

A Guide to Preparing for Promotion and Tenure in the LSU College of Science

When we hire tenure-track faculty in the College of Science, we do so with the hope and expectation that they will be successful, and that they will enjoy long and prosperous careers at LSU. This document describes the promotion and tenure (P&T) process at LSU and provides a perspective on expectations regarding research, teaching, and service responsibilities that characterize a successful faculty member in the College of Science. Building a portfolio that documents success begins on “day one” and faculty are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the evaluation procedures and opportunities for mentoring and professional development that are described herein.

Cynthia B. Peterson

Dean

Updated February 21, 2020

Introduction

Promotion and tenure is a serious matter, and proper attention to rules and regulations is important. While the College of Science and its departments have certain latitude in determining their policies regarding promotion and tenure, all College and departmental policies must be consistent with those outlined in *Policy Statement 36 – Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty: Appointments, Reappointment, Promotions, Tenure, Annual Reviews, and Enhancement of Job Performance* (found under Policies and Procedures on the LSU website). Thus, the present document is intended to complement but not supersede PS-36T.

Our goal is to hire outstanding faculty who succeed at LSU. Toward that end, the College and departments are committed to providing financial support, administrative infrastructure, and mentoring that will facilitate achievement of this desired outcome. The College of Science hosts a year-long series of workshops and activities for new faculty. This professional development series introduces faculty to campus units and resources for grant submissions, research administration, and effective teaching. All new faculty are expected to attend.

I – Responsibilities of Faculty and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

As outlined in PS-36T, faculty considered for promotion and tenure will be judged on their performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The College of Science is the premier research unit in an R1 setting (Carnegie Classification R1: Doctoral Universities- Highest Research Activity), and, as a consequence, great emphasis is placed on research for most faculty members. At the same time, demonstration of quality teaching is absolutely essential to promotion and tenure. Furthermore, service is expected from all faculty and is crucial to the operations of our departments, the university, funding agencies, professional societies, etc. Along with the ability to maintain independence in thought and actions, effective interactional skills are expected so that an individual can work productively with others while making progress in the areas of research, teaching, and service.

A general guide to expectations in the three categories of research, teaching and service follows.

A. Research

The research record is of critical importance for promotion and tenure consideration. Evidence of research success includes publications, funding for research, invited talks and awards or other forms of recognition that come from the broader scientific community. It would be convenient if we could simply require some specified number of papers in refereed journals, and a dollar figure in grants and contracts. However, each candidate is an individual case and the various disciplines in the College do not have uniform metrics that define excellence; no simple numerically based formula can (or should) be applied, and it would be foolish to try to describe minimum requirements in these terms.

Publications. PS-36T provides a list of scholarly publications that can contribute to an individual record of achievement. The most pertinent for faculty members in the College of Science include:

- 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. Development of patents, processes, or instruments
- iv. Membership in scientific expeditions
- v. The delivery or application of technology
- vi. Scholarship that arises from community engagement or community-engaged scholarship

The most desirable publication record is one that is steady (publications every year), prolific (lots of papers), and high quality (influential papers in quality peer-reviewed journals). Consistent publication in leading journals is preferred to similar or even greater publication rates in journals with lesser reputations.

Funding. In general, faculty members are expected to successfully compete for funding from major federal agencies (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, ONR, NOAA, USDA, EPA, NASA). In addition to providing the financial resources necessary to maintain a successful research program, federal funding typically requires rigorous peer review by leading researchers. Thus, the ability to attract funding from federal agencies is an important endorsement of a respected research program. Early career faculty should familiarize themselves soon after their arrival at LSU with funding avenues directed to early-career faculty (e.g. NSF CAREER, DoD programs) and apply for these opportunities when appropriate. Early and multi-year planning is important to take advantage of special funding opportunities such as these.

The emphasis on federal funding should not be interpreted to mean that funding from other sources is undesirable. Indeed, faculty members are encouraged to pursue any funding opportunities that will facilitate their research programs. In particular, Louisiana's Board of Regents Support Fund (BoRSF) may be a source of support for many beginning faculty, and an important means of attracting funds for various equipment purchases. Industry and private philanthropic organizations may also provide funding opportunities. All of these sources of support are valuable on their own, and can significantly facilitate attracting major federal funding. While junior faculty members are encouraged to pursue all sources of funding that will allow them to establish their programs, they should not delay in submitting proposals to federal agencies. Funding is often difficult to obtain and rarely does one get it on the first try.

Collaborative Research. The College strongly supports collaborative and interdisciplinary research. A grant with a single PI is not absolutely required for a successful research portfolio, but the ability to conduct and publish independent research is required and should be evident. Leadership roles assumed by faculty on interdisciplinary research are particularly desirable. Those faculty members who are engaged in interdisciplinary research must demonstrate that they are contributing substantially and tangibly to a project, and that the success of their research program is

not entirely dependent on the success of other researchers. For example, if a faculty member's papers represent collaborations with former mentors who then appear as co-authors, reviewers may ask about the creative contribution of the candidate. Outside reviewers and committee members can be very tough on this issue, and many will discount such publications.

It is important that one's own contribution be easily recognizable, and if the candidate is publishing with a senior researcher in an area in which the senior researcher has a long-standing interest, this point is sometimes hard to make. Similarly, if the candidate is one of a number of co-PIs on a grant with a more senior investigator as PI, the candidate's individual contribution may be questioned, especially in the case of a young researcher. However, in the case of collaboration on an NIH program project, for example, where each contribution is evaluated and funded separately, these issues ordinarily would not be raised. Because of the value of collaborative research and the need for others to be able to discern clearly the contribution of individuals, it is important to maintain records of these items. It is advisable to construct a CV that is clear, giving brief explanations beneath each multi-authored publication or collaborative grant explaining the faculty member's role.

Other evidence of recognition from the broader research community. There are numerous mechanisms by which professional scientists recognize merit among their colleagues. These include, but are not limited to, invitations for lectureships, presentations at conferences, residencies at research institutes, fellowships, and competitive awards. LSU confers a number of prestigious peer-reviewed internal awards that also signify that a faculty member has achieved high standing in their discipline.

B. Teaching

Along with research, the business of LSU is education. Within the College of Science, educational efforts include classroom teaching, instruction in both the teaching and research laboratories, and graduate and undergraduate student mentoring. The College values quality teaching, and our goal is to hire only individuals who are committed to being good classroom teachers. All faculty members are expected to take their teaching obligations seriously and to document their efforts and successes as teachers. Faculty members are expected to teach each semester in the academic year. A notable exception to this expectation is the granting of semester(s) free from teaching during their appointment as assistant professors, as negotiated at the time of the initial hire. The process for approval and documentation of other special circumstances that may result in a reduced teaching commitment is described in the College Policy on Teaching. The College recommends that the number of *new* courses taught by untenured faculty be kept to a minimum (no more than 3 throughout their appointment as assistant professor). It is desirable that faculty members teach at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. If the candidate's undergraduate teaching record includes large-enrollment classes, these may provide a different kind of insight into teaching ability.

Classroom teaching: All faculty must develop and maintain a **Teaching Portfolio**. As described in detail in Section IV-B., the portfolio must include: 1. statement of teaching philosophy and practice; 2. record of student feedback; 3. peer teaching evaluations; 4. summary of graduate student thesis/dissertation supervision; and 5. record of supervising undergraduate research. Within the teaching statement, faculty are encouraged to include a description of effective pedagogies they have employed (such as active learning and other evidence-based practices) and any relevant details about professional development opportunities they have pursued to advance teaching/learning approaches. The teaching portfolio may also include other material faculty deem appropriate to demonstrate their approaches/success, such as syllabi; self-assessments; evidence of student success; ancillary materials (handouts, slides, etc.); documentation of activities outside the classroom (service learning, field trips, exhibits, etc.); multimedia material; and student projects.

Graduate-student mentoring. For faculty members at a major research university, mentoring of graduate students is an essential element of teaching. The Teaching Portfolio should therefore include clear documentation of graduate student mentoring and a Mentoring Statement that addresses their approaches and successes. Documentation of graduate student placements after graduation is helpful. Faculty are also encouraged to take advantage of opportunities to develop their mentoring skills.

C. Service

Service is one of the three major responsibilities for faculty members. All faculty members are expected to serve their departments, which rely on faculty governance in all aspects of academic life. Whereas departments are encouraged to keep service activity to a reasonable minimum for untenured faculty members, adequate participation/departmental citizenship is a criterion for promotion. It is important also to recognize that service to the broader community is a professional responsibility. Service within the discipline can involve a wide range of activities, including manuscript reviews, grant reviews, conference organization, service to professional societies, etc. While service is required, a heavy service record is not likely to have much impact on a promotion decision unless it has national or international scope. Examples of the latter might include journal editorships or society officer positions, but such opportunities are uncommon for untenured faculty. Questions about choosing and balancing service opportunities are good topics to discuss with the mentoring committee.

II -- Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The responsibilities of faculty members in the areas of research, teaching and service continue throughout their career at LSU. The first section of this document primarily focuses on criteria for obtaining promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure. In the case of promotion from associate to full professor, sustained contributions in the areas of research, teaching and service are required. Faculty earn promotion by displaying a high level of scholarly achievement commensurate with a national or international reputation. The strength of the research

record should be substantiated by a strong publication record and steady funding from federal agencies. Scholarship will often include publication of major invited papers, major review articles, or other significant scholarly work such as a textbook. Strong teaching is also required, with documentation provided in the Teaching Portfolio. An increased involvement in service to the department, university and profession is expected. A successful candidate for promotion to Professor will ordinarily also have some compelling combination of the following credentials/accomplishments:

- service on review panels for major federal funding agencies (NSF, NIH, DOE, ONR, etc.);
- significant editorial responsibilities for leading peer-reviewed journals;
- invitations to speak at major national or international meetings;
- organizing role for national or international meetings;
- leadership service in disciplinary societies;
- national or international awards;
- evidence of quality graduate-student and postdoc mentoring (e.g., students receiving degrees, peer-reviewed publications with students, awards received by trainees);
- professional placement of former students and postdocs after leaving LSU.

III--Administrative Policy and Procedures

A. Mentoring Committees

Each tenure-track faculty member is assigned a mentoring committee within their first semester of residence. The purpose of the committee is to provide guidance, support, and critique when needed toward the ultimate goal of obtaining tenure. The committee should consist of at least three tenured faculty members. A minimum of two members of the committee should come from the candidate's home department (the department in which tenure will reside). In the case of joint appointments, one of the committee members should come from the department in which the junior faculty member has a minority (< 50%) appointment. Faculty members who have joint appointments with the Center for Computation & Technology (CCT) should have one committee member from CCT. The department chair is responsible for appointing the committee in consultation with the candidate. The goal is to appoint a committee whose scientific interests complement those of the junior faculty member; the junior faculty member should feel free to recommend particular faculty members as potential members of their committee. The nature of the candidate's research may indicate that it would be appropriate to add a fourth member to the mentoring committee; because this need may emerge with time, it is acceptable to have such members added to the mentoring committee after the first semester. Likewise, it may be necessary to remove a faculty member from the committee due to a variety of circumstances.

As the name implies, the charge of the mentoring committee is to provide guidance to the junior faculty member in all aspects of his/her professional development. The following are some examples of what the mentoring committee should do: (1) offer to review drafts of grant proposals and manuscripts and discuss

reviews of declined grant proposals and manuscripts, (2) advise on matters such as appropriate levels of service commitments to university and professional organizations, and faculty relations, and (3) advise on teaching, service, and student relations.

The committee members are expected to be available to provide advice as needed. Early in the relationship, the mentoring committee should establish a “mentoring agreement” with the mentee that establishes an expected set of mentoring activities/discussions. The timetables for standard promotion and tenure at the end of this document are useful for establishing calendars and topics. A junior faculty member should keep his/her mentoring committee well updated on relevant activities, such as submission/acceptance of papers and grant proposals; materials relevant to evaluation of teaching should also be forwarded to the mentoring committee on a timely basis.

The mentoring committee will also work with the faculty member to arrange for (at least) two formal peer teaching evaluations to be performed. [The process for teaching evaluation is outlined in the next section.] If the teaching reviews indicate that teaching methods need improvement, the mentoring committee will discuss the situation with the junior faculty member and provide guidance to resolve the problem.

Early in the spring semester of each year, the junior faculty member should submit his/her faculty annual report to the mentoring committee, along with a complete CV with all details regarding research, teaching and service. The committee should meet with the junior faculty member and discuss her/his progress and any areas of concern. The chair of the mentoring committee should prepare a memo summarizing the points of discussion to be shared with the junior faculty member.

B. Peer Teaching Evaluation

Although most everyone will agree that the quality of teaching is important to all universities – including those like LSU within the “R1: Doctoral Universities – Very high research activity ” classification – many institutions have struggled to determine how teaching should be judged and evaluated. Student feedback is one important component. The need for additional methods to evaluate teaching performance has been widely recognized, and informs our recommendation for the development of a Teaching Portfolio, as described above. While student feedback on teaching (SFT; also known as student evaluation of teaching, or SET) is collected each semester, these results alone are insufficient to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Another useful component is peer teaching evaluation. At least one peer teaching evaluation is required prior to the third-year review, and another is required prior to the P&T review for candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Candidates for full professor must have at least one peer teaching review as associate professor prior to their consideration for promotion. Non-tenured associate professors or professors must have one peer teaching review before their review for tenure.

The peer-teaching review committee should be composed of at least three individuals. One member is chosen by the candidate, a second by the department chair and a third by the mentoring committee (or by mutual agreement of the chair and candidate for candidates for full professor). It is acceptable to have peer-teaching committee members from outside the department. When possible, appointment of

mentoring committee members to the peer-teaching review committee should be avoided, acknowledging the primary role of the mentoring committee in advocacy/advising and because the mentoring committee participates in selecting one of the members of the review committee. There may be some situations in which an alternative committee composition may be favored. In those cases, the department chair should consult with the dean to secure approvals prior to the review process.

The following process for the teaching review is recommended:

- (1) The candidate will provide the committee with the Teaching Portfolio in its current state of development. At a minimum, this will include a teaching statement, a mentoring statement, and the following for all courses taught after any prior review that has happened: SET (SFT), syllabi, examples of exams, grade distributions, and a record of teaching workshops or other professional development activities.
- (2) An initial meeting of the committee and candidate will be held to review the portfolio, ask questions, learn about the individual's approaches to student learning and engagement, etc., and schedule classroom visits
- (3) Each review includes at least two in-person classroom visits by at least one of the committee members. These can be visits to the same course or two different courses, and they can be conducted in a single semester or over two semesters. Reviewers should assess content and assessments, mechanics (time management, assignments), instructor effectiveness (oral delivery, use of visual and other learning aids, etc.), and student engagement. If desired, there are a variety of useful resources for performing classroom assessments that can be found online through reputable teaching/learning centers. On campus, the LSU Teaching-Learning Collaborative (currently led by Dr. Bill Wischusen in the Department of Biological Sciences) is recommended, which includes a membership to CIRTLL (the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning), with access to its electronic resources.
- (4) A written document summarizing strengths and areas for improvement should be drafted and presented to the candidate in a second meeting with the committee.
- (5) A copy of this document will be provided to the department chair and mentoring committee.

C. Annual Review

All faculty have performance reviews by the department chair every year. An annual report and updated CV are provided to the department chair through an online submission system (currently Faculty 360). SFT results are automatically uploaded into the online system.

According to PS-36T, tenure-track faculty must first be evaluated by a departmental committee (typically, this is the departmental P&T committee; see Section III-E for a definition). The candidate will provide the CV, annual report, and any peer teaching evaluations that have been completed (see Section III-B). The departmental committee will provide a written evaluation that will be forwarded along with the other items to the department chair.

In the case of joint appointments, the chair of the department in which the faculty member will be tenured (or holds tenure) will seek input on progress from the leader(s) of the secondary unit(s). This input should be in the form of a written recommendation to the chair of the department.

The chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and an overall rating of “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” is given, along with a narrative evaluation. The online materials provided, along with the departmental committee evaluation and chairs recommendation, are subsequently reviewed by the Dean and Provost. Copies of annual reviews are required in packages for promotion and tenure. *Note: annual reviews are not required for candidates at the time of the reappointment review or P&T review.*

D. Third-year Review

New tenure-track assistant professors are initially given a three-year appointment. During the third year of the appointment, typically in the second semester, tenured faculty members review progress by the candidate and make a recommendation to the dean regarding reappointment. As noted above, In the case of joint appointments, the chair of the department in which the faculty member will hold tenure must solicit input from the other department through a written recommendation regarding reappointment. The tenured faculty can recommend one of three options:

- (1) Reappointment for 3 years. This is the normal result if the candidate is making satisfactory progress. It would carry the candidate through the 6th year, when mandatory review for promotion & tenure (P&T) occurs.
- (2) Reappointment for 1 year. Such a recommendation might occur when tenured faculty members have significant concerns about the candidate’s progress. This recommendation would require annual reappointment reviews in future years until a final decision is reached on P&T or nonreappointment.
- (3) Nonreappointment. If the tenured faculty concludes that there is sufficient evidence to indicate that an assistant professor would not be successful at obtaining tenure, they can recommend that the appointment not be renewed. With a recommendation for nonreappointment, a faculty member will be terminated at the end of year 4.

PS-36T provides additional details concerning the reappointment process. Once the department makes its recommendation, the dean makes the final decision on reappointment of assistant professors.

E. Promotion & Tenure Review.

The P&T process typically¹ begins in the spring semester prior to the academic

¹ In the case of individuals who began their appointment in January, the process begins in the fall semester preceding mandatory review.

year in which the evaluation will occur (see Table 1 at the end of this document for a summary of P&T timelines). Early in the spring semester, department chairs will be given a list of faculty members who will be up for mandatory review in the next academic year. Chairs will also be asked to identify any other individuals who wish to be considered for promotion (i.e., an early tenure decision or promotion to full professor). In the case of non-mandatory reviews, a vote of approval from the eligible voting faculty (or a review committee, if the department uses one) is required in order to proceed with a full review of the case. The initial appointment of an untenured associate or full professor is for ≤ 5 years, and the tenure review must occur no later than the 4th year at that rank. If a reappointment is necessary, the final decision rests with the Provost (to whom the Dean submits a recommendation). The following reviews are considered to be “early” unless some specific agreement has been negotiated to the contrary:

- Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure prior to 6th year of appointment
- Untenured to tenured Associate or Full Professor prior to the 4th year of appointment
- Tenured Associate to Full Professor prior to the 5th year of appointment as Associate

Following the procedures described in Section IV, the department identifies a list of reviewers for the candidate. The department chair presents the list of potential reviewers to the dean for approval. Prior to the end of the spring semester, all reviewers should be contacted to verify their willingness to review the package. Reviewers will be informed that they will receive the complete promotion package by early in the fall semester in which the review is initiated (typically around September 1) and that evaluations will need to be returned within a reasonable time period (typically by mid-October). The exact dates may vary somewhat from year to year, depending on the schedule announced by HRM. (Further details about solicitation of reviews are provided below.)

The eligible voting faculty meet to discuss the case and vote. A written summary of the faculty discussion and formal record of the vote are prepared. The department chair is normally present for the departmental meeting, but does not vote or participate in the discussion, aside from providing factual information as requested by the eligible voting faculty (per PS-36T). A separate letter of recommendation on the case is prepared by the department chair. In the case of joint appointments, a written recommendation is prepared by the secondary department(s). This feedback should be considered in the department chair’s recommendation and appended to the chair’s recommendation. Departmental promotion and tenure documents must be submitted to the dean's office by a pre-announced date, usually in the first week of November.

The College has two promotion and tenure committees that are advisory to the dean (see below), and both of these committees meet shortly after the P&T documents have been submitted to the dean’s office.

Final recommendations from the dean are generally due to Academic Affairs by an announced date prior to the end of the fall semester. Formal, recorded

recommendations to the LSU Board of Supervisors are made by the following units or individuals:

- (1) The eligible voting faculty (i.e., the departmental vote is reported)
- (2) The Chair of the department
- (3) The Dean
- (4) The Provost
- (5) The President

Additional input from the following is advisory only:

- (1) The College P&T faculty committee²
- (2) The College chairs committee³
- (3) The head/chair/director of the secondary department (in the case of joint appointments)
- (4) The Dean of the Graduate School
- (5) The Provost's advisory committee

Subject to the Provost's approval, the Graduate Council annually appoints the Provost's Advisory Committee from its membership. The committee reviews the materials and provides a recommendation in favor or against promotion and tenure. The Dean of the Graduate School convenes and moderates this meeting. The Dean then provides the Provost with a written summary of the discussion and committee recommendation, along with his/her own evaluation and recommendation.

Mandatory vs. Early Review. Early tenure reviews are those submitted prior to the mandatory review period. As noted above, mandatory tenure reviews are conducted in the 6th year for assistant professors and in the 4th year for tenure-track associate and full professors. Earlier reviews are sometimes appropriate due to credit for prior service elsewhere or exceptional accomplishments. Assistant professors may not be reappointed after seven years of service without tenure, and non-tenured associate or full professors may not be reappointed after five years of service without tenure, unless explicit permission to do so has been granted (see below).

The College is willing to consider early decisions, but has a higher standard for early decisions, in keeping with PS-36T's stated requirement that an early review "should proceed only when merit is well established and clearly exceeds the holistic expectations applied in other reviews." Thus, in the College of Science, early tenure and promotion reviews should only be considered when an applicant has unambiguously demonstrated excellence in all areas (research, teaching, and service).

Tenured associate professors are not required to be considered for promotion to full professor, and thus there is no 'mandatory' review. However, promotion from associate to full professor prior to the 5th year of appointment at the associate level is also considered 'early' and subject to the conditions noted above.

² The dean reports the votes and summarizes the recommendations of the SCI P&T and SCI chairs committee in his/her recommendation.

Tenure-clock extensions. Situations may arise in which it is appropriate to delay a mandatory tenure decision. PS-36T lists the following as examples of reasons (not an exhaustive list) that can be considered for tenure-clock extensions: serious personal health conditions; pregnancy, childbirth, or the adoption of a child; caring for a spouse, child, or parent who has a serious health condition; death of a family member; significant delays in the provision of start-up funds or facilities; and effects of natural disasters. It is important to emphasize, however, that tenure-clock extensions must be requested by the candidate (i.e., ***there is no situation under which the tenure clock is automatically extended***). Requests for an extended tenure clock should be in the form of a memo from the faculty member, addressed to the Provost, and routed through the chair and dean, as described in PS-36T. Requests for an extension to the tenure clock should be submitted as soon as possible; last-minute requests are less likely to be approved. An extension of the tenure clock does not alter expectations for promotion and tenure. The deliberations in the P&T review are to be based on the criteria in PS 36 and not on any extension of the tenure clock.

Reconsideration of a negative tenure decision. Applicants who have undergone a mandatory review and received a negative decision may apply for re-review in those extremely rare circumstances in which substantially new, relevant information comes about. Upon agreement by the applicant's department to do so, the procedure outlined in PS-36T for non-mandatory review ('early' review) for tenure, including an initial vote by the tenured faculty, will be followed.

F. The P&T Review Committees

Department Level. PS-36T defines two groups of faculty that participate in P&T reviews within the department in which an individual holds/will hold tenure. The "eligible voting faculty" comprises all faculty members in the department who are eligible to vote on a particular decision. The "review committee" consists of at least three members of the eligible voting faculty within the department, but it may be the entire eligible voting faculty; its job is to assist in annual reviews of tenure-track faculty and manage the P&T process. In many departments, the "review committee" is called the "Promotion and Tenure Committee". The composition of the eligible voting faculty is given in a table in PS-36T (available online under LSU Policies & Procedures)

While the College strongly encourages all eligible faculty members to vote on P&T cases, it is recognized that some faculty may be out of the country for extended periods or may need to recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest (e.g., a spouse). While faculty who are on leave and/or absent from campus have the right to vote on P&T cases, the expectation is that they will do so only if they have been actively engaged with review of the case. Regardless, department chairs establish the review committee from eligible faculty who are able to vote. Chairs must account for all members of the eligible voting faculty when preparing their reports, and are required to provide a brief explanation for any faculty members who did not vote.

Departments may use subcommittees to gather information, organize outside letters, and help prepare documentation. The subcommittee may provide the results of

its activities to the full review committee, but the review committee and any subcommittees should not vote before the entire eligible voting faculty votes. All subcommittee presentations should be factual and objective. Candidates should be apprised of any such committees and their memberships.

In the case of joint appointments, the chair of the department in which the faculty member holds/will hold tenure is the sole reviewing officer and is responsible for ensuring that contributions from other units in which the candidate holds a secondary appointment are part of their review process. As stated in PS-36T, "The unit leader(s) of the secondary unit(s) will be responsible for calling meetings of the appropriate eligible voting faculty within their unit to consider and vote on recommendations for appointment, reappointment, promotion and/or advancement to tenure, and annual reviews, and forwarding those written recommendations to the chair of the department in which the candidate holds the primary appointment or unit." Such recommendations and reports from secondary units are forwarded to the dean as part of the P&T documentation (see Section IV).

College Level. Two College committees serve in an advisory capacity to the dean. They are (1) the department chairs of the College, and (2) a committee of faculty members at the rank of full professor. The latter committee consists of one representative elected from each department by vote of the tenure-track faculty. Additional members may be appointed by the dean, who also chooses the chair of the committee. As required by PS-36T, the votes from these committees are reported by the dean and the general recommendations of these committees are considered as the prepares his or her recommendation.

University Level. The Provost's Advisory Committee consists of members selected from the Graduate Council and approved by the Provost. This committee makes a recommendation to the Dean of the Graduate School, who in turn forwards a formal recommendation to the Provost.

IV -- Guidelines for Assembling Materials for Review

A. Materials for Third-Year Review

Assembly of the materials that will be reviewed for the third-year and beyond should be ongoing, beginning when a faculty member assumes their position at LSU. At the time of the third-year review, junior faculty should assemble the following to be submitted to the department:

- (1) Current CV formatted in PS-36 style
- (2) A statement of research objectives and accomplishments to date.
- (3) Copies of publications based on work carried out at LSU.
- (4) At least one peer evaluation of teaching.
- (5) Student feedback on teaching.
- (6) Any other items available in the growing Teaching Portfolio. As mentioned above, this can include any of the following: a statement of teaching philosophy and

practice; mentoring statement; a summary of graduate student thesis/dissertation supervision; a record of supervising undergraduate research; course outlines and syllabi; evidence of student success; description of effective pedagogies (active learning; evidence-based practices); professional development activities in teaching/learning approaches; ancillary materials (handouts, slides, etc.); documentation on activities outside the classroom (field trips, exhibits, etc.); multimedia material; student projects; records of advising activities; etc..

These items, a record of the tenured faculty meeting and vote, and the chair's recommendation, are forwarded to the dean for review.

B. Materials Provided by the Candidate for Promotion & Tenure

As mentioned above, assembly of the materials that will be reviewed by the outside reviewers and LSU committees should be ongoing and build upon what was presented for the third-year review. Materials are meant to portray the full spectrum of the faculty member's work in research, teaching and service. A Research Summary, providing a detailed and substantive review of the candidate's research objectives and accomplishments, is required, as is a Teaching Portfolio as described above.

Materials assembled by the candidate are shared with the department, and those provided to external reviewers are indicated by an asterisk. A list of required materials for P&T packets routed at LSU for administrative review beyond the department level is also appended to this document as a reference. The packet of materials should include all of the following in order:

- (1) *A statement of research objectives and accomplishments. The candidate should clearly describe collaborative/interdisciplinary projects including their role and individual contributions.
- (2) A Teaching Portfolio that should include:
 - a. *A statement of teaching philosophy and practice
 - b. *A mentoring statement
 - c. Peer evaluations of teaching (A minimum of two for candidates for promotion and tenure, a minimum of one for tenure-track associate professors or professors, and a minimum of one for promotion of previously tenured faculty).
 - d. Report of student evaluations that is clearly defined. For student teaching evaluations administered after the spring of 2018, the average of questions 1-9 and responses to question 10 should be reported. For student teaching evaluations prior to that semester, the average of questions 1-8, and responses to questions 9 and 10 should be reported. Means and standard deviations for comparable courses (i.e., lower level, upper level, or graduate) in the department and the College should be indicated (see table in the Appendix as a guideline).
 - e. Summary of graduate student thesis/dissertation supervision.
 - f. Record of supervision in undergraduate research
 - g. Optional: Additional items may be included, as described in Section I-B, e.g. representative syllabi, evidence of participation in workshops to

improve teaching, and any additional material of direct relevance to teaching performance

- (3) *Full CV that contains *at least* the following information (*Note that candidates maintain CV's in a variety of styles, according to personal preference, and these are suitable for review by the department and external reviewers. However, the CV must be in PS-36T format for the materials that are routed to the Dean and Provost.*):
- a. Clearly indicate papers published since coming to LSU and since last promotion.
 - b. Indicate papers with student coauthors.
 - c. Indicate corresponding author.
 - d. Indicate your role in multi-authored papers.
 - e. Provide title, full name of funding agency, and agency's grant number for funded projects.
 - f. Indicate your role in funded projects (e.g., PI, Co-PI, or other capacity).
 - g. Indicate the duration of funded projects, the amount of funding (specifying direct and indirect costs), and your share of that funding.
 - h. [*NOTE: The PS-36T format CV also includes all proposals submitted, with the agency, program, date and funding requested.*]
- (4) *A collection of all papers published since the previous promotion, or, for faculty being promoted for the first time at LSU, all publications that list LSU as the address for the candidate. This can be an electronic file or links to published work.

Rationale on guidelines and further recommendations for the assembly of these materials: Based on our experience with external reviewers, and on how P&T packages are perceived both within and beyond the College, candidates are advised of the following:

Given the importance of the candidate's publication record, the way the publications are listed in the CV merits close attention.

- Clearly differentiate peer-reviewed from non-peer-reviewed publications.
- Highlight papers that involve student authors (this is a good thing!), and indicate whether the student was a graduate or undergraduate. Candidates sometimes use color printing to denote these roles. However, please remember that CVs are often printed in black and white by reviewers, or scanned or faxed. Thus, color printing is not guaranteed to be preserved in getting this information across. Instead, candidates may wish to consider underline, italic, or bold, or special symbols (asterisk, daggers etc.), for this purpose. Indicate the corresponding author for each publication.
- Insert a 1- or 2-sentence explanation beneath each multi-authored publication explaining the candidate's role as an author in the paper. Questions often arise regarding the role of the candidate in multi-author publications. Further, conventions for determining the order of authorship vary substantially among disciplines. Many of the people reviewing P&T packages will not be familiar with these conventions.

- Clearly differentiate published papers, papers in press, and papers currently under review. There is little to be gained by including papers that are “in preparation”, but any such listing should be clearly distinguished from papers that have been published or submitted for review.

A few points to consider in preparing a list of grant support for a P&T CV:

- Provide the title of the proposal and the full name of the funding agency.
- The candidate should indicate his/her role in funded projects. Were you the sole PI? If it was a collaborative proposal, were you PI, Co-PI, or subcontractor?
- Indicate the dates for which the project is/was funded.
- Indicate the dollar value of the grant and your share of funds in collaborative projects.

C. P&T Materials Reviewed by the Department

The P&T package that is reviewed by the department will include all of the above as well as the outside letters (see Section IV-E) and annual evaluations:

- (1) Sample letter used to request evaluations
- (2) Names and addresses of all individuals from whom letters were formally solicited, with an indication of whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate or the department.
- (3) Qualifications of external reviewers, summarized in a short paragraph.
- (4) Letters from external reviewers
- (5) Annual evaluations (copies of official evaluations that have been signed by both the candidate and the chair). *Do NOT include annual reports submitted by faculty.*
- (6) In cases for faculty members who hold joint appointments, the materials will include written recommendations on promotion and tenure from the head of the secondary unit in which a faculty member holds an appointment

D. P&T Materials Reviewed by the College

The package that is forwarded to the College will include all of the above and is prefaced by:

- (1) Promotion/Tenure Cover Sheet
- (2) Report of the departmental faculty vote
- (3) Report of the department’s recommendation, providing a summary all discussion points including both the majority and minority opinions
- (4) The Chair’s recommendation. In the case of a joint appointment, the written recommendation from the secondary unit(s) should be appended.
- (5) The faculty member’s written response, if there is one (see PS-36T).

E. Outside Letters

Evaluations by outside reviewers play an extremely important role in the promotion and tenure process, and thus attention to procedures and thoughtful selection of reviewers is of utmost importance. As experts in the field, outside reviewers provide an assessment of the quality and impact of the research portfolio of the candidate. Accordingly, the insights and assessments provided in the letters written by external reviewers play a very important role in promotion and tenure deliberations. Ordinarily, these reviewers are in a position to comment primarily on the research record, secondarily on the service record, and very little, if at all, on the teaching record.

The candidate is asked to suggest names of potential reviewers, and may also submit names of persons the candidate feels should not be used (any such list should be very short and should include justification for the exclusion). It is recommended that the candidate submit a list of 5 or 6 potential reviewers. The candidate should bear in mind that half or more of the reviewers will come from individuals *not* on the candidate's list. The reason for this is to avoid selecting a set of reviewers that are strongly biased in favor of the candidate. Therefore, the candidate should think carefully about how many reviewers to put on the list, and whom to include. For example, if the candidate lists a large fraction of the top people in their field, the committee may find relatively few additional reviewers to choose who are well matched with the candidate's research.

The department chair and the departmental P&T committee are responsible for choosing evaluators. Approval of outside reviewers by the dean is required, but the dean expects to follow the recommendations of the chair and P&T committee provided that the guidelines outlined below are followed. PS-36T requires a minimum of 3 outside letters; however, our goal is to have at least 5 letters, and we recommend soliciting 7 or 8 letters, with no more than half from the candidate's list. Chairs submit the list of suggested reviewers to the dean in the standard format appended to this document.³

The following guidelines for selection of reviewers should be followed as closely as possible:

- Reviewers below the rank of full professor are not acceptable for candidates being considered for the rank of full professor; for candidates being considered for promotion to associate professor, individuals at the rank of full professor are also preferred (It is recommended that *no more than one* recommendation from an associate professor should be solicited in any case).
- Reviewers should be at institutions with a research stature that is comparable or superior to that of LSU.
- Reviewers with potential conflicts of interest should be avoided. This includes former graduate advisors, former post-doctoral mentors, co-authors on papers,

³ It is acknowledged that the number of letters may be challenging for faculty members in some situations, e.g. work in crowded fields or research fields characterized by very large collaborative teams. In these special circumstances, the chair should provide a written document that outlines the challenges in the scenario and justifies invitations to a shorter list of reviewers.

and collaborators on grants, as well as individuals employed by institutions where the candidate has previously worked, reviewers at institutions where the candidate has earned a degree, performed postdoctoral research, or had any other official appointment, regardless of whether the reviewer's appointment at the institution overlapped with that of the candidate.

- Letters should not be solicited from more than one individual at a single institution.
- Reviewers from research institutes, national labs, or non-U.S. universities are acceptable. Nonetheless, researchers from these types of institutions often do not hold similar appointments and may not understand the U.S. tenure system. Thus, these reviewers should be selected with care. Clear identification of qualities that establish their appointment rank relative to the U.S. system is important for non-U.S. reviewers, and senior status of reviewers employed at research institutes or national labs should be evident. The College recommends limiting the number to 2 or less.
- Candidates should not recommend their personal friends as potential reviewers, and departments should avoid them whenever possible. While individuals will often be acquainted professionally with the candidate, it is important to identify individuals who can maintain an "arms-length" distance in the evaluation such that the objectivity of the reviewers' comments cannot be called into question.

The intent of these guidelines for reviewer selection is to preserve the integrity of the process and to minimize the chance that individuals reviewing a P&T packet might question the appropriateness of one or more reviewers. It is important to bear in mind that, as a P&T package moves to levels beyond the department, those evaluating the package quickly become less familiar with the particulars of an area of faculty expertise. It is therefore in the best interests of the candidate to remove as many procedural questions as possible (e.g., potential conflict of interest).

Once the dean has approved the proposed list of reviewers, the appropriate departmental representative should contact potential reviewers **before the end of the spring semester**. The departmental representative should explain to the reviewer that the package will be delivered early in the fall semester, and obtain a verbal commitment that the review will be completed within a reasonable time (e.g. mid-October) All letters received must be included in the promotion package. An example copy of letters sent to reviewers must also be included in the package that is reviewed by the faculty and forwarded to the dean. A standard solicitation letter is attached in the appendix to this document. Any changes to this standard letter should be approved by the dean.

The letters received from outside reviewers are appended to the review materials provided by the candidate to complete the package of materials that is reviewed by all P&T review committees at LSU. The department should provide a list of the reviewers and summaries of their qualifications, and a list of any reviewers from whom letters were solicited but not obtained, with an indication of whether each individual was recommended by the candidate or the department.

V. Pay raises associated with P&T

LSU uses the following standard formulas for calculating raises associated with promotions:

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
 $\$2500 + 4\%$ of 9-month salary

Associate Professor to Full Professor
 $\$3500 + 4\%$ of 9-month salary

Faculty do not receive an automatic raise for “tenure only” decisions.

Table 1. Timelines for promotion and tenure

A. Standard timeline for successful promotion of newly appointed assistant professor to tenured associate professor		
Year of Appointment	Semester	Semester
1	Fall 1: Initial 3-year appointment begins	Spring 1
2	Fall 2	Spring 2
3	Fall 3 one teaching evaluation must be completed	Spring 3: 3 rd -year review
4	¹ Fall 4: 2 nd 3-year appointment begins	Spring 4
5	Fall 5	Spring 5: Second teaching evaluation must be completed Identify P&T reviewers Late summer 5: package is sent to reviewers
6	² Fall 6: P&T review process begins	Spring 6: P&T decision finalized
7	³ Fall 7: Begin year 1 of appointment as tenured associate professor	Spring 7

¹If assistant professor is not reappointed, employment ends after 4th year of appointment. Alternatively, reappointment may be for 1 year.

²Reviews beginning prior to the 6th year of service are considered “early”.

³If promotion is not successful, year 7 is the final year of appointment.

B. Standard timeline for successful promotion of tenured associate professor to professor		
Year of Appointment	Semester	Semester
1	¹ Fall 1: 1 st year as associate professor	Spring 1
2	Fall 2	Spring 2
3	Fall 3	Spring 3
4	Fall 4 (year of mandatory tenure decision for tenure-track associate professor; see table 1C below)	Spring 4: teaching evaluation must be completed Identify P&T reviewers Late summer 4: package is sent to reviewers
5	² Fall 5: Promotion review process begins	Spring 5: P&T decision finalized
6	³ Fall 6: Begin year 1 of appointment as tenured professor	Spring 6:

¹Equivalent to “Year 7” in the timeline for assistant professors.

²Reviews beginning prior to the 5th year of service are considered “early”.

³If promotion is not successful, appointment as tenured associate professor continues.

D. Typical timeline for successful award of tenure to tenure-track associate professor or professor		
Year of Appointment	Semester	Semester
1	Fall 1: 1 st year as tenure-track associate professor or professor	Spring 1
2	Fall 2	Spring 2
3	Fall 3	Spring 3: teaching evaluation must be completed Identify reviewers Late summer 3: package is sent to reviewers
4	¹ Fall 4: tenure and/or promotion review process begins	Spring 4: Tenure decision finalized
5	² Fall 5: Begin year 1 of appointment as tenured associate professor or professor	Spring 5:

¹Reviews beginning prior to the 4th year of service are considered “early”.

²If tenure is not granted, year 5 is the final year of appointment.

Date

To: ***
Dean, College of Science

From: ***
Chair, Department of ****

Re: External reviewers for Dr. ***

I submit for your consideration and approval the following list of potential external reviewers for Dr. ***, whose case for [promotion and/or tenure] will be considered by the Department of *** in the [Fall/Spring] of 2***. In accordance with College of Science policies, Dr. ***'s case for [promotion and/or tenure] will be considered by the Department of *** in the [Fall/Spring] of 2***. In accordance with College of Science policies (1) All of the potential reviewers are at the rank of professor [note and explain exceptions]; (2) Reviewers are from institutions with research statures that are comparable or superior to LSU's [note and explain exceptions]; (3) We have taken care to assure that reviewers do not have conflicts of interest with Dr. ***, and have avoided former thesis or dissertation advisors, former post-doctoral mentors, coauthors on papers, collaborators on grants, as well as individuals from institutions where Dr. *** was previously employed or was a student [note and explain any exceptions]; (4) We will not solicit letters from more than one individual at a single institution; (5) No more than two of the proposed reviewers are from non-academic or non-U.S. institutions [note and explain exceptions]; (6) We have made every effort to assure that the potential reviewers are not personal friends with Dr. ***.

When we have your approval, we will immediately contact potential reviewers to secure their commitment to review Dr. ***'s package. The package will be sent to reviewers during the first week of September, and we will inform reviewers that reviews must be complete by the second Monday of October. Packages will be sent to reviewers with the standard College of Science cover letter.

Potential reviewers suggested by Dr. * [4-6 names, listed in order of preference]**

1. Dr. Reviewer One
Professor of ***, University of ***
Administrative title [e.g., chair, dean], if any
Honorifics [NAS, Society Fellows, etc.]
Ph.D. Granting institution
Website
Email address and telephone number
2.

Potential reviewers suggested by the Department of * [4-6 names, listed in order of preference]**

1. Dr. Reviewer One
Professor of ***, University of ***
Administrative title [e.g., chair, dean], if any
Honorifics [NAS, Society Fellows, etc.]
Ph.D. Granting institution
Website
Email address and telephone number

2.

SAMPLE LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Address Block

Greeting Line

Dr. XXX, who is currently an Assistant/Associate Professor/Professor in the Department of XXX, at Louisiana State University, is under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure/tenure/Professor. He/she holds a XX% research, XX% teaching appointment with a normal teaching load of X course(s) per year. [According to PS-26-T (revised 2018), the following statement or its equivalent **must be included** in the letter for candidates who are undergoing an early review: *This candidate has requested early review for promotion and/or tenure. LSU policy states that an early review is highly unusual and should proceed only when merit is well established and clearly exceeds the holistic expectations applied in other reviews.*] I appreciate your willingness to evaluate his/her research, teaching, and service contributions, and ask that you specifically respond to the following:

- A. Do you know the candidate personally or professionally? If so, how long and in what capacity have you known the candidate?
- B. To the extent that you are able to do so, please rank the candidate against other scholars in the same discipline, with similar time in rank.
- C. Comment upon the degree of recognition already achieved by the candidate in his/her discipline, noting any distinctive contributions.
- D. Evaluate the scope and significance of the candidate's scholarly/research interest and activities in terms of their importance, and his/her promise for further growth as a scholar.
- E. To the extent that you feel qualified to do so, comment on the candidate's contributions to instruction in his/her discipline.
- F. Evaluate the candidate's degree of university and professional service.
- G. Provide any additional insights that may be helpful in evaluating the candidate for promotion and/or tenure.

For your convenience, I enclose Dr. XXX's vitae and selected supporting material. I would appreciate a reply by *date*.

LSU policy stipulates that letters of recommendation or references obtained as part of the tenure process will not be made available to the employee except for letters containing explicit statements by the author that the letter is not to be regarded as confidential. Therefore, unless you indicate that your letter is not confidential, the contents of the letter and your identity will be shared only with those individuals who participate in the decision process or as may be required by applicable law.

If you send your response electronically, please also send a signed, paper original for our files. I also ask that you include your CV for our records.

I understand the time commitment required to evaluate promotion files, and I greatly appreciate your help in this extremely important process. If you need further information, please contact me at (225)578-XXXX, Fax: (225)578-XXXX, or XXX@lsu.edu. [For your convenience, a return Federal Express air bill is enclosed. (optional)]

Sincerely,

Professor and Chair

Enclosure

Appendices:

Table to Report Student Evaluation of Teaching
P&T Packet Order (from HRM)