and/or international locations and institutions
- iv. Participation in musical performances or theatrical productions performed at local, regional, national, and/or international locations and institutions
- v. Creations, performances, or installations in the visual arts, theatre, video, film, or other media
- vi. Professionally recorded, produced, and distributed musical performances.
- vii. Development of patents, processes, or instruments
- viii. Membership in scientific expeditions
- ix. Designs and built works
- x. The delivery or application of technology
- xi. Scholarship that arises from community engagement or community-engaged scholarship
- xii. Other scholarly contributions to the profession as appropriate to the discipline

b. Illustrative Factors and Evidence of Quality: Examples of appropriate factors and evidence that may contribute to a judgment of the quality of scholarly contributions include the following.

- i. Publication by respected academic journals and publishing houses that accept work only after review and approval by experts
- ii. Published reviews by experts
- iii. Citations in research publications or other evidence of impact
- iv. Awards for excellence, especially from national or international academic and professional organizations
- v. Invitations to give performances, presentations, exhibitions, or lectures at local, regional, national, and/or international locations and institutions

- vi. Grants and contracts to fund research activities, especially by national or international agencies or foundations

2. Teaching

The University exists for the development and the dissemination of knowledge and understanding, and for the conduct of excellent instructional programs. This may include national and international teaching activities beyond LSU. Every faculty member with teaching as a responsibility is expected to be reliable, committed, and highly competent in the performance of assigned teaching duties, to contribute to the teaching mission of the department, and to perform an appropriate role in the development of curricula and of educational policy.

Characteristics of an excellent teacher include intellectual honesty, command of the subject, organization of material for effective presentation, cogency and logic, ability to arouse students' curiosity, stimulation of independent learning and creative work, high standards, and thoughtful academic mentoring.

If teaching is a part of the department's mission, then in every case for appointment, reappointment, or promotion, it is the responsibility of the appropriate group of faculty to arrive at a judgment as to the quality of the candidate's teaching.

a. Illustrative Examples of Teaching Contributions: Examples of contributions to the teaching mission that are valid and will be recognized, depending on the unit, include the following. This list is not exhaustive.

- i. Classroom instruction and the conduct of courses on and off the LSU campus, including study abroad
- ii. Conduct of seminars, critiques, and practica both on and off campus and at international locations and institutions
- iii. Direction of independent study
- iv. Direction of creative and artistic projects
- v. Informal student seminars
- vi. Supervision of students in clinical work
- vii. Integration of academic service-learning into a course
- viii. Involvement of students in research and publication both on and off campus and at international locations or institutions

- ix. Multidisciplinary and interdepartmental teaching both on and off campus and at international locations or institutions
- x. Direction of a thesis or dissertation
- xi. Articles on pedagogy
- xii. Redesign of a course, or development of a new course
- xiii. Innovation in teaching methods, including instruction that has an impact on the community and community partnerships
- xiv. Instruction that embeds engaged learning into a community environment
- xv. Contributions to committees and other entities concerned with teaching, curricula, or educational policy
- xvi. Publication of textbooks or other materials relevant for teaching by respected publishing houses
- xvii. Textbook adoptions at other universities

b. Illustrative Factors and Evidence of Quality: Examples of appropriate factors and evidence that may contribute to a judgment of teaching quality include the following.

- i. Observation of classroom teaching or of other presentations
- ii. Statements by the candidate of personal educational philosophy
- iii. Evaluations by peers, including those at other institutions, of course syllabi or other instructional materials
- iv. Student performance on departmental examinations or standardized tests
- v. Students' subsequent success or demonstration of mastery
- vi. Honors or special recognition for teaching excellence
- vii. Invitations to teach in programs at other national and international educational institutions
- viii. Invitations to give lectures and panel presentations that pertain to teaching at local, national, and international locations or institutions

- ix. Evaluations of teaching and testimonials by present or former students. Any sampling of student opinion should be carried out in such a manner so that students can state their judgments freely and without fear of reprisal.
- x. Grants and contracts to fund teaching activities or provide student stipends, especially by national agencies or foundations
- xi. Development of joint academic programs with other institutions including international partner institutions
- xii. Courses that have been vetted through special designation in the course catalog (e.g., service-learning courses and communication-intensive courses)
- xiii. Impact of teaching or teaching materials on the community or a community partner

3. Service

The term service is used to mean *other contributions to the department, the University, the academic profession, or the broader national or international community that support the primary missions of scholarship and teaching*. In some cases, specific service will be a substantial and explicit part of a faculty member's work, as specified in the rules of the department or as specified in the faculty member's job duties and work assignments. Such is the case, for example, when the faculty member occupies an administrative position or when part of the mission of the department is to deliver benefits of its knowledge, disciplines, and skills to the local, national, and international communities. In such a case, the faculty member is expected to be reliable, committed, and highly competent in the performance of the assigned duties.

The responsibilities of the faculty as a whole include determining educational policy, playing a central role in faculty personnel decisions, and participating in shared governance in other areas of University life. All faculty members are expected to remain informed, participate in meetings, and cast votes. Also, a faculty member's service to the local, national, and international communities or to the profession beyond the campus may confirm recognized stature in scholarship and teaching, may enliven the intellectual climate on campus, and may improve opportunities for students and other faculty. High-quality contributions of these kinds will be valued when evaluations are made, and may have weight in decisions on appointment, reappointment, and promotion. Civic and community service that is not based on a faculty member's professional or academic responsibility, though admirable, will not have weight. Further, a faculty member's service is governed by the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors, LSU permanent memoranda and campus policies, as well as the provisions of the Code of Ethics for Government Employees.

a. Illustrative Examples of Service: Examples of contributions to the community at large that are valid and will be recognized, depending on the unit, include the following. This list is not exhaustive.

- i. Clinical consultation, evaluation, assessment, treatment, patient management, specialty service, or diagnostic support, provided through University-affiliated hospitals and clinics
- ii. Service rendered to the community as a part of courses taught
- iii. Participation on a certification board
- iv. Expert advice to professions, businesses, or government
- v. Holding office or other position of responsibility in a professional organization
- vi. Participation in a governmental body
- vii. Holding an administrative office in the University
- viii. Advisory role with a student organization
- ix. Committee work for the department, college, or LSU
- x. Contributions toward faculty or staff training and development
- xi. Leadership in technology transfer, economic development, or job creation
- xii. Taking part in the organization of a conference
- xiii. An editorship or editorial board membership
- xiv. Refereeing or reviewing scholarly works or grant proposals
- xv. Judging student or professional competitions
- xvi. Consultation for industry, agriculture, or government
- xvii. Community-engaged scholarly service or service to community entities and partners that is mutually beneficial, or contributions that benefit the public or community and are considered non-University service (e.g., expert advice and consultation)
- xviii. Scholarly services to external entities that are mutually beneficial
- xix. Collaboration between LSU and the larger community for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity
- xx. Administration of grants

E. Initial Appointments

Every initial appointment to a rank covered by PS 36NT, including part-time or part-year appointments at those ranks, will require at least a master's degree or the equivalent in graduate study or professional experience. Those who teach University courses must have completed at least 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and hold at least a master's degree, or hold the minimum of a master's degree with a major in the teaching discipline. In some cases, with the Provost's approval, professional experience and demonstrated contributions to the teaching discipline may be substituted for formal academic credentials.

1. Procedure

The following provisions govern the steps leading to the initial appointment of a non-tenure-track faculty member, including the recruitment and evaluation of candidates by the department. In special cases, a person may be proposed for an appointment from outside the department. For such an appointment, the eligible voting faculty recommendation, documentation of the candidate's academic credentials, and the approval process are still required.

a. The Unit Leader's Responsibility: The unit leader is responsible for developing a hiring strategy in consultation with the tenured and tenure-track faculty and with other faculty where appropriate, securing budgetary commitments from the dean, determining the job description and qualifications, advertising the position, recruiting qualified persons to apply, screening applicants, ensuring compliance with PS 1 (*Equal Opportunity Policy*) and PS 25 (*Nepotism*), and making the recommendation to appoint, including salary, term, and other conditions of the appointment. To perform these tasks, the unit leader should establish procedures and appoint committees, and may delegate other responsibilities where appropriate.

The unit leader shall carry out hiring responsibilities in a manner that recognizes all faculty members are entitled to be informed about the processes; to have access to the application files; and to provide their written evaluations of applicants for inclusion in the application files.

b. Recommendation to Appoint: When the unit leader calls a meeting of the eligible voting faculty and takes a vote, the faculty are not limited to approving the appointment of a given candidate for a position, but may adopt a motion to give more complex instructions to the unit leader. For example, in consideration of possible rapid changes in the availability of candidates under discussion, the faculty may approve more than one candidate for a position, ordering the list by preference and/or allowing the unit leader to exercise discretion.

c. Documentation of Academic Credentials: For every appointment, the required academic credentials must be documented through official transcripts of the academic record. If a degree is required but has not been awarded, then there must be written certification, by the appropriate office of the degree-granting institution, that all requirements for the degree have been completed.

d. Approval Procedure; Official Offer: The unit leader of the department will forward to the dean an appointment file, comprising the following items:

- i. The candidate's Curriculum Vitae (CV) and appropriate supporting material, including all letters of evaluation;
- ii. The report of the department's recommendation including a vote tally on appointment at rank;
- iii. The proposed employment contract signed by the unit leader of the department; the contract will name all the participating departments and will identify the primary department; and
- iv. The unit leader's recommendation, explaining as necessary the terms of the contract.

In the case of a recommended initial appointment with an annual salary exceeding limits set by PM 69 (*Delegation of Authority to Execute Personnel Actions*), and/or to a position with a modified title indicating particular distinction, the recommendation will require the approval of the dean and Provost. When this is not the case, the final approval level depends on the proposed faculty rank. Appointments in units that report through the Office of Research & Economic Development and that require approval beyond the level of dean will be routed to the Vice President for Research & Economic Development before they are forwarded to the Provost.

If the proposed appointment is to instructor, general librarian, or professional-in-residence, or to the rank of an assistant professor in visiting, research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series, then the dean will make the final decision. The dean's decision is also final if the proposed appointment is for a half-year or less regardless of rank.

In all other cases, these provisions apply: If the dean recommends approval of the appointment, the proposed contract will be signed and forwarded along with the candidate's CV and documentation of academic credentials to HRM for procedural review and routing to the Provost. In the event the dean does not support the offer, a written statement will be included with explanation to that effect. The Provost will make the final decision on the recommended initial appointment of an associate professor or professor in one of the series listed above.

When a recommendation reaches the Provost, the option always exists for a final decision against the appointment. If the Provost favors the appointment and the President's approval is required, the Provost will sign the proposed contract and send it through HRM to the President for the final decision.

When final approval has been secured, the signed contract will be returned to the unit leader. Only then will the position be offered to the candidate and the contract sent for consideration, and only then will any University officer make a written or oral commitment regarding any aspect or condition of the appointment. A line officer may have preliminary discussions with

the candidate prior to this time as long as those discussions establish that the line officer is not making an offer of employment.

e. References and Background Checks: At least three references should be contacted by the unit leader or unit leader's designee to verify information listed on the CV, vouch for professionalism in the work environment including collegiality, and endorse the potential for success relative to the job description. When files require consideration beyond the college, references should either be written letters of recommendation, or other written summaries of contact with the identified person providing the reference. Criminal background checks will be conducted by HRM. An offer of employment is contingent upon completion of a background check deemed satisfactory by HRM. The background check must be complete before the date of employment. Background checks revealing misrepresentations may be grounds for immediate rejection of the application.

2. Qualifications for Appointments

In every case, the qualifications required for an initial appointment must be consistent with LSU PM 23 and the criteria for evaluating faculty job performance in this policy; must be appropriate to the mission of the department and to the job duties and work assignments anticipated; and must be in keeping with the standards of the department and University for the rank of the position.

In a case when a degree is required but has not been awarded, the University may, at its discretion, extend the offer of the position, but only on this condition: the appointment will be made only if the appropriate office of the degree-granting institution has, by a specified date, provided written certification that all requirements for the degree have been completed.

When a degree is required for a position, but LSU has not received the certification that the requirements for that degree have been completed, the University may still, at its discretion, make the appointment, under conditions that will be stated in the contract. Written certification must be received within 12 months for contract renewal.

3. Requirement of an Interview and Faculty Review

a. Interview: An interview is desirable but not required for an initial appointment.

b. Need for Faculty Review: For an initial appointment to professional-in-residence, instructor with a multiyear term, general librarian with a multiyear term, or any rank in the research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series, a faculty review committee is required, and the provisions of the present subsection govern the procedure.

For an initial appointment to instructor, general librarian, or any rank in the visiting series, no faculty review committee is required, and references to a committee in this policy do not apply—except as may be specified otherwise by the bylaws of the department or college.

4. Joint Appointments

a. General: Faculty in ranks covered by PS 36NT may be jointly appointed to more than one department and, in some cases, more than one campus within LSU. The primary purpose of such shared appointments is to support faculty whose expertise spans traditional disciplinary boundaries and to encourage interdisciplinary activities in established and emerging areas of discourse and research. Such appointments require shared responsibilities between units with respect to initial appointments, reappointment, mentoring, promotion, and annual performance evaluations. A memorandum of understanding outlining the distribution of responsibilities and expectations of the faculty and units will be established, reviewed by HRM, signed by the Provost when multiple campuses are involved, and provided to the faculty member. For joint appointments *within* the LSU campus, the dean(s) must approve the memorandum of understanding and have final signature authority.

If the concurrent appointments are collectively initiated by the departments involved and the overall percent effort equals 100%, the appointments will be considered joint appointments and the faculty member will be subject to this policy statement. When a faculty member is separately hired by multiple departments for the same or overlapping periods, the appointments will be treated as part-time in each department even when the sum of the part-time appointments equals 100%.

b. Unit Roles: In cases of a joint appointment, the memorandum of understanding shall designate an academic department or unit as the primary appointment. Secondary appointments or units may be another academic department, research center, or other institutional entity.

c. Review Processes: All faculty, whether jointly appointed or not, should be evaluated for appointment, annual review, reappointment, and promotion by their departmental and disciplinary peers. Moreover, when a faculty member's discipline crosses departmental lines, it is essential that these interdisciplinary points of view are solicited and fully considered during the review process. Unit recommendations for appointment, reappointment, or promotion could be based on (1) discussions and/or voting by the appropriate eligible voting faculty within their unit; (2) independent review of materials and annual reviews by the unit leader of the secondary unit; or (3) a combination of the two. This process should be described in the memorandum of understanding, and kept as similar as possible across faculty appointments to maintain consistency.

For joint appointments, the faculty member will be responsible for one self-evaluation that will be in format for and meet the deadline of the primary unit. The unit leader of the primary unit will be the only reviewing officer and will be responsible for ensuring that contributions from secondary unit(s) are part of their review process. The unit leader(s) of the secondary unit(s) will be responsible for forwarding written recommendations to the unit leader of the primary appointment or unit.

Because of the shared nature of these positions, all units with a significant financial interest (at least 25%) in the appointment must be represented and consulted in the primary unit's

hiring, review, and promotion processes. Such representation can include consultation regarding the candidate's appointment, reappointment, and promotion, and annual reviews; reports from shared faculty mentoring between units; external letters requested from scholars in secondary disciplines; and/or collaboration on annual reviews by a representative unit leader.

d. Split Recommendations: In the case where there is a split recommendation for reappointment, any degree-granting academic unit which supports reappointment shall have the option to recommend to the dean the faculty member for reappointment and become the sole participating unit.

e. Multicampus Appointments: Faculty appointments shared by multiple campuses within LSU are governed in accordance with LSU [PM 23](#). A memorandum of understanding outlining the distribution of responsibilities and expectations of the faculty and campuses will be established and provided to the faculty member. For joint appointments across campuses, the chief academic officers must approve the memorandum of understanding and have final signature authority.

F. Annual Departmental Reviews for Faculty

1. General Guidelines

All faculty are subject to reporting requirements, and are entitled to regular and accurate reviews and evaluations. The University will maintain an electronic file on each faculty member, including annual reports and evaluations. The annual review process should be understood and carried out in keeping with the principles of academic freedom, and with the awareness that faculty work is in large part a matter of multiyear projects and commitments. The importance of a single year's report or evaluation will often be incremental in nature, as the process is a framework for businesslike and collegial communication. For those faculty with teaching responsibilities, course evaluations will be conducted and considered. The process will disclose and identify the strengths and weaknesses in job performance that may have a bearing on rewards or other decisions affecting the faculty member. The unit leader will offer advice and assistance for the remediation of negative factors, if any.

PS 36NT describes the minimum requirements of the process. The department or college may adopt its own rules and procedures in conformity with this policy.

2. Responsible Parties and Duties

In each annual review process for a faculty member, there will be only one reviewing officer, the unit leader. The reviewing officer will have primary responsibility for the process, but will incorporate evaluations by others as appropriate. The reviewing officer must request input from any other unit or administrative office where the faculty member has at least a 25% appointment. When the faculty member has at least a 50% administrative appointment—for example, as the unit leader—the line officer to whom the faculty member reports will be the sole reviewing officer. When appropriate, [PS 111](#) (*Consultation with*

Faculty in Certain Reviews of Administrative Performance) should be followed for faculty input.

The unit leader is responsible for ensuring that all courses taught within the unit are subject to regular student evaluations. For faculty with teaching responsibilities, some form of student evaluation of the faculty member is mandatory, and this gathering of student opinions should be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that students are free to convey honest opinions without fear of reprisal. Faculty members should be informed about the results of the student evaluations by the unit leader in a timely manner after they are gathered; conveyance of this information should not be delayed until the annual review.

3. Procedure

a. Timetable The annual review process will occur every year for every faculty member, except those being reviewed for reappointment or promotion, or those who have been given notice of nonreappointment or termination. Other exceptions: A faculty member may suffer from documented physical, mental, or emotional illness, or other condition, to such a degree that a job performance evaluation cannot reasonably proceed in disregard thereof. In such a case the reviewing officer, acting under the guidance of HRM and with approval by the line officer to whom the reviewing officer reports, may suspend or modify the annual review process. See [PS 59](#), entitled *Employee Assistance Program*.

b. Steps within the Unit: This portion of the annual review process will consist of the following steps:

- i. Each year the unit leader will give appropriate notice to faculty members to bring the documentation in their files up-to-date, and to prepare an annual report on their professional activities. Faculty members may choose or be required by unit bylaws to include a self-evaluation.
- ii. If required by a unit's rules or if the unit leader requests a faculty review, the unit leader will provide the necessary information to the appropriate review committee, which will conduct a full review of job performance resulting in a written report that will become part of the faculty member's file.
- iii. After giving due consideration to all the contents of the file, the unit leader will prepare and sign a document, called the unit leader's evaluation. The unit leader is free to delegate all or part of its preparation while remaining responsible for its content; it represents the unit leader's independent judgment. The department's rules may further specify and regulate the unit leader's evaluation. The unit leader's evaluation will incorporate any notice of upcoming review for reappointment or promotion and the unit leader's evaluation of the faculty member's job performance.

The unit leader's evaluation includes by reference all the contents of the faculty member's file. The unit leader may allow this material to speak for itself, or may summarize or discuss its significance. The unit leader's evaluation must be based on the faculty member's job

duties, work assignments, or work plans, as appropriate. The unit leader's evaluation must observe the guidelines for criteria for evaluating faculty job performance set forth in this policy. In evaluating the faculty member, the unit leader may be brief, and need not engage in systematic rankings, comparisons, or classifications. The unit leader must provide an overall evaluation of either satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

If in the unit leader's view the faculty member's job performance in any way fails to meet appropriate expectations regardless of the overall evaluation, the unit leader will clearly state this and will call for improvements. In so doing, the unit leader must be specific and must offer appropriate advice and assistance.

iv. The unit leader will provide to the faculty member any review committee report and the unit leader's evaluation. The unit leader may meet with each faculty member to discuss the evaluation, and must do so if either the unit leader (or any person acting for the unit leader in preparing part of the document) and/or the faculty member requests such a discussion. The unit leader must notify all faculty of the right to provide a formal letter of response or rebuttal, with materials in support thereof, or to send such letters and materials to the unit leader and to the dean, and that this right must be exercised within seven calendar days. The unit leader is responsible for including any response in the faculty member's file.

c. Acknowledgement of Receipt of Evaluation: The unit leader's evaluation will be signed by the faculty member, under a statement that will read, at least in part and in effect, as follows:

My signature indicates that:

- i. I am aware of the contents of my file and have had the opportunity to bring it up-to-date and to provide my annual report;
- ii. I have been notified of and had the opportunity to read the unit leader's evaluation;
- iii. I have exercised, or else waived, my rights to discuss the evaluation with the unit leader; and
- iv. I understand that I have the right to provide a formal letter of response or rebuttal, with materials in support thereof, within seven calendar days to the unit leader and to the dean.

d. Steps beyond the Unit: The unit leader will provide the dean with the review committee's report, when one exists, the unit leader's evaluation, and any response from the faculty member. If the dean makes comments or recommendations pertaining to the faculty member, they will become part of the file and will be shared with the unit leader and the faculty member. If the faculty member has entered a letter of response or rebuttal, HRM will circulate the file to the Provost.

G. Reappointment Reviews

1. General Guidelines

A term appointment or a series of term appointments carries no assurance of reappointment or promotion. Reappointment is made solely at the initiative of the University.

2. Procedure

a. Timetable: Reappointment reviews are normally conducted in a time frame that allows for timely notice of nonreappointment as provided in the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors. A reappointment review will occur based on the expiration date of the faculty member's current appointment; pertinent college or department rule; instruction from the line officer to whom the unit leader reports; or at the discretion of the review committee, provided one is allowed by pertinent policy or rules. Note that for faculty on one-year appointments, the annual review is also the reappointment review. The length of reappointment shall be consistent with the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors.

b. Advanced Working Titles: Following six years of full-time (100% effort) continuous employment as an instructor or general librarian with consecutive satisfactory annual reviews, these faculty may be eligible to receive the working title of senior instructor or senior general librarian, respectively. Following six years of full-time (100% effort) continuous employment as senior instructor or senior general librarian, these faculty may be eligible to receive the working title of distinguished instructor or distinguished general librarian, respectively. Faculty members awarded these advanced working titles normally are placed on three-year contracts, renewable based on satisfactory annual reviews and three-year reappointment. The awarding of the working title senior instructor, senior general librarian, distinguished instructor, or distinguished general librarian does not equate to de facto tenure or a permanent appointment.

c. Steps within the Unit

i. Faculty committee reviews are required as part of the procedure for reappointment decisions in the following situations: the term will be for a period longer than one year; reappointment of an instructor, general librarian, or professional-in-residence would result in continuation of full-time service beyond the sixth year; or an instructor or general librarian has applied for senior instructor, senior general librarian, distinguished instructor, or distinguished general librarian status as described in this policy.

In all such cases, the faculty committee review must take place, even if the continued availability of the position in question is uncertain. Unless a concurrent promotion review is being conducted, a review committee will be established as provided in the department's rules; or, if the rules do not address the matter, then the committee will be established by the unit leader. If reappointment and promotion are being concurrently considered, the review committee may be the entire eligible voting faculty or a subset thereof.

- ii. The unit leader will give appropriate notice for the faculty member to bring the CV and supporting documentation in the faculty member's file up-to-date, and to prepare a comprehensive report documenting professional activities. The faculty member may include a self-evaluation.
- iii. The unit leader will ensure that the faculty member's file contains the reports from all formal evaluations that have been completed.
- iv. The unit leader will make the file available to the members of the review committee for their examination. The review committee will conduct a full review of job performance resulting in a written report and recommendation.
- v. The unit leader will establish a date to convene the eligible voting faculty to consider the file, discuss the faculty member's job performance, and vote on whether to recommend reappointment. The unit leader will not be included in the vote. The report of the departmental recommendation will be placed in the faculty member's file.
- vi. After considering the recommendation of the review committee, if applicable, the unit leader will make a decision, which is final.
- vii. The unit leader will meet with the faculty member to communicate the recommendation, provide copies of the departmental report, and explain the options and procedural steps that will follow. The unit leader must notify the faculty member of the right to provide a formal letter of response or rebuttal, with materials in support thereof, and that this right must be exercised within seven calendar days. The unit leader is responsible for including any response in the faculty member's file. If the decision is negative, the unit leader will provide written notification of nonreappointment in accordance with the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors. A sample letter is provided in [Appendix C](#).

d. Acknowledgement of Receipt of Evaluation: The unit leader's report and recommendation will be signed by the faculty member, under a statement that will read, at least in part and in effect, as follows:

My signature indicates that:

- i. I am aware of the contents of my file and have had the opportunity to bring it up-to-date and to provide my annual report;
- ii. I have been notified of and had the opportunity to read the report and recommendation with regard to my appointment;
- iii. I have exercised, or else waived, my rights to discuss the report and recommendation with the unit leader from each unit in which I am employed; and

iv. I understand that I have the right to provide a formal letter of response or rebuttal, with materials in support thereof, within seven calendar days to the unit leader and to the dean of my primary unit.

e. Approval Process: In all cases, the unit leader will send to HRM a request to carry out the decision. HRM will coordinate finalizing the personnel action as appropriate.

H. Promotion Reviews

1. General Guidelines. This section describes the process for reaching a decision on one of the following actions: promotion from a non-faculty position to a non-tenure-track position; promotion from one non-tenure-track position to another; or promotion within non-tenure-track ranks.

2. When a Review Will Be Conducted

a. A promotion review will be initiated only as provided by this policy statement and is not mandated to occur at any given time with reference to a candidate's years of service.

b. A promotion review requires the better part of a year for completion. All activities related to a review must be timed to conform with the current timetable set by the Provost and communicated through HRM, and with the timetables set in colleges and departments for their parts in the process.

c. A promotion review for a given faculty member may be proposed by the unit leader, proposed by a member of the appropriate faculty review committee, or requested by the faculty member. The unit leader will provide timely notification to the appropriate faculty review committee when a request for nonmandatory review has been made. After consideration by the review committee, the unit leader will consider the vote and determine if the review will be conducted. The unit leader will immediately advise the candidate of the decision. If the unit leader's decision is to not review, the candidate may then ask the line officer to whom the unit leader reports to consider the matter. That line officer will make the final decision to either uphold the unit leader's decision or order that a review will be conducted.

d. A faculty member holding a rank in the visiting series at LSU who receives a promotion at his or her home institution may receive the corresponding change of rank within the series without the formal LSU promotion review process, thus without review committee participation.

3. Concurrent Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

A reappointment review and a promotion review may be conducted concurrently and always will be for faculty limited to one-year appointments (instructors and those in the visiting and clinical specialist series). The decision on reappointment may be positive even when the promotion decision is negative. Accordingly, the review committee will make a report and

recommendation on all decisions being considered, and the decision procedures (on reappointment and/or promotion, as the case may be) will proceed together, with a vote on each decision by the eligible voting faculty. The final decision on the reappointment and notification of the candidate will not in any event be delayed by reason of the promotion review procedures. If the final decision on the reappointment is negative, then the consideration of the promotion will proceed no further.

4. The Review Committee

The review committee for a faculty member under review may be the entire eligible voting faculty or a subset thereof, led by someone other than the unit leader, and appointed by the unit leader unless otherwise provided by the department's rules. When outside experts are to be asked for letters of evaluation, the review committee will take part in their selection.

5. Evaluation by Experts Outside LSU

This stage is required for every promotion to instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor in the research series. It is also required in any case when scholarship is a substantial part of the job duties, or when the recognition and repute of the candidate's scholarship beyond the campus are important to the case for promotion. As a matter of courtesy to those who are asked to write letters of evaluation, ample time should be allowed for this process.

Whether or not this stage is required, its regulations are not intended to hamper the use of letters of evaluation which chiefly address areas other than scholarship.

a. Confidentiality: The identity of every outside expert who is asked to write an evaluation will be kept confidential to the extent possible. In particular, the candidate will not be informed as to the identity of the evaluators. During the review, the candidate should not communicate on the subject of the review with anyone suspected to be an evaluator.

The content of every letter will be kept confidential to the extent possible, as required by PS 40 (*Employee Records Confidentiality*) and applicable law. Access to the letters will be limited to the eligible voting faculty members, the unit leader, and staff members as necessary, and to other persons beyond the department who are authorized participants in the review process.

b. The Use of Letters of Evaluation: Every letter of evaluation obtained from evaluators who meet the requirements below during the current review or during previous reviews of the candidate must be included in the review file, with the following exceptions. The age of a letter will be measured from the date on the letter to the date of the deadline for submission of the review file by the department. Letters received after the consideration and vote by the department faculty will not be accepted.

i. A letter that is more than two years old will be excluded unless the letter is current on all aspects of the faculty member's record and the review committee concurs that its inclusion is appropriate.

ii. A letter that is two years old or less may be excluded provided the evaluator has written a more recent letter to replace it.

c. Procedure for Selection: The review committee will ask the candidate, the unit leader, and the eligible voting faculty members to suggest outside evaluators, and also to list potential outside evaluators who, by reason of a bias or conflict of interest, should not be chosen. The review committee and the unit leader will jointly select a list of evaluators to ask for letters, and subsequently may make changes in the list. At least one evaluator suggested by the faculty candidate and at least one not on the candidate's list are required. Each evaluator must be approved by the dean before a contact is made to request a letter.

d. Requirements for Evaluators: The following standards and objectives must be observed. Exceptions require approval of the line officer to whom the unit leader reports.

(1) The evaluators from whom letters are obtained must, taken together, have expertise that reasonably covers the areas of the candidate's work.

(2) Each evaluator with a university faculty position must hold tenure and a rank higher than that of the candidate.

(3) Each evaluator must have appropriate professional standing. Examples include: a faculty position at a U.S. university whose Carnegie classification, with regard to research and advanced study, is at least that of LSU; and a research position at a government or private-sector research agency, institute, or laboratory.

(4) A person known to have a bias or conflict of interest relevant to the case will not be asked to serve as an evaluator.

(5) Letters of evaluation must be obtained from at least three persons from different institutions.

(6) Letters of evaluation may not be obtained from the candidate's major professor for any graduate degree, or from the candidate's postdoctoral advisor for any graduate degree.

e. Communications with Evaluators: The unit leader—or the review committee's designee—will manage communications with the evaluators including those from secondary units. Preliminary contacts may be made with evaluators to determine their ability and willingness to serve, and a request for a CV or other information may be made, if needed, to provide an accurate and appropriate description of an evaluator's qualifications. The letter requesting a letter of evaluation must comply with the model provided in [Appendix D](#), except for variations approved by the line officer to whom the

unit leader reports. The candidate's CV will be enclosed. The candidate, in consultation with the unit leader (or the review committee's designee), may select supporting material to be enclosed also.

6. Review Committee Report

The committee will add all outside evaluations to the review file along with:

- a. The name and address of everyone asked to write an evaluation;
- b. For each evaluator, a brief statement of qualifications, including academic rank and institution of employment;
- c. A sample letter used to request the evaluations; and
- d. Explanatory notes as needed, at the discretion of the unit leader or review committee.

The unit leader will take appropriate measures to ensure that confidentiality of this matter in the review file is maintained.

The review committee will then consider all material in the review file, including the letters, and will prepare a report. The committee report must be a comprehensive statement on the case, observing the relevant criteria for evaluating faculty job performance. This report will be placed in the review file.

7. Recommendation by the Unit

The composition of the eligible voting faculty depends on the action being considered and the rank of the person under review. ([Refer to Appendix B.](#))

- a. The unit leader will make the review file available to the eligible voting faculty for their study when the following items have been compiled:
 - i. The candidate's CV in the format required by the University ([Refer to Appendix E](#)), and other documentation as required by the college or department;
 - ii. Copies of the unit leader's annual evaluations together with attachments, if any, by the faculty member;
 - iii. All outside evaluations to the review file along with:
 - (a) The name and address of everyone asked to write an evaluation;
 - (b) For each evaluator, a brief statement of qualifications, including academic rank and institution of employment;

(c) A sample letter used to request the evaluations; and

(d) Explanatory notes as needed, at the discretion of the unit leader or review committee.

iv. The preliminary report of the review committee if available. The committee report must be a comprehensive statement on the case, observing the relevant criteria for evaluating faculty job performance. The unit leader will take appropriate measures to ensure that confidentiality is maintained.

b. The unit leader will convene the eligible voting faculty to consider the case and to vote on their recommendation on the promotion. The unit leader does not take part in the discussion or voting, but provides factual information when requested by the eligible voting faculty.

c. The unit leader will provide a statement indicating the unit leader's own recommendation. This statement must include the vote of the eligible voting faculty.

d. The final report of the unit's recommendation will be prepared and placed in the review file. The final report will incorporate the preliminary report of the review committee, revised as appropriate to reflect the deliberations of the eligible voting faculty. In cases when more than one candidate is being considered for the same action, the report will not rank the faculty members.

8. Notification and Response

a. The unit leader will meet with the candidate to communicate the recommendation unless the candidate elects not to do so.

b. The unit leader will provide copies of the reports written under the provisions of items 7.c and 7.d above, to the candidate, excluding the part that must be kept confidential. Any information identifying external reviewers will be redacted from the reports provided to the candidate.

c. The unit leader will advise the candidate of the right to write a formal response for inclusion in the file; any response must be submitted to the unit leader no later than seven calendar days after the date when the candidate is advised of the recommendation. If the review file is being forwarded to the next administrative level, the response must also be sent to the line officer to whom the unit leader reports.

d. Acknowledgement of Receipt of Evaluation: The unit leader's report and recommendation will be signed by the faculty member, under a statement that will read, at least in part and in effect, as follows:

My signature indicates that:

- i. I am aware of the contents of my file and have had the opportunity to bring it up-to-date and to provide my annual report;
- ii. I have been notified of and had the opportunity to read the report and recommendation with regard to my appointment;
- iii. I have exercised, or else waived, my rights to discuss the report and recommendation with the unit leader from each unit in which I am employed; and
- iv. I understand that I have the right to provide a formal letter of response or rebuttal, with materials in support thereof, within seven calendar days to the unit leader and to the dean of my primary unit.

9. Steps beyond the Unit

- a. If either the eligible voting faculty or the unit leader makes a positive recommendation on the promotion, the unit leader will forward the review file to the line officer to whom they report for consideration.
- b. If the faculty committee and the unit leader agree that the promotion should not be granted, that will be the final decision on promotion—unless the candidate requests in writing that the review file be forwarded to the line officer to whom the unit leader reports for consideration. The report will also include a recommendation regarding reappointment where applicable.

10. Consideration at Additional Administrative Levels

The Provost and deans will employ advisory committees of tenured, tenure-track, and other faculty as they deem appropriate for additional administrative reviews. No officer will make rankings of candidates. The steps of additional administrative reviews, which occur if the review file is forwarded by the unit leader to the unit leader's line officer, will be as described in this section. If the candidate withdraws from the promotion review at any point by means of a written request to the line officer currently holding the review file, consideration of the promotion will proceed no further.

- a. When both the eligible voting faculty and the unit leader have made a negative recommendation on the promotion, if the reviewing officer concurs in the negative recommendation, then the reviewing officer's decision will be final as delegated by the President. The reviewing officer will notify the unit leader and the candidate, and will meet with the candidate.
- b. When the dean is the line officer to whom the unit leader reports and 10.a does not apply, the dean will review the decision, forward a recommendation and the review file to the Provost, and notify the unit leader and the candidate of the recommendation. If the

dean's recommendation is negative, or if the candidate requests it, the dean will meet with the candidate.

c. When 10.a does not apply and the decision is submitted to the Provost for review, the Provost will consider the review file and will forward a recommendation and the review file to the President.

d. The President will review the file and make the final decision. The President or the President's designee will notify the candidate of the decision.

11. Late Events and Evidence

After the unit leader has forwarded the review file, evidence may appear or events may occur that are substantial and pertinent to the decision being made. Either the candidate or any one of the line officers involved may send such information to the line officer currently holding the file, and it will then be added to the file. The candidate and all the line officers will be advised of such an addition to the file but will not halt the process, nor will the addition require the process to start over.

12. Disposition of Supporting Material

Supporting material remains in the unit until the review process is finalized but may be requested by a reviewer at any subsequent stage of the review process. Supporting material provided by the faculty member should be returned to the faculty member who is recommended for promotion after final approval by the President. Supporting material for a candidate who is not recommended for promotion should be retained at the department level for at least five years after the final decision. In cases involving grievances, administrative review, or litigation, the review file should be retained until such actions are resolved.

I. Appeals

After the completion of a decision at the final approval level regarding a reappointment or promotion, a faculty member may appeal the decision seeking the reversal or other modification of the decision in question.

1. Grounds

A faculty member can appeal decisions solely on the basis of procedural error, meaning one (or more) of the steps outlined in PS 36NT was either omitted or improperly carried out. Examples of such errors include, but are not limited to: failure to follow procedure outlined in PS 36NT; bias in selection of external reviewers; conflict of interest of an external reviewer; and a vote cast by an ineligible faculty member.

A faculty member may not appeal on the basis of substance or merit of the decision. Disagreement between the faculty member and others who considered the case on the quality and quantity of the work presented may not be considered on appeal.

2. Procedure

a. In order for an appeal to be processed and heard, the faculty member must submit, within 30 calendar days of receipt of a final decision under this policy, a written appeal to the unit leader and the dean describing the basis for appeal and the requested resolution. In submitting an appeal, a faculty member is free to present all information and evidence the faculty member considers pertinent.

b. The dean, in consultation with the unit leader, will consider the appeal and submit a written response to the faculty member within 14 calendar days, excluding holidays as enumerated in [PM 5](#) (*LSU Holiday Schedules*), of receipt of the appeal.

i. If the dean agrees with the appeal and has authority to implement the decision, the dean will notify the faculty member in the written response of the dean's intent to do so.

ii. If the dean agrees with the appeal but lacks the authority to implement the decision, the dean will forward the appeal and the dean's written response to the Provost. The dean will notify the faculty member that the matter has been forwarded.

iii. If the dean does not agree with the appeal, the dean will notify the faculty member in writing.

c. If the faculty member accepts the dean's decision, the faculty member should notify the dean in writing within 14 calendar days. If the faculty member either accepts the decision or does not respond, the decision will be implemented.

d. If the faculty member rejects the dean's decision and wishes to continue the appeal, the faculty member must submit a written notice of appeal to the Provost, copied to the dean, within 14 calendar days following receipt of the dean's written response. The faculty member has the option to request that the Provost submit the appeal to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee for an advisory opinion, but any such request must be submitted in writing to the Provost along with the notice of appeal.

e. If the faculty member requests that the matter be submitted to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee for an advisory opinion, the Provost must submit the appeal and accompanying documentation to the committee. The Provost may elect to submit the appeal and accompanying documentation to the committee even if it has not been requested by the faculty member.

f. The Faculty Senate committee will be given 30 contiguous calendar days during the academic year to consider the appeal and render an advisory opinion to the Provost. The

written report submitted to the Provost will address the concerns of the faculty appeal, and if procedural errors are identified, the report will reference relevant sections of this policy.

g. The Provost will act within 14 calendar days of receipt of the Faculty Senate committee's advisory opinion, if one is timely submitted, or upon the expiration of the 30-day period if no timely advisory opinion is received.

The Provost will act within 14 calendar days of receipt of the appeal if the faculty member does not request an advisory opinion from the Faculty Senate committee and if the Provost has not elected to obtain one. The Provost will either provide a written response to the appeal or, if there is a conflict of interest or similar impropriety in considering the appeal, the Provost will refer the matter directly to the President for final review and action.

h. Decisions by the Provost will be handled in the following manner:

i. If the Provost agrees with the appeal and has authority to grant the request, the Provost will notify the faculty member in the written response of the intent to do so.

ii. If the Provost agrees with the appeal but lacks the authority to grant the request, the appeal and the Provost's written response will be forwarded to the President, and the faculty member will be notified in writing.

iii. If the Provost does not agree with the appeal and therefore denies the appeal, the Provost will notify the faculty member in writing.

i. If the faculty member accepts the decision of the Provost, the faculty member should notify the Provost in writing within 14 calendar days. If the faculty member either accepts the decision or does not respond, the decision will be implemented.

j. If the faculty member rejects the Provost's decision and wishes to continue the appeal, the faculty member must submit a written notice of appeal to the Provost, copied to the dean, within 14 calendar days following receipt of the Provost's written response. The Provost will ensure that the entire appeal file, including the original appeal, all written responses, any additional documentation, and any advisory opinions, is transmitted to the President for final review and decision.

k. The President will notify the faculty member of the decision in writing within 30 calendar days, copying the Provost and the dean.

V. APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Full-Time Faculty Appointments and Terms Covered by PS 36NT

Title	Appointment
Instructor	Specified term, ordinarily one year, but no more than three years
General librarian	Specified term, ordinarily one year, but no more than three years
Professional-in-residence	Term not to exceed three years
Visiting series	Term not to exceed one year
Research series	Specified term, ordinarily not to exceed three years
Clinical specialist series	Term not to exceed five years
Professional practice series	Specified term, ordinarily not to exceed three years

Appendix B: Eligible Voting Faculty* and Final Approval Authorities**

Action	Rank	Eligible Voting Faculty***	Final Approval Authority AUTHORITY
Appointment for a half-year or less	Any rank covered by PS 36NT	Review committee not required except as specified by rules of the unit or by unit leader	Dean
Appointment	As instructor or general librarian with a one-year term, or assistant professor in the visiting series	Review committee not required except as specified by rules of the unit or by unit leader	Dean
Appointment	As senior or distinguished instructor, or senior or distinguished general librarian with a multiyear term	All tenure-track and tenured faculty or a committee of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and instructors or general librarians with the same distinction or above	Dean
Appointment	As professional-in-residence	All tenure-track and tenured faculty or a committee of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and professionals-in-residence	Dean
Appointment	As assistant professor in research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series	All tenure-track and tenured faculty or a committee of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and assistant professors, associate professors, and professors in the same series	Dean
Appointment	As associate professor or professor in the visiting series	Review committee not required except as specified by rules of the unit or by unit leader	Provost

Appointment	As associate professor in research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series	Associate professors and professors in tenured or tenure-track positions, and associate professors and professors in the same series	Provost
Appointment	As professor in research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series	Professors in tenured or tenure-track positions, and professors in the same series	Provost
Reappointment for 1 year or less	Any rank covered by PS 36NT	Review committee not required except as specified by rules of the unit or by unit leader	Unit leader
Reappointment for term longer than 1 year	Any rank covered by PS 36NT	All tenure-track and tenured faculty and non-tenured faculty holding higher ranks within the same series, excluding visiting series	Unit leader
Reappointment with the working title of senior instructor, distinguished instructor, senior general librarian, or distinguished general librarian	As instructor or general librarian	All tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and senior instructors or senior general librarians and instructors or general librarians with the same distinction or above	Dean
Promotion	From instructor to professional-in-residence	All tenure-track and tenured faculty, and professionals-in-residence	LSU President
Promotion	To assistant professor in research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series	All tenure-track and tenured faculty, and assistant professors, associate professors, and professors in the same series	LSU President

Promotion	To associate professor in research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series	Associate professors and professors in tenured or tenure-track positions, and associate professors and professors in the same series	LSU President
Promotion	To professor in research, clinical specialist, or professional practice series	Professors in tenured or tenure-track positions, and professors in the same series	LSU President

*Review committees will not be required for personnel actions in the Laboratory School except as may be specified in the school's rules.

**Overarching policies may impact final approval authority.

***All voting faculty must be full-time employees.

Appendix C: Sample Letter for Notice of Nonreappointment

[*Date*]

[*Address*]

This letter serves as notice that your existing appointment expires on [*date*]. In accordance with the provisions of Chapter II, Section 2-7 of the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors, this provides you with proper notice that your contract will be extended through [*date*] and will not be renewed beyond [*date*]. Accordingly, your employment will end effective [*date*], close of business. As is our normal practice, academic-year appointments will be in a nonpaid status between academic years and semesters, and will be assigned no duties unless approved for additional compensation.

Your appointment remains subject to the rules of the University and the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors. You are encouraged to contact the HRM Benefits Service Center for information regarding continuation of insurance coverage and options for disposition of retirement benefits upon separation.

Sincerely,

[*Name of department head*]

[*Title, department*]

xc: LSU Office of Human Resource Management

Appendix D: Sample Letter to External Evaluator

Dear [---]:

[---], who is currently [*position/rank*] in the Department of [---] at Louisiana State University, is under consideration for promotion to [*position/rank*]. The department would be most grateful if you would prepare and send us an evaluation of the candidate to assist us in making this decision. A CV and [---] are enclosed for your use. [*Further description or explanation of enclosures, as necessary. The letter or the enclosures should make clear the degree of the candidate's teaching and service responsibilities.*]

[*Include if applicable:*] We realize that you wrote us previously about this candidate on [*date*]. A copy of that letter is enclosed. University procedures require that we ask you for an updated letter at this time, to ensure that any further developments have been appropriately addressed. [*Include further clarification as necessary.*]

We request that your letter respond to the following points:

1. State whether you have known the candidate personally and, if so, during what time period and in what capacity.

2. We seek to form an objective assessment of the candidate's [*research / --- (Scholarship being defined in a broad sense, the wording here should be appropriate to the department)*]. We wish to apply national standards, and we would be grateful if your letter addresses the matter in those terms. To that end, please consider responding to each of the following questions.

(a) How widely and to what degree is the candidate's work recognized?

(b) What is the scope and significance of the candidate's program of work?

(c) Does the candidate's record suggest promise for future growth as a [*scholar---or other appropriate wording, depending on the discipline*]?

3. Compare the candidate's achievements with those of other persons when they were at the same career stage, who have received the corresponding promotion, in cases with which you are familiar.

4. Assess the candidate's abilities as a teacher, if you are in a position to form an opinion. [*The wording here may be chosen as appropriate to the position/discipline.*]

5. Assess the candidate's service to the profession, if you are in a position to form an opinion. [*The wording here may be chosen as appropriate to the position/discipline.*]

6. Provide any additional insights or advice that you believe should be considered as we make our decision.

LSU makes every effort to maintain confidentiality of external reviewer identities. While the overall sentiment or citations may be shared with the candidate, complete letters with the author's identity are normally only shared with those individuals who participate in the decision process. Under the Louisiana Public Records Act, however, all documents related to promotion and tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, may be public records subject to lawful requests to the University for viewing and/or copies.

To be useful to us in the decision process, your response should arrive by email by *[date]*. We thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please feel free to contact me for further information at *[phone number and email address]*.

Sincerely,

Appendix E: C.V. and Supporting Documentation for PS 36T and PS 36NT

The following extensive listings describe material outlined in PS-36-T and PS-36-NT Criteria Statement (Section IV) which should be considered in the reappointment review and the promotion and/or tenure review of a candidate. These items are not arranged in order of importance. With the exception of the history of assignments, all Documentation and Supporting Material should be compiled and furnished by the candidate. It is the candidate's responsibility to insure the accuracy and authenticity of the Documentation and Supporting Material.

1. Documentation

These records must be submitted with the LSU Promotion/Tenure Review Request form in the order listed through appropriate review channels. Each item should be listed only once.

1.1 History of Assignments:

A report prepared by the chair describing assignments for teaching, scholarship, and service.

1.2 Teaching:

1.2.1 Documentation of teaching activities. Provide summary data only.

1.2.1.1 Teaching Evaluations: results of student evaluations of teaching.

1.2.1.2 Teaching history

* Courses taught, including interdisciplinary and off-campus courses. (Course number, title, location, semester, and enrollment)

* New courses developed. (Course number, title, location, semester, and enrollment)

* Graduate committees: chair or member

1.2.2 Listing of publications concerning instruction [Published items only]: All authors should be listed in the order they appear in the publication or manuscript.

1.2.2.1 Textbooks

* Entire books

* Laboratory manuals

* Portion of a book (specify exactly what portion)

1.2.2.2 Shorter Works

* Chapters or essays in books, except for textbooks

* Articles in refereed journals or bulletins: Journals of national and international reputation; all other refereed journals

* Other Publications

1.2.2.3 Edited books with scholarly introductions or notes by the editor

* Collections of previously unpublished material, correspondence and diaries

* Collections of scholarly essays

* New editions of previously published works

* Translations

1.2.2.4 Recordings

* Video or audio recordings produced for presentation on radio or television.

* Video or audio recordings produced for public distribution.

1.2.2.5 Instructional material—multimedia, electronic, etc.

1.2.2.6 Miscellaneous—Any pertinent item not covered above such as bibliographies, book bibliographies, book reviews, abstracts, other video or audio recordings, articles in non-refereed journals, etc.

1.2.3 Listing of publications concerning instruction accepted for publication but not yet published: Include all available pertinent information.

1.2.4 Participation in:

1.2.4.1 Professional Meetings, Symposia, Workshops, and Conferences on teaching (other than artistic performances): List the meetings, date, and location, and indicate the nature of the participation, e.g., reading a paper, critiquing, organizing, or chairing sections.

1.2.4.2 Local instructional activities (guest lectures, etc.)

1.2.5 Other instructional activities or other contributions to the profession:

1.2.5.1 Membership in professional organizations;

1.2.5.2 Administrative duties;

1.2.5.3 New teaching methods/material developed, etc.

1.2.6 Awards, lectureships, or prizes that show recognition of teaching achievement.

1.2.7 Research Support/Grant Activities aimed at advancing one's ability to teach: Activities should be enumerated by clearly describing funding proposals which were submitted and projects which were funded.

1.3 Scholarship:

1.3.1 Listing of research publications [Published items only]: All authors should be listed in the order they appear in the publication or manuscript.

1.3.1.1 Books and Monographs: include place, publisher, and date of publication.

1.3.1.2 Shorter Works

* Chapters or essays in books, except for textbooks

* Articles in refereed journals or bulletins: Journals of national and international reputation; all other refereed journals

* Other Publications

1.3.1.3 Edited books with scholarly introductions or notes by the editor

1.3.1.4 Collections of previously unpublished material, correspondence and diaries

* Collections of scholarly essays

* New editions of previously published works

* Translations

1.3.1.5 Recordings

* Video or audio recordings produced for presentation on radio or television.

* Video or audio recordings produced for public distribution.

1.3.1.6 Miscellaneous—Any pertinent item not covered above such as bibliographies, book bibliographies, book reviews, abstracts, other video or audio recordings, articles in non-refereed journals, etc.

1.3.1.7 Electronic dissemination of research.

1.3.2 Listing of other publications accepted for publication but not yet published: Include all available pertinent information.

1.3.3 Other creative and artistic contributions: Those faculty members whose job expectations consist of creative activities (e.g., creation of works of art; participation in dramatic productions; presentation of recitals; performances; exhibits; etc.) should provide evidence of these activities and their significance. Dates and places should be designated. Creative activities should be listed in order of importance as follows:

1.3.3.1 Original works presented: plays, poetry, musical compositions, art, designs, completed projects (interior design, architecture, landscape architecture, etc.)

1.3.3.2 Other creative activities: contributions to theatrical productions, guest artist in solo or collaborative presentations in juried competitions.

1.3.4 Participation in Other Professional Meetings, Symposia, Workshops, and Conferences (other than artistic performances): List the meetings, date, and location, and indicate the nature of the participation, e.g., reading a paper, critiquing, organizing, or chairing sections.

1.3.5 Other scholarly or creative activities or other contributions to the profession:

1.3.5.1 Membership in professional organizations;

1.3.5.2 Administrative duties;

1.3.5.3 New standard testing methods, new design of equipment, etc.

1.3.6 Other awards, lectureships, or prizes that show recognition of scholarly or artistic achievement.

1.3.7 Other research Support/Grant Activities: Activities should be enumerated by clearly describing funding proposals which were submitted and projects which were funded.

1.3.8 Major areas of research interest. (This item submitted for university purposes ONLY.)

1.4 Service:

1.4.1 Student organizations advised.

1.4.2 Recruitment of students and faculty.

1.4.3 University service: department, college, university, and Faculty Senate committees.

1.4.4 Professional service:

1.4.4.1 Advisory boards, commissions, or agencies.

1.4.4.2 Journals edited, manuscripts refereed, books and proposals reviewed.

1.4.5 Other external service:

1.4.5.1 Art shows/science fairs judged.

2. Supporting Material

These materials remain in the department until the review process is finalized but may be requested by a reviewer at any subsequent stage of the review process. Such material may include:

2.1 Teaching portfolios, including course syllabi, teaching philosophy, instructional material developed, etc.;

2.2 Comments and letters of commendation from students, peers, etc.;

2.3 Copies of papers and evidence of other scholarly activities;

2.4 Examples of creative and artistic work;

2.5 Appointment letters to commissions, review panels, etc.

Appendix F: Statement on Academic Freedom

LSU is committed to the principle of academic freedom, and faculty are encouraged to explore fully their fields of interest. This principle also includes the right of a member of the academic staff to exercise the ordinary rights of an American citizen in speaking, writing, and action outside the university. At the same time, faculty are expected to be knowledgeable about laws and regulations that increasingly are affecting universities and to operate within the guidelines of university policy and regulations. Among the many implicit responsibilities of academic freedom is that of refraining from insistence that students or others accept any controversial point of view as authoritative. Academic freedom does not extend to any kind of abuse or infringement of the rights of others.

Academic freedom is a cornerstone in the pursuit of answers to the many perplexing, sometimes controversial, questions that are asked, discussed, studied, and researched in an educational setting. The purpose of any policy on academic freedom is to clarify the conditions and parameters of that freedom. Broadly described, academic freedom allows faculty and other research professionals to express themselves through their research and to adopt pedagogy appropriate for their teaching goals.

Note. This language is taken verbatim from PS 36T.08. A separate policy on Academic Freedom is being drafted. Once it is approved this Appendix will be removed from PS 36NT.09.