

2-17-2005

Faculty Senate Resolution 05-01

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/senate-pubs>

Recommended Citation

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College, "Faculty Senate Resolution 05-01" (2005). *LSU Faculty Senate Publications*. 321.

<http://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/senate-pubs/321>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Faculty Senate Publications by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gcoste1@lsu.edu.

**Faculty Senate Resolution 05-01
To Be Presented at the Meeting of September 9, 2004.**

Resolved: The Faculty Senate recommends that the University adopt the document

A Proposed New PS-36:
Tenure- Track and Tenured Faculty: Appointments, Reappointments,
Promotions, Advancement to Tenure, and Annual Reviews

To replace the PS-36 that was issued July 1, 1997.

Proposed Procedural Motion

At its meeting of September 9, the Senate will hear a report and conduct an informal discussion of the document, which is posted at http://www.math.lsu.edu/_mcgehee/YPS-36.pdf

Up until October 1, the PS-36 Committee may make changes to the document which are minor, or which follow by consensus from the discussion on September 9, provided a list of all the changes is distributed at the October meeting.

Beginning at the meeting in October, the Senate will take up Resolution 05-01 under Old Business and consider the document *seriatim*, one page at a time.

This means that the chair will call the page numbers in order, and when a page is called, discussion and amendments, if any, may be offered on (1) the material on that page or any preceding page or on (2) material related to the subject matter on that page.

When the pages have all been processed in this manner, further discussion and amendments, if any, may be offered. When that has been finished, a vote may be taken on the Resolution if the Senate is ready.

September 2, 2004
A Proposed New PS-36:
Tenure-Track and Tenured
Faculty: Appointments,
Reappointments, Promo-
tions, Advancement to
Tenure, and Annual Reviews

URL: <http://www.math.lsu.edu/~mcgehee/YPS-36.pdf>

**The PS-36 Committee: Professors Pratul Ajmera (since April '04),
Emily Batinski, Lou Day, Stacia Haynie (since July '04), Rick
Ortner (until April '04), Jim Richardson, Roger Seals (until
Aug. '03), Jill Sutor (until March '04), Roger Stockbauer, Carruth
McGehee (Chair), and Director Janie Frickie, HRM, ex officio**

Contents

<i>A New PS-36</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>I Preamble</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>II Preliminaries</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>II.A Applicability and Limitations</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>II.B Part-Time Appointments</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>II.C Pertinent Policies Stated Elsewhere</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>II.D Effective Date</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>III Rules of an Academic Unit</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>III.A Preamble</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>III.B Validity and Recognition</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>III.C Authority to Require a Change</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>III.D Parliamentary Authority</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>IV Guidelines for Criteria</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>IV.A Scholarship</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>IV.B Teaching</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>IV.C Service</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>V General Procedural Provisions</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>V.A Confidentiality</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>V.B Definitions of Certain Terms</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>V.C Meetings</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>V.D The Role of the Provost</i>	<i>9</i>

vi CONTENTS

	V.E	<i>The Role of the Dean</i>	9
	V.F	<i>The Role of the Chair</i>	10
	V.G	<i>Recusal of a Line Officer</i>	10
	V.H	<i>Right to a Peer Advisor</i>	10
	V.I	<i>Participation by All Voting Faculty</i>	10
	V.J	<i>The Manner of Voting</i>	10
	V.K	<i>Separate Counts</i>	11
	V.L	<i>The Voting Faculty</i>	11
		V.L.1 <i>Preliminary Definition</i>	11
		V.L.2 <i>The Chair as Member</i>	11
		V.L.3 <i>Recusals and Exclusions</i>	12
		V.L.4 <i>Added Voting Faculty</i>	12
		V.L.5 <i>Voting Twice on the Same Decision</i>	12
	V.M	<i>The Departmental Recommendation</i>	13
	V.N	<i>Required Notice of Nonreappointment</i>	13
VI		<i>Initial Appointments</i>	14
	VI.A	<i>Procedure</i>	14
		VI.A.1 <i>The Chair's Responsibility</i>	14
		VI.A.2 <i>An Open Process</i>	14
		VI.A.3 <i>A Recommendation to Appoint</i>	14
		VI.A.4 <i>Documentation of Credentials</i>	14
		VI.A.5 <i>Approval Process</i>	14
	VI.B	<i>Minimum Qualifications for Appointments</i>	15
		VI.B.1 <i>For Every Appointment</i>	15
		VI.B.2 <i>For Appointment to a Higher Rank</i>	15
		VI.B.3 <i>For Appointment with Tenure</i>	15
	VI.C	<i>Requirement of an Interview</i>	16
	VI.D	<i>Inbreeding</i>	16
	VI.E	<i>Initial Appointments and the Tenure Clock</i>	16
		VI.E.1 <i>Assistant Professors</i>	16
		VI.E.2 <i>Associate Professors and Professors</i>	16
	VI.F	<i>An Appointment Without the Terminal Degree</i>	17
VII		<i>The Probationary Period for Tenure-Track Faculty</i>	17
	VII.A	<i>Annual Reviews, Reappointment Reviews</i>	17
	VII.B	<i>Timetable Provisions for Reappointments</i>	18
	VII.C	<i>Procedure for a Reappointment Review</i>	18
		VII.C.1 <i>Approval Process</i>	19
	VII.D	<i>Adjustments to the Tenure Clock</i>	20

<i>VIII</i>	<i>Promotion and Tenure Reviews</i>	20
	<i>VIII.A General Provisions</i>	20
	<i>VIII.A.1 Line Officers' Responsibilities</i>	21
	<i>VIII.A.2 Withdrawal from a Mandated Review</i>	21
	<i>VIII.A.3 An Early Review</i>	22
	<i>VIII.A.4 The Review Committee</i>	22
	<i>VIII.B Stage 1: Evaluation by Experts Outside LSU</i>	22
	<i>VIII.B.1 Confidentiality</i>	22
	<i>VIII.B.2 Qualifications</i>	22
	<i>VIII.B.3 The Use of Letters of Evaluation</i>	23
	<i>VIII.B.4 Procedure for Choosing Evaluators</i>	23
	<i>VIII.B.5 Form Letter Requesting an Evaluation</i>	24
	<i>VIII.C Stage 2: Recommendation by the Department</i>	25
	<i>VIII.D Stage 3: Consideration by Higher Offices</i>	26
	<i>VIII.E Contents of the Review File</i>	26
<i>IX</i>	<i>Appeals</i>	27
	<i>IX.A Procedures</i>	27
	<i>IX.B Grounds</i>	28
<i>X</i>	<i>Annual Reviews</i>	28
	<i>X.A Preamble</i>	28
	<i>X.B A Faculty Member's File</i>	28
	<i>X.C The Annual Review Process</i>	29
	<i>X.C.1 Objectives</i>	29
	<i>X.C.2 Preliminary Steps</i>	30
	<i>X.C.3 Next Steps, Tenure-Track Faculty</i>	30
	<i>X.C.4 Next Steps, Tenured Faculty</i>	31
	<i>X.C.5 Final Steps</i>	31
	<i>X.C.6 Evaluation by the Chair</i>	32
<i>XI</i>	<i>Assistance Program to Enhance Job Performance</i>	32
<i>XII</i>	<i>Glossary</i>	33
	<i>Index</i>	37

A New PS-36

I PREAMBLE

By means of these policies and procedures, the University seeks to employ and to maintain a staff of tenured and tenure-track 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.

Among personnel decisions, the decision to advance a person to tenure is of distinguished and central importance. The University will do so only through a rigorous, careful process of examination and deliberation. Accordingly, advancement to tenure entails the presumption of professional excellence. It implies the expectation of an academic career which will develop and grow in quality and value, and one which will be substantially self-supervised and self-directed. With tenure, the University grants heightened job security in order to allow long-term plans and undertakings, and in order to encourage quality, innovation, and independence. With tenure comes a steward's role in the University's governance and leadership. In particular, the tenured faculty will play a key role in the decisions to appoint new faculty and to promote continuing faculty.

II PRELIMINARIES

II.A Applicability and Limitations

The present Policy Statement 36 (PS-36) does not increase or diminish legally enforceable rights of the University or of its employees which may derive from laws, regulations, contracts, or written commitments.

PS-36 applies only to tenured and tenure-track faculty, except when other cases are explicitly addressed, for example in VI.F, page 17. It sets forth policies and procedures with regard to appointments, reappointments, promotions, tenure, and annual reviews. Its provisions are stated for the professorial series, but apply equally to other series of tenure-track and tenured positions and titles, as named in the LSU System document PM-23. In particular, provisions stated herein for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors apply also, respectively, to Assistant Librarians and Assistant Curators; to Associate Librarians and Associate Curators; and to Librarians and Curators.

II.B Part-Time Appointments

Tenured and tenure-track faculty appointments are understood always to be full-time except when there is a temporary change to part-time status or an approved leave for a specified period of time. See for example PS-12, or item 1 of VII.D on page 20 of PS-36. If and when a faculty member requests and accepts a regular part-time appointment, then his or her tenured or tenure-track status will be cancelled.

II.C Pertinent Policies Stated Elsewhere

Other University Policy Statements, Permanent Memoranda of the LSU System, and the Bylaws and Regulations of the LSU Board of Supervisors contain provisions which are pertinent to the subject matter and processes of PS-36. For example:

1. PS-01 contains advertising requirements and anti-discrimination provisions.
2. PS-07 establishes policy regarding academic honorifics, including awards; lectureships; and named chairs and professorships, including Boyd Professorships.
3. PS-12 establishes leave guidelines. Certain provisions related to leaves are set forth in PS-36; see VII.D, page 20.
4. PS-25, entitled **Nepotism**, recounts the University's obligations under the Code of Governmental Ethics of the State of Louisiana. It prohibits employment in certain cases. It also requires a faculty member's recusal from certain decisions affecting a member of his or her immediate family.
5. PS-40 establishes the confidentiality of personnel records.

6. PS-50 defines the authority and responsibilities of faculty and of academic officers.
7. PS-59 describes the Employee Assistance Program, referred to in X.C, page 29.
8. PS-104 establishes the criteria and the procedures required for the consideration of dismissal for cause.
9. PM-23 states LSU System policies regarding titles, ranks, and conditions for faculty positions.
10. Footnote (1) to the table in Section 2-6 of the Board Regulations, entitled **Academic Ranks**, deals with the titles of Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Assistant Professor.
11. In Section 1-2 of the Board Regulations, subsections 1-6 define the faculty and various classifications of faculty.
12. Chapter 2 of the Board Regulations, which is entitled **Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure**, sets forth basic faculty personnel policies.
13. In Section 2-7 of the Board Regulations, the part entitled **Expiration of Appointment** establishes minimum notice requirements for nonreappointment, which are restated in V.N, page 13.
14. Section 5-13 of the Board Regulations sets forth policy for actions that may be taken under a condition of Financial Exigency.

II.D Effective Date

It is not intended that in any application of PS-36, anyone will be materially disadvantaged as a result of having relied, at a time when an earlier version of PS-36 was still in effect, on a provision or provisions of that earlier version. A person who believes himself or herself to be so disadvantaged may, on that basis, appeal a decision, following the procedures of Section IX, page 27.

III THE RULES OF A DEPARTMENT OR OTHER ACADEMIC UNIT

III.A Preamble

To establish the most effective faculty governance, and to make due provision for the varying characteristics of departments and other academic units, their disciplines, and their circumstances, PS-36 grants an important role to rules that a unit may adopt to further specify and regulate the policies and procedures dealt with herein.

III.B Validity and Recognition

To be valid and recognized under PS-36, all rules pertinent to the subject matter of PS-36 must meet the following requirements:

- The rules of an academic unit must be consistent with PS-36 and all other University policy statements. A department's rules must be consistent with those of the college to which it reports.
- A department's rules must be approved by a majority vote of the tenured faculty with primary appointment therein. A department may have an additional requirement, for example a majority vote of a more inclusive body of faculty, for the adoption of some or all categories of its rules.
- A college's rules must be approved as provided by the college's bylaws, which may, for example, delegate the authority to adopt and amend some or all categories of its rules to an elected body of faculty.

III.C Authority to Require a Change

The chair or dean of each academic unit must promulgate the unit's rules, and in particular must provide the current version of the unit's rules to the dean (if the unit reports to a dean), the Provost, and the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel Policies. The Provost, after consultation with the Committee, may require a change in the unit's rules, based on a finding that they are inconsistent with the rules of a higher unit, inconsistent with a University Policy Statement, or contrary to the interests of the University.

III.D Parliamentary Authority

The rules contained in the current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* will govern each academic unit in all cases to which they are applicable, except when they are superseded by rules of procedure which the unit may adopt, or by provisions in University Policy Statements.

IV GUIDELINES FOR CRITERIA

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

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

Intellectual honesty; cooperative, ethical, and professional conduct; avoidance of disruptive or combative behavior; and respect for others' rights and safety are expected. A failure to meet these essential and fundamental expectations must be

considered, and will have a negative effect, whenever a faculty member is evaluated. Except when there has been such a failure, the appropriate areas for consideration are the three traditional ones of scholarship, teaching, and service as described below. The distribution of emphasis among the three areas will be consistent with the department's mission and with the faculty member's job description and work assignments.

The three areas are distinct, but they are also interdependent and mutually supportive. For example: A faculty member's scholarly engagement in an academic discipline should assure that he or she will bring current information and skills to the classroom, and will place students at the frontier of knowledge and practice. A faculty member's experience in scholarship and teaching should assure that he or she will bring intellectual and educational values to the performance of service to the University or the broader community.

IV.A Scholarship

Scholarship is an essential purpose of the University and of every academic unit. Every tenure-track or tenured faculty member must engage in scholarship. The term *scholarship* is used here in a broad sense, to signify *contributions to knowledge, in the disciplines appropriate to the department, at a level of quality and significance which is competitive by national standards.*

Examples of scholarship which may be recognized, depending on the department, include the following. This list is not exhaustive.

1. Books, essays, articles, or bulletins reporting the results of original research.
2. Novels, poetry, plays, exhibitions, or musical compositions.
3. Participation in musical performances or theatrical productions.
4. Creations in the visual arts, video or other media.
5. Development of patents, processes, or instruments.
6. Membership on scientific expeditions.
7. Designs and built works.
8. The delivery or application of technology.

In every case for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, achievement in scholarship is essential, and quality is of the essence. In every case it is the responsibility of the voting faculty to arrive at a judgment of the importance, originality, influence, persistence, and future promise of the candidate's program of work. Evaluations by experts outside LSU are essential to the formation of this judgment.

Examples of appropriate factors and evidence which may be used in judging the quality of scholarship include the following. The list is not exhaustive, and an item may or may not apply in a given department.

6 A New PS-36

1. Publication by respected academic journals and publishing houses, that accept work only after review and approval by experts.
2. Published reviews by experts.
3. Citations in research publications or other evidence of impact.
4. Awards for excellence, especially from national or international academic organizations.
5. Invitations to give performances, presentations, exhibitions or lectures.
6. Awards of grants and contracts that indicate a recognition of research achievement or capability.

Variations in the extent and the nature of expectations in scholarship activity may be established in the rules of departments and other academic units, as provided in Section III; and in written contracts.

IV.B Teaching

The University exists for the development and the dissemination of knowledge and understanding, and for the conduct of excellent instructional programs. Every faculty member is expected to be reliable, committed, and highly competent in the performance of his or her 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.

Contributions to the teaching mission which are valid and will be recognized, depending on the department, include, for example, the following. The list is not exhaustive.

1. Classroom instruction and the conduct of courses.
2. Conduct of seminars, critiques, and *practica*.
3. Direction of independent study.
4. Direction of creative and artistic projects.
5. Informal student seminars.
6. Supervision of students in clinical work.
7. Conduct of a course which integrates learning and community service.
8. Involving students in research and publication.

9. Multidisciplinary and interdepartmental teaching.
10. Direction of a thesis or dissertation.
11. Articles on pedagogy.
12. Redesign of a course, or development of a new course.
13. Innovation in teaching methods.
14. Contributions to committees and other entities concerned with teaching, curricula, or educational policy.
15. Publication of textbooks.

If teaching is a part of the department's mission, then in every case for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, it is the responsibility of the voting faculty to arrive at a judgment as to the quality of the candidate's teaching. Examples of appropriate factors and evidence which may contribute to such a judgment are as follows. The list is not exhaustive.

1. Observation of classroom teaching or of other presentations.
2. Statements by the candidate of his or her educational philosophy.
3. Evaluations by peers of course syllabi or other instructional materials.
4. Student performance on departmental examinations or standardized tests.
5. Students' subsequent success or demonstration of mastery.
6. Honors or special recognition for teaching excellence.
7. Invitations to teach in programs at other educational institutions.
8. Invited lectures and panel presentations that pertain to teaching.
9. Evaluations of teaching and testimonials by present or former students.
10. Publication by respected publishing houses.
11. Textbook adoptions at other universities.
12. Grants and contracts to fund teaching activities or provide student stipends, especially by national agencies or foundations.

IV.C Service

The term *service* is used to mean *other contributions to the department, the University, the academic profession, or the broader community, which are broadly supportive to 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 (see Section III, page 3); or in the job description. 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 community. In such a case, he or she 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 jurisdiction over educational policy, a central role in faculty personnel decisions, and shared governance in other areas of University life. All faculty are expected to play a citizen's part in fulfilling these responsibilities. Also, a faculty member's service to the community or to the profession beyond the campus may confirm his or her 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 whenever evaluations are made, and may have weight in decisions on appointment, reappointment, promotion, and advancement to tenure.

Examples of service which are valid and may be recognized are as follows. The list is not exhaustive.

1. Clinical consultation, evaluation, assessment, treatment, patient management, specialty service, or diagnostic support, provided through University-affiliated hospitals and clinics.
2. Service rendered to the community as a part of courses taught.
3. Participation on a certification board.
4. Expert advice to professions, businesses, or government.
5. Holding office or other position of responsibility in a professional organization.
6. Participating on a governmental body.
7. Holding an administrative office in the University.
8. Advisory role with a student organization.
9. Committee work for the department, college, University, or LSU System.
10. Contributions toward faculty or staff training and development.
11. Leadership in technology transfer, economic development, or job creation.
12. Taking part in the organization of a conference.

13. An editorship or editorial board membership.
14. Refereeing or reviewing papers or grant proposals.
15. Judging student or professional competitions.
16. Consultation for industry, agriculture, or government.
17. Administering grants.

V GENERAL PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS

V.A Confidentiality

Every effort should be made to ensure confidentiality in the processes of PS-36. The files generated under these processes are personnel records in the sense of PS-40.

V.B Definitions of Certain Terms

For the sake of brevity in covering a variety of cases, PS-36 uses each of the terms *college*, *department*, *dean*, and *chair* in a broad sense. For the definitions of these and other terms such as *primary department* and *secondary department*, see Section XII, page 33.

V.C Meetings

For each provision in PS-36 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 so long as it allows discussion.

V.D The Role of the Provost

As the chief academic officer of the University, the Provost will assure that all policies and procedures of the LSU System and of LSU are observed. The Provost will promulgate in timely fashion timetables for procedures, and also the forms and content required when documentation is submitted, including the LSU System forms required for promotion or advancement to tenure.

V.E The Role of the Dean

As the chief academic officer of the college, the dean will promulgate in timely fashion any further information, including specifications of deadlines, forms, and procedures, necessary to assure that the pertinent policies of the University, and the rules of the college (see Section III, page 3) are observed.

V.F The Role of the Chair

As the chief academic officer of the department, the chair will organize and direct the procedures of PS-36 so that the pertinent policies of the University and rules of academic units (see Section III), are followed. The chair is responsible for planning and conducting all procedures in a timely fashion, so that the notice requirements stated in V.N, page 13, will be satisfied, and so that departmental actions are completed in accord with timetables established by the Provost and the dean. The chair will assure the integrity of all proceedings, and as the presiding officer at meetings must be impartial. The chair will exercise independent judgment in making evaluations and recommendations, and will be held responsible for them.

V.G Recusal of a Line Officer

If a decision would personally affect a line officer or the immediate family thereof, then that line officer must recuse himself or herself from all involvement with that decision process. Whenever a line officer recuses himself or herself from a given decision, the officer to whom that person reports will designate a replacement for him or her, for the purposes of that decision.

V.H Right to a Peer Advisor

A faculty member, at certain meetings with a chair or other line officer, has a right to invite a tenured faculty member at LSU to participate in the discussion. Those meetings are identified in PS-36 by the statement, "V.H applies." If the line officer has delegated all or part of his role in the subject matter of such a meeting to another person, this right extends to meetings with that person.

V.I Participation by All Voting Faculty

The chair will establish and carry out procedures and practices to assure that, with regard to each decision, and to the extent possible without excessive delays, all voting faculty, including those who are not in residence, will be afforded the opportunity to be informed, to express views, and to cast votes. In so doing the chair will observe the pertinent regulations, if any, contained in the department's rules (see Section III, page 3).

V.J The Manner of Voting

To establish a departmental decision or recommendation on a PS-36 matter, ordinarily the chair must call a meeting of the voting faculty, hold a discussion, and take a vote by written ballot, also using email or other means as may be necessary and appropriate to comply with V.I. When necessary, as for example when decisions on initial appointments are made during summer months, online systems for information, discussion, and voting may be used. Every count will be verified by at least one

witness. The tally, including separate counts when taken, will be reported to the voting faculty. The right of each person to have his or her ballot kept confidential will be respected. The rules of the department (see Section III, page 3), may further specify and regulate the manner of voting.

V.K Separate Counts

Whenever the voting faculty include both tenured and tenure-track faculty, their votes will be counted separately, and the tally will be reported for each group as well as for the voting faculty as a whole. Separate counts by rank, tenure status, and/or other appropriate criteria will be taken in other cases when required by the rules of the department or college (see Section III). Marked ballots or other means may be used as necessary to make separate counts. In every case, nevertheless, the outcome will be decided by a majority of the voting faculty as a whole.

V.L The Voting Faculty

For the purposes of a given decision, the *voting faculty* will consist of all full-time LSU faculty who hold primary appointment in the department, and who qualify as stated in V.L.1; with exclusions and additions which may occur as provided in V.L.2, V.L.3, and V.L.4.

V.L.1 Preliminary Definition of the Voting Faculty

1. For an initial appointment to a tenure-track position, the voting faculty will be the tenured and tenure-track faculty; except that the rules of the department (see Section III, page 3) may, for some or all such cases, define the voting faculty to be a committee of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.
2. For an initial appointment to a tenured position, there will be separate voting on the appointment and on the granting of tenure. For the appointment, the voting faculty will be the tenured and tenure-track faculty. For the granting of tenure, the voting faculty will be the tenured faculty with rank equal to or higher than that to which the candidate would be appointed.
3. For reappointment of a tenure-track faculty member, the voting faculty will be the tenured faculty with rank equal to or higher than that of the candidate.
4. For a promotion to Associate Professor, and for an advancement of an Associate Professor to tenure, the voting faculty will be the tenured Associate Professors and Professors.
5. For a promotion to Professor, and for an advancement of a Professor to tenure, the voting faculty will be the tenured Professors.

V.L.2 The Chair as Member of the Voting Faculty Even in a case when it is not implied by V.L.1, the chair will be a member of the voting faculty. As

the presiding officer at meetings of the voting faculty, the chair has the duty to be impartial, and his or her voting rights are restricted, as provided in *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised*. The chair will not take part in deliberations or balloting on the decision itself, because later the chair will write an independent evaluation and recommendation with regard to the decision, as required in V.M.

V.L.3 Recusals, Exclusions, and Other Restrictions

1. A faculty member whose immediate family would be affected by a decision must recuse himself or herself from all involvement in the decision process and will not belong to the voting faculty for that decision. See PS-25.
2. A faculty member may serve as an administrator who must make a recommendation on a case at some level above the department. Such a person must recuse himself or herself from votes and deliberations on the case at the department level, and will not belong to the voting faculty for that decision.
3. A faculty member may serve in an advisory capacity on a case at some level above the department. Such a person will be a member of the voting faculty at the department level but must, at the later stage, disclose the connection and refrain from any vote that may be taken.
4. Under exceptional circumstances, a faculty member may recuse himself or herself voluntarily.
5. A faculty member who is under notice of nonreappointment or termination will not be a member of the voting faculty.

V.L.4 Added Voting Faculty For a decision which is to be made in a primary or secondary department, the voting faculty as determined by the provisions above will sometimes be fewer than six in number. In such a case, the line officer to whom the chair reports may find it desirable and practical to improve the range of expertise of the voting faculty, for the decision in question, by increasing their number. After consulting the chair and the voting faculty within the department, he or she may elect to appoint additional persons to the voting faculty. In so doing, he or she may bring the total number up to as many as six. The appointees must hold rank and tenure status at LSU as required in V.L.1. The appointments will be subject to approval by the Provost. V.L.5 may apply.

It is preferable to make such appointments well in advance. When such appointments are made for successive decisions affecting a tenure-track faculty member, it is preferable to have continuity in the make-up of the voting faculty for those decisions.

V.L.5 Voting Twice on the Same Decision As a result of provisions above, a person may be a member of the voting faculty in more than one department on the same decision. In such a case, he or she will not vote on that decision in more than one of the departments.

V.M The Report of a Departmental Recommendation

Whenever the voting faculty in a primary or secondary department complete their deliberations and arrive at a recommendation—with regard to initial appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure—the report of the recommendation will include the following elements:

1. A count of the votes, separately by rank and/or tenure status of faculty when appropriate.
2. An accounting for the members of the voting faculty who did not vote.
3. Analysis and explanations, as needed, with regard to letters from outside experts, in cases when those are included. All material in which the content of those letters is revealed or their authors identified will be presented separately and kept confidential.
4. The chair's independent judgment and recommendation with regard to the decision.
5. An account of the important factors underlying the voting faculty's recommendation, including minority views, with written statements by minorities when they so choose.

Unless the rules of the department or college (see Section III) require otherwise, the following provision will apply:

- The chair will assemble the report. A representative of the voting faculty other than the chair will either sign the chair's report, confirming its accuracy and completeness; or, if he or she prefers, prepare and sign a supplementary report on behalf of the voting faculty which will be attached to the chair's report.

The rules of the department (see Section III, page 3) may make a different provision. For example, the rules may provide that the chair will prepare the first four elements of the report, and a voting-faculty representative will prepare the fifth.

V.N Required Notice of Nonreappointment

Notice of a decision not to reappoint will ordinarily be given in writing at least ninety days before the end of an initial one-year appointment; at least six months before the end of an appointment that is ending in the second year of service; and at least one calendar year before the end of an appointment that is ending after two or more years of service. These provisions may be abrogated in extraordinary circumstances; see II.C, items 8 and 14.

Once a person is notified that the decision has been made not to reappoint him or her, that decision will normally be irrevocable. The decision will not be suspended pending an appeal. The decision does not require approval by administrative offices or by the Board of Supervisors except as explicitly provided in PS-36.

VI INITIAL APPOINTMENTS

VI.A Procedure

VI.A.1 The Chair's Responsibility The pertinent rules of the department, if any (see Section III, page 3), and the requirements of PS-36 and all other University policies that apply (see II.C, page 2) must be observed. Subject to those constraints, the chair is responsible for developing hiring strategy in consultation with the faculty, securing budgetary commitments from higher offices, advertising positions, recruiting qualified persons to apply, screening applicants, and carrying out other steps in the process of making an appointment. To perform these tasks, the chair may delegate responsibilities, establish procedures, and appoint committees.

VI.A.2 An Open Process All tenured and tenure-track faculty are entitled to information about the processes referred to in VI.A.1; to have access to the application files; and to provide their written evaluations of applicants for inclusion in the application files. (see V.L, page 11).

VI.A.3 A Recommendation to Appoint For the department to recommend an appointment, the chair must call a meeting of the voting faculty and take a vote by written ballot, with separate counts when appropriate. See item 2 of V.L.1, page 11; and V.J, page 10. The voting 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 chair. For example, in consideration of possible rapid changes in the availability of candidates under discussion, they may approve more than one candidate for a position, ordering the list by preference and/or allowing the chair to exercise a certain discretion.

In the case of a joint appointment, the chair of each secondary department must also call a meeting of the voting faculty and take a vote by written ballot on whether to support the hire.

The report of the departmental recommendation will be prepared as provided in V.M, page 13.

VI.A.4 Documentation of Academic Credentials For every appointment, the required academic credentials must be documented. If a degree is required, then there must be official written certification, by the appropriate office of the degree-granting institution, that all requirements for the degree have been completed. At the discretion of LSU, official transcripts of the academic record will be required.

VI.A.5 Approval Process The chair of the primary department will forward to the dean an appointment file, comprising the following items:

1. The candidate's *C.V.* and appropriate supporting material, including documentation of academic credentials and all letters of evaluation. See VI.A.4 and VI.F.

2. The report of the departmental recommendation from the primary and each secondary department, as described in V.M, page 13.
3. The employment contract signed by the chair. The primary department will be identified on the contract.
4. The chair's statement on the recommendation, explaining as necessary the terms of the contract, such as provisions related to the tenure clock (see VI.E).

If the proposed appointment is of an Assistant Professor, the dean will make the final decision. Otherwise, if the dean recommends approval of the appointment, he or she will sign the contract and forward it with the candidate's *C.V.* and documentation of academic credentials to HRM, who will forward them to the Provost. If the dean recommends against approval, he or she will forward the contract, the candidate's *C.V.* and certification of credentials to the Provost with a statement explaining the recommendation. Other documents will be returned to the chair until final disposition of the recommendation.

If the proposed appointment is without tenure, the Provost will make the final decision. Otherwise, if the Provost recommends approval of the appointment, he or she will sign the contract and send it through HRM to the Chancellor and, if approved by the Chancellor, to the LSU System President for final approval.

When final approval has been secured, the signed contract will be returned through channels to the chair. Only then will the position be offered to the candidate and the contract sent for his or her consideration. Only then will any University officer make any written commitment regarding any aspect or condition of the appointment.

VI.B Minimum Qualifications for Appointments

VI.B.1 For Every Appointment For an appointment to a tenure-track or tenured position, a person must hold the terminal degree in an academic discipline and/or suitable professional experience and achievements, as appropriate to the department and the job description. See VI.A.4 and VI.F. PS-25, entitled **Nepotism**, prohibits employment in certain cases.

VI.B.2 For Appointment to a Higher Rank Appointment at a rank higher than Assistant Professor requires distinguished qualifications appropriate to the mission of the department and competitive with those of persons promoted to such a rank from within LSU.

VI.B.3 For Appointment with Tenure Tenure may be granted with an initial appointment if the candidate holds tenure at a comparable university, or if he or she possesses distinguished qualifications appropriate to the mission of the department and competitive with those of persons advanced to tenure from within LSU.

VI.C Requirement of an Interview

Except in extraordinary cases, for every candidate recommended for appointment, there must have been an interview on campus, allowing interaction between the candidate and the voting faculty who are in residence. If there is no on-campus interview, there must be an off-campus interview, teleconference, or some other provision for interaction that is satisfactory to the voting faculty.

VI.D Inbreeding

An appointment will not be offered to a person whose terminal degree is from LSU unless the department has an exceptional need for someone with his or her qualifications; or unless he or she has exceptional merit; for example, having achieved an excellent record elsewhere since the time of the terminal degree.

VI.E Initial Appointments and the Tenure Clock

For a tenure-track faculty member, the following provisions specify how the tenure clock will be set at the time of the initial appointment. They also define, by reference to the tenure clock, the year of mandatory tenure review. In that year, there must be a tenure review unless when the year begins, as a result of a decision previously made, the faculty member is already tenured or is under notice of nonreappointment. For provisions regarding the probationary period, see Section VII, page 17. Regarding tenure reviews, see Section VIII, page 20.

VI.E.1 Assistant Professors The initial appointment of an Assistant Professor will be for a term of three years. At the University's discretion, if the person has suitable qualifications and achievements and/or a period of service at another university, then the appointment contract may define the first year of service as an Assistant Professor at LSU to be year two, three, four, or five on the tenure clock. Otherwise, that first year will be year one on the tenure clock.

Year six on the tenure clock will be the year of the mandatory tenure review. The appointment will not be continued after year seven on the tenure clock if tenure has not been granted.

VI.E.2 Associate Professors and Professors The initial appointment of a tenure-track, untenured Associate Professor or Professor will be for a term of at least three but no more than five years. At the University's discretion, if the person has suitable qualifications and achievements and/or a period of service in the rank at another university, then the appointment contract may define the first year in the rank at LSU to be year two or three on the tenure clock. Otherwise the first year of service in the rank at LSU will be year one on the tenure clock.

Year four on the tenure clock will be the year of the mandatory tenure review. The appointment will not be continued after year five on the tenure clock if tenure has not been granted.

VI.F An Appointment Without the Terminal Degree

The following provisions apply when a degree that is required for the position has not been awarded. The University may, at its discretion, extend the offer, but only on this condition: That the appointment will be made only if the appropriate office of the degree-granting institution has, by a specified date, provided official written certification that all requirements for the degree have been completed. In the absence of said certification, the University may, at its discretion, appoint the person as a non-tenure-track Acting Assistant Professor, at a reduced salary, for no more than two years at a time and, except in extraordinary circumstances, for a total of no more than two years. If the certification is provided subsequently, the University may, at its discretion, appoint the person as a tenure-track Assistant Professor.

VII THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

VII.A Annual Reviews, Reappointment Reviews

The provisions of the present Section VII do not apply in a year when a faculty member is undergoing a tenure review; in that case, Section VIII governs. They also do not apply if he or she has resigned, or is under notice of nonreappointment. They may be abrogated in extraordinary circumstances; see II.C, items 8 and 14.

With the exceptions just mentioned, each year, for each untenured faculty member, there will be a *review committee* defined as follows. It will consist of all tenured faculty at or above the rank of the faculty member or, if so provided in the department's rules (see Section III), a committee thereof.

The chair will meet with the review committee and advise the members of the time on the faculty member's tenure clock. The chair will also advise the committee if, for the person in question, a reappointment review is mandated by VII.B, mandated by rules of the department or college (see Section III), or required by the line officer to whom the chair reports. The review committee may at this time decide that there will be a reappointment review during the year at hand, even if one is not thus mandated or required, provided one is allowed by VII.B and any other pertinent rules. If a reappointment review will not take place, then the annual review process of Section X will take place. The committee will discuss the steps that will follow, beginning with those described in X.C.2.

Nonreappointment can occur only as a negative result of a reappointment review or tenure review, and the notice requirements of V.N must be observed. Thus if a reappointment review does not take place during a given year, it means that the term of the faculty member's appointment will be extended to continue through the next two years if it does not already include that period.

The rules of a department or college, established in compliance with Section III, page 3, may further specify and regulate the matter of when a reappointment review will take place, and the procedure for such a review.

Regarding the initial setting of the tenure clock, see VI.E, page 16. Regarding possible later adjustments to the tenure clock, see VII.D, page 20.

VII.B Timetable Provisions for Reappointments

1. If a person's first year of service as an Assistant Professor at LSU was year one or year two on the tenure clock, then these two regulations apply:
 - There must be a reappointment review no later than the third year of service.
 - No appointment may continue into year five on the person's tenure clock except as a positive result of a reappointment review or tenure review.
2. When an Assistant Professor has begun year five on the tenure clock and is not under notice of nonreappointment, the term of his or her appointment will extend through year six on the tenure clock, which will be the year of the mandatory tenure review. Year seven will then be the last year of the appointment unless the person is advanced to tenure.
3. When an Associate Professor or Professor has begun year three on the tenure clock and is not under notice of nonreappointment, the term of his or her appointment will extend through year four on the tenure clock, which will be the year of the mandatory tenure review. Year five on the tenure clock will then be the last year of the appointment unless the person is advanced to tenure.

VII.C Procedure for a Reappointment Review

After the preliminary steps of the annual review process (X.C.2, page 30), a reappointment review will follow the steps of the present VII.C instead of those described in X.C.3. Note that the definition of the voting faculty depends on the rank of the person being reviewed; see item 3 of V.L, page 11.

1. The chair will make the file available to the voting faculty for their study. The chair will also make it available to the voting faculty of each secondary department, if any, through the chair thereof.
2. In each secondary department, the chair will convene the voting faculty to consider the file, discuss the person's job performance, and arrive at their advice regarding the reappointment decision. The report of the departmental recommendation, described in V.M, page 13, will be sent to the primary department, and it will be placed in the file.
3. In the primary department, the chair will convene the voting faculty to consider the file, discuss the person's job performance, and vote on whether to recommend nonreappointment, or to recommend reappointment by adding to the person's term a specified period of time. This period will be chosen

consistent with other provisions in the present Section VII, and will not exceed three years in any case. The report of the departmental recommendation, described in V.M, page 13, will be placed in the file.

4. The chair will meet with the faculty member to advise him or her of the recommendation; V.H applies. The chair will advise the faculty member of the procedural steps that will follow.
5. The document 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:
 - (a) I am aware of the contents of my file and have had the opportunity to provide my annual report and up-to-date documentation.
 - (b) I have been notified of the recommendation with regard to my reappointment.
 - (c) I have exercised, or else waived, my rights to discuss the recommendation with the chair and/or with the chair of each secondary department in which I am employed.
 - (d) I understand that I have the right to attach a formal letter of response or rebuttal, with materials in support thereof. I {have done so / have not done so}.
6. The faculty member may prepare a formal letter of response or rebuttal for inclusion in the file. To be considered in the approval process, it must be sent to the chair and to the dean no later than five working days after the deadline for the reappointment recommendation to reach the dean.

VII.C.1 Approval Process The chair will send a copy of the file (omitting unchanged, previously transmitted contents) to the dean.

There may be a committee to review such files and assist the dean, either appointed by the dean or otherwise established under the college's rules (see Section III, page 3). Such a committee is advisory only, and its communications will not become part of the file. The dean is responsible for his or her actions and for justifying them.

With regard to an Assistant Professor's reappointment, the dean will make the decision. He or she will prepare a written statement explaining the decision, provide it to the chair and to the faculty member, and place it in the file. If the decision is not to reappoint, the dean will in timely fashion meet with the faculty member; V.H applies.

With regard to an Associate Professor's or Professor's reappointment, the dean will make a recommendation to the Provost. He or she will prepare a written statement explaining the recommendation, provide it to the chair and to the faculty member, and place it in the file. If the decision is to recommend against reappointment, the dean will in timely fashion meet with the faculty member; V.H applies. The Provost will make the decision and notify the dean, the chair, and the faculty member. If the

decision is negative and contrary to the dean's recommendation, then the Provost will in timely fashion meet with the faculty member; V.H applies.

The chair will inform the voting faculty of the decision.

In all cases, the chair will send the dean, along with the file, a Personnel Action Form to carry out the recommended action, to reappoint or not to reappoint. The dean, HRM, and the Provost in turn will process the form as appropriate.

VII.D Adjustments to the Tenure Clock

The tenure clock may be stopped for a specified period of time under the following provisions. Such an adjustment may be made only for a tenure-track faculty member who is not under notice of nonreappointment, and provided year six on the tenure clock has not begun. A reappointment, promotion, or tenure review may take place during the period when the clock is stopped.

1. The faculty member may request that for a specified period of time, he or she (1) be granted leave without pay, (2) become a part-time employee, or (3) be assigned duties that do not contribute to a case for advancement to tenure. With the chair's recommendation, and with the approval of the dean and of such other officers as may be required, such a request may be granted. If so, the tenure clock will be stopped for this period of time, unless the person asks otherwise when making the request and the exception is approved. With regard to leave guidelines, see PS-12.
2. The faculty member may request that the tenure clock be stopped for a specified period of time, with or without requesting one of the actions named in item 1.

Some examples of circumstances in which such a request will be considered are as follows.

- The faculty member may be a primary or coequal caregiver of newborn or newly adopted children. On this basis, the tenure clock may be stopped for up to one year for each child, and for a maximum of two years in all.
- The faculty member may have major obligations for elder or dependent care; or suffer disability or chronic illness; or face other circumstances, beyond his or her control, that significantly impede progress toward a case for advancement to tenure. Ordinarily, under this provision, the tenure clock may be stopped for a maximum of one year in all.

VIII PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

VIII.A General Provisions

In the present Section, the term *review* means a formal process for reaching a decision on one or more of the following actions: (1) Advancement to tenure, (2) promotion to

Associate Professor, or (3) promotion to Professor. In case (1), it is a *tenure review*; in case (2) or (3), it is a *promotion review*. For an Assistant Professor, advancement to tenure and promotion are always done in combination. The term *candidate* refers to the faculty member under review.

A review will be conducted if (1) it is a mandated tenure review, or (2) the faculty member is nominated for a review by the chair or by another member of the voting faculty, or (3) the review is requested by the faculty member in question.

A review requires preparation of a *review file*, described in VIII.E, which in large part is the responsibility of the candidate.

A review has three stages:

1. Evaluation by selected outside experts—VIII.B, page 22. Letters of evaluation will be requested and obtained from selected evaluators external to LSU.
2. Recommendation by the department—VIII.C, page 25.
3. Consideration by higher offices, from the dean through the LSU System—VIII.D, page 26.

A positive decision on the action in question requires the successful completion of all three stages. Judicious and careful preparation and deliberation are called for at each stage. Accordingly, it is advisable to allow a full calendar year to carry out the process. For illustration, in the usual case—that is, for a review that is to be completed late in the spring semester—the suggested timetable is as follows: Stage 1 should begin by late in the spring semester of the year before, and should be completed by early fall. Stage 2 should be completed during the fall semester. Stage 3 begins in late fall and runs through the spring semester.

VIII.A.1 Line Officers' Responsibilities General provisions regarding the roles of the line officers are found in V.D, V.E, and V.F. The Provost through HRM will make known in timely fashion the schedule for the steps of stage 3, as well as all pertinent LSU System and University specifications and guidelines for the review file (see VIII.E). The dean will make known in timely fashion college guidelines for the review, including the deadline for the department to submit recommendations to the college. The dean will provide appropriate guidance to chairs about the conduct of stages 1 and 2. The chair will inform the department faculty about the procedures and timetables.

The chair will advise the candidate about the preparation of the review file (see VIII.E) and the procedures described in the present Section. The two of them will make appropriate arrangements to communicate, and to move the process along, for any periods of time during the review period when the candidate will be out of town.

VIII.A.2 Withdrawal from a Mandated Review A mandated tenure review, as discussed in VII.B, will lead either to advancement to tenure or to nonreappointment. Such a review will proceed through all three stages unless the faculty member declines to be reviewed or withdraws from consideration after the review is under

way. He or she may do so by means of a written request to the Provost through the chair and dean. Such a request must include an official resignation and will result in nonreappointment at the end of the person's current term.

VIII.A.3 An Early Review An *early review* is either (1) a review for promotion to Professor¹ that takes place before the faculty member's fifth year of service at LSU in the rank of Associate Professor; or (2) a tenure review that takes place before the year when it is mandated (see VI.E). An early review is unusual, and should proceed only when merit is well-established and clearly meets or exceeds the expectations applied in other reviews. An early review may end with a negative decision with regard to the action in question; however, such a result will be without prejudice to future reviews of the faculty member.

VIII.A.4 The Review Committee The *review committee* for a faculty member under review will be a committee of the voting faculty, chaired by someone other than the department chair, and appointed as provided in the department's rules (see Section III, page 3). If those rules do not make a provision, the review committee will be appointed by the chair, and may consist of all the voting faculty. As provided in VIII.B.4, the review committee will take part in the selection of the outside experts to be asked for letters of evaluation. After those letters have been obtained, the committee will consider the material in the review file (VIII.E), including the letters, and will prepare a report, which will be a comprehensive statement on the case, observing the provisions of Section IV. Their report will be placed in the review file.

VIII.B Stage 1: Evaluation by Experts Outside LSU

VIII.B.1 Confidentiality The identity of each and every outside expert who is asked to write an evaluation will be kept confidential to the extent possible, consistent with the provisions of VIII.B.4. In particular, the candidate will not be informed as to who the evaluators are. During the review, the candidate will not communicate on the subject of the review with anyone that he or she knows may be an evaluator.

The content of each and every letter will be kept confidential to the extent possible, as required by PS-40. Access to the letters will be limited to the voting faculty, the chair, and staff members as necessary; and to other persons beyond the department who are authorized participants in the review process under VIII.D.

VIII.B.2 Qualifications The following regulations and objectives must be observed. Exceptions must be approved by the line officer to whom the chair reports.

¹*For information only:* In the five years 99-00 through 03-04, 129 Associate Professors were promoted to Professor. Twenty-nine of them were promoted "on time," after just 5 years of service as Associate Professor; 22 were promoted early; and 26 were promoted after ten or more years of service. The average number of years in rank was 7.2.

1. The evaluators from whom letters are obtained must, taken together, have expertise which covers the areas of the candidate's work.
2. Each evaluator with a university faculty position must hold the rank of Professor or a rank higher than that of the candidate.
3. Each evaluator must have appropriate professional standing, for example that of a faculty position at an university whose Carnegie Classification, with regard to research and advanced study, is at least that of LSU.²
4. A person known to have a bias or conflict of interest that would affect his or her evaluation will not be asked to serve as an evaluator.
5. Letters of evaluation must be obtained from persons from at least three different institutions.
6. Letters of evaluation must be obtained from at least three persons other than the candidate's major professor for the terminal degree or postdoctoral advisor.

VIII.B.3 The Use of Letters of Evaluation Every letter of evaluation obtained 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.

1. A letter which is more than two years old will be excluded unless the letter is up-to-date on all aspects of the case that it addresses, and the review committee favors its inclusion.
2. A letter which is two years old or less may be excluded provided the evaluator has written a more recent letter to replace it.

VIII.B.4 Procedure for Choosing Evaluators Ample time should be allowed for this procedure. Courtesy requires that those who are asked to write letters of evaluation should not be rushed.

1. The review committee will ask the faculty member under review, the chair, and the voting faculty to submit nominations of outside evaluators; and will then select a list of evaluators to ask for letters. The committee and the chair will jointly choose the evaluators, and subsequently may make changes in the list.
2. Each evaluator must be approved by the dean before a contact is made with him or her.

²As of August, 2004, the highest classification defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is that of a Doctoral/Research University—Extensive, which includes about 150 U.S. institutions, and LSU is among them.

3. The chair may make preliminary contacts with evaluators to determine their ability and willingness to serve. The chair may request a *C.V.* or other information if one is needed to provide an accurate and appropriate description of an evaluator's qualifications.
4. To request each evaluation, the chair will send a letter as provided in VIII.B.5. The chair will furnish the candidate's *C.V.* The candidate, in consultation with the chair, may select supporting material to be enclosed with the letter.

VIII.B.5 Form Letter, for Requesting a Letter of Evaluation The letter to each person being asked to write a letter of evaluation must comply with the following model, except for variations approved by the officer to whom the chair reports.

Dear [· · ·]:

[· · ·], who is currently [*an assistant professor / an associate professor / a professor*] in the Department of [· · ·] here at Louisiana State University, is under consideration for promotion to [*associate professor with tenure / tenure / professor*]. 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 *C.V.* and [· · ·] are enclosed for your use. [*Further description or explanation of enclosures, as necessary.*]

To be useful to us in the decision process, your response must reach us by [*date*].

[*Include if appropriate:*] We realize that you wrote us previously about this candidate [*on such and such a date.*] A copy of your previous letter is enclosed. University procedures require that we ask you for an updated letter at this time, to assure 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 know the candidate personally; and if so, during what period of time and in what capacity.
2. We seek to form an objective assessment of the candidate's [*research / · · · (Scholarship being defined in a broad sense (see IV.A), 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 if you find it appropriate to do so.
 - (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*]?
 - (d) How do the candidate's achievements compare 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?

3. Please assess the candidate's abilities as a teacher or expositor, if you are in a position to form an opinion. [*The wording here may be chosen to make it appropriate to the discipline.*]
4. Please assess the candidate's service to the profession, if you are in a position to have an opinion. [*The wording here may be chosen to make it appropriate to the discipline.*]
5. Provide any additional insights or advice that you believe should be considered as we make our decision.

Published LSU policy stipulates that letters of evaluation will be regarded as confidential and will not be provided to the candidate. Unless you state explicitly that the letter is not to be regarded as confidential, your letter and identity will be shared only with those individuals who are authorized to participate in the decision process. The only exception to this policy would come in the event of a direct court order to release the data on a specific candidate to that candidate or to his or her representatives.

We thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please feel free to get in touch with me for further information at [*phone number, fax number, . . . , and/or email address*].

Yours sincerely,

VIII.C Stage 2: Recommendation by the Department

The definition of the voting faculty depends on the action being considered and the status of the person under review; see V.L, page 11.

1. When items 1-3, listed in VIII.E, and the preliminary report of the review committee, have been placed in the review file, the chair will make the file available to the voting faculty for their study. The chair will also make it available to the voting faculty of each secondary department, if any, through the chair thereof. Chairs will take appropriate measures to assure that confidentiality is maintained.
2. The chair of each secondary department will convene the voting faculty therein to consider the case and to vote on their advice regarding the decision to be made. The report of the department's recommendation, described in V.M, page 13, will be prepared and sent to the chair of the primary department, and will be placed in the review file.
3. The chair of the primary department will convene the voting faculty to consider the case and to vote on their recommendation on the decision to be made. The report of the department's recommendation, described in V.M, page 13, will be prepared and placed in the review file. The report will incorporate the report of the review committee, revised as appropriate to reflect the deliberations of

the voting faculty. In cases when more than one candidate is being considered for the same action, the report will not engage in rankings.

4. The chair will provide copies of the reports written under the provisions of items 2 and 3 to the candidate, exclusive of the part that must be kept confidential (see item 3 of V.M, page 13). The candidate may write a formal response for inclusion in the file. To be considered at the next stage, such a response must be sent to the chair, and also to the officer to whom the chair reports, no later than five working days after the deadline for forwarding the departmental recommendation.

VIII.D Stage 3: Consideration by Higher Offices

The Provost or a dean may appoint a faculty committee to review cases and provide advice to him or her. However, such a committee will be advisory only, and its recommendations will not become part of review files. Each officer is solely responsible for writing the evaluation and making the recommendation for his or her level, using criteria consistent with the guidelines of Section IV, page 4. Rankings will not be made. The steps are as follows.

1. The dean may recommend for or against the action in question, and will then forward the review file to the Provost. At the same time, the dean will advise the chair and the candidate of the recommendation. If it is negative, or if the candidate requests it, the dean will meet with the candidate; V.H applies.
2. The Provost may recommend for or against the action in question, and will then forward the review file to the Chancellor.
3. The Chancellor may recommend for or against the action in question, and will then forward the review file to the President of the LSU System. At the same time, the Chancellor will notify the candidate of the University recommendation.
4. In each case, the final decision will be made by the LSU System in accord to its policies and procedures.
5. The Chancellor will in timely fashion notify candidates of LSU System decisions.

VIII.E Contents of the Review File

1. *C.V.* and other documentation, as required by the LSU System, University, college, or department.
2. The chair's evaluation, together with attachments if any by the faculty member, from each annual review process that has taken place. See X.C.
3. Outside evaluations, as provided in VIII.B, together with:

- (a) Name and address of everyone asked to write an evaluation.
 - (b) For each evaluator, a brief statement of his or her qualifications, including academic rank and institution of employment.
 - (c) A sample letter used to request the evaluations.
 - (d) Explanatory notes as needed, at the discretion of the chair or review committee.
4. The report, as described in V.M, page 13, on the recommendation of each secondary department, if any, and of the primary department.
 5. The faculty member's written response, if any, as provided in item 4 of VIII.C.

IX APPEALS

IX.A Procedures

After the final disposition of a reappointment, promotion, or tenure recommendation, a faculty member may appeal the decision, seeking the reversal or other modification of the action in question. A written response is required from each office that considers an appeal. All documents pertinent to the appeal will become part of the faculty member's file. The following steps will be followed.

1. The faculty member will submit to the chair and the dean a written petition, describing the matters in dispute and the requested resolution. The dean, in consultation with the chair, will consider the appeal and make a written response. If the dean agrees with the appeal but lacks the authority to grant the request, he or she may forward the petition and a statement of support to the Provost, and notify the petitioner that this has been done.
2. If the dean neither resolves the appeal satisfactorily nor forwards it to the Provost, the faculty member may choose one of the following options.
 - (a) He or she may submit the petition to the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee. The Faculty Senate Bylaws define the Committee's procedures and describe the possible outcomes.
 - (b) He or she may bypass the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee and submit the petition to the Provost. In this case, the Provost may choose to submit the matter to the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee for an advisory opinion. The Provost will make a written response.
3. If the appeal is not resolved satisfactorily in an earlier step, and if the Provost has not yet considered the petition, the petitioner may submit it to the Provost.
4. If the appeal is not resolved satisfactorily by the Provost, the petitioner may request that the Provost forward the appeal file to the Chancellor for review and final action. The findings of the Chancellor constitute the final step in the appeal procedure.

IX.B Grounds

In submitting an appeal, a faculty member is free to present whatever information and evidence he or she considers to be pertinent. The following principles will be observed.

1. The faculty and academic officers of the University will be held responsible for following the procedures set forth in PS-36, other University policies, and the rules of academic units (see Section III). However, procedural errors that do not corrupt the process or affect the substance of a decision will not be grounds for delaying, reconsidering, modifying, or setting aside that decision.
2. The purview of the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee is restricted. The Senate Bylaws state in part that the Committee "cannot substitute its judgment for an academic judgment made in a fair and reasonable manner, according to University evaluative procedures."

X ANNUAL DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

X.A Preamble

All faculty are subject to reporting requirements, and are entitled to regular and accurate reviews and evaluations. Such procedures aim to nurture and support faculty work and faculty careers, to recognize excellence, and be fair to everyone.

The annual review process described in X.C 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 multi-year projects and commitments. The import of a single year's report or evaluation will often be incremental in nature.

The process is a framework for businesslike and collegial communication. PS-36 does not prescribe in complete detail. The rules of the department or college (see Section III, page 3) may further specify and regulate the criteria, the process, and the timetable; and may provide additional formal reviews, of various kinds and frequencies, that fit around this framework.

X.B A Faculty Member's File

Each department will maintain an official departmental personnel file, herein called the *file*, for each faculty member with primary appointment in the department. He or she will have ready access to the file, and may update its contents or add appropriate material at any time.

This file will not include letters of recommendation or evaluation which, under PS-40, the Policy Statement entitled *Employee Records Confidentiality*, are not available to the faculty member. It will include at the minimum the items listed below. Various provisions of PS-36 may apply, requiring certain other items to be included. The

rules of a department or college (see Section III, page 3) may further specify and regulate the contents of the file.

Each item should bear the date when it was placed in the file.

1. An up-to-date *C.V.* and supporting documentation.
2. The faculty member's annual reports.
3. The reports from all formal reviews that have been completed, either under PS-36 or under rules of academic units (see Section III), including reviews for reappointment, promotion, and advancement to tenure.
4. All chair's annual evaluations of the faculty member.
5. All evaluations by chairs of the faculty member's secondary departments, if any.
6. A list of the file's contents.

X.C The Annual Review Process

In each annual review process for a faculty member, there will be only one reviewing officer. He or she will have primary responsibility for the process, but will incorporate evaluations by others as appropriate, for example when the faculty member has duties in more than one unit.

The process will occur every year for every faculty member, except when he or she is being reviewed for reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure; or is under notice of nonreappointment or termination. Other exceptions: He or she may suffer from physical or emotional illness, or drug or alcohol dependency, 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 next higher officer, may suspend or modify the annual review process. See PS-59, the Policy Statement entitled *Employee Assistance Program*.

The process will occur in the faculty member's primary department, with the chair as the reviewing officer, under the provisions of the present subsection X.C; except when the faculty member is serving as an administrator—for example, as the chair—and reports to an officer above the department level, who will then be the reviewing officer. In that case, the evaluation of the faculty member's performance of his or her departmental duties will be carried out in the department as provided in its rules (see Section III, page 3); and the reviewing officer will collect, consider, and incorporate said evaluation.

X.C.1 Objectives The annual review process will assure the following results.

1. The contents of the file will be correct, up-to-date, and familiar both to the chair and to the faculty member.

2. The faculty member will be informed of the chair's evaluation of his or her job performance, and will be made aware of the basis for it.
3. 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 chair will offer advice and assistance for the remediation of negative factors, if any.
4. The faculty member will have an opportunity to discuss all pertinent issues with the chair, and, if in disagreement, to write his or her position into the record.

The annual review process will consist of the following steps.

X.C.2 Preliminary Steps

1. When the chair, giving appropriate notice, asks the faculty member to do so, he or she will bring the *C.V.* and supporting documentation in the file up-to-date, and will prepare an annual report on his or her activities. The faculty member may include a self-evaluation.
2. The chair will assure that the file contains the reports from all formal evaluations that have been completed.
3. In the case of an untenured faculty member for whom a reappointment review will take place instead of an annual review process, as provided in Section VII, the chair will advise him or her of that fact, and will explain the procedures that will follow. In this case VII.C will govern, instead of X.C.3 and X.C.5.

X.C.3 Further Steps for Tenure-Track Faculty

1. The chair will make the file available to the review committee (as defined in VII.A) for study, and also to the review committee of each secondary department, if any, through the chair thereof.
2. In each secondary department, if any, the review committee will meet to consider the file and discuss the person's job performance. A report will be prepared independently of the chair, and will be signed by a representative of the review committee. The chair will send this report together with his or her own report to the chair of the primary department, who will place both in the file. The two reports taken together will include an account of minority views, if any.
3. In the primary department, the review committee will meet to consider the file and discuss the person's job performance. A report will be prepared independently of the chair, signed by a representative of the review committee other than the chair, and placed in the file.

4. After giving due consideration to all the contents of the file, the chair will prepare and sign a document, called the chair's evaluation, described in X.C.6, and provide a copy to the faculty member for review.
5. The chair will discuss the evaluation with the faculty member; V.H applies.

The procedure of X.C.5 comes next.

X.C.4 Further Steps for Tenured Faculty In the case of a tenured faculty member, PS-36 does not require the involvement of faculty other than the chair in the annual review process. Nevertheless, the chair is free to delegate all or part of the preparation of the chair's evaluation, while remaining responsible for its content. Furthermore, the rules of the department or college (see Section III, page 3) may set forth guidelines for evaluations; and/or establish a committee to advise the chair about evaluations; and/or provide that either on some regular basis or under special circumstances, a committee will be established to make an evaluation, independently of the chair, that will be placed in the file.

1. The chair will ask the chair of each of the faculty member's secondary departments, if any, to submit a performance evaluation, and will place such evaluations in the file.
2. After giving due consideration to all the contents of the file, the chair will prepare and sign a document, called the chair's evaluation, described in X.C.6, and provide a copy to the faculty member for review.
3. The chair (or any person acting for the chair in preparing part of the document) and the faculty member will discuss the evaluation, if either requests such a discussion; V.H applies.

X.C.5 Final Steps

1. The chair'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:
 - (a) 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.
 - (b) I have read and understood the chair's evaluation.
 - (c) I have exercised, or else waived, my rights to discuss the evaluation with the chair and/or with the chair of each secondary department in which I am employed.
 - (d) I understand that I have the right to attach a formal letter of response or rebuttal, with materials in support thereof. I {have done so / have not done so}.

2. The chair will send a copy of the file (omitting unchanged, previously transmitted contents) to the dean, who will send it to HRM. Each of those offices will bring its file on the faculty member up to date. If the dean sends comments or recommendations pertaining to the faculty member, they will become part of the file and copies will go to the chair and to the faculty member. If the faculty member has entered a letter of response or rebuttal, HRM will circulate the file to the Provost.

X.C.6 Evaluation by the Chair The chair is responsible for this document, and it represents the chair's independent judgment. The chair's evaluation will incorporate at least the following elements.

1. An advisory concerning any upcoming review for reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure.
2. The chair's evaluation of the faculty member's job performance.
 - (a) The contents of the file will be considered attached to the chair's evaluation. The chair may allow this material to speak for itself, or may summarize or discuss its significance.
 - (b) The chair's evaluation must observe the guidelines for criteria set forth in Section IV.
 - (c) If in the chair's view the faculty member's job performance in any way fails to meet appropriate expectations, the chair will clearly so state, and will call for improvements. In so doing, the chair must be specific and must offer appropriate advice and assistance.
 - (d) In evaluating the faculty member, the chair may be brief, and need not engage in systematic rankings, comparisons, or classifications.
 - (e) If the faculty member, during the year in question, has administrative or other duties for which he or she reports to an office outside the department, then the chair's evaluation will address only the person's departmental role.

XI ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO ENHANCE JOB PERFORMANCE

The Preamble on page 1 states that advancement to tenure "implies the expectation of an academic career which will develop and grow in quality and value, and one which will be substantially self-supervised and self-directed," permitting "long-term plans and undertakings" in scholarship and teaching. In its commitment to faculty careers, the University provides assistance and support through a variety of means and measures. The present Section defines, for a tenured faculty member, a formal **Assistance Program** which occasionally may be found to be the tool of choice. The rules of a department or college (see Section III, page 3), may further specify and regulate the procedures set forth here.

The steps of an Assistance Program will be as follows.

1. Either the chair or the faculty member may suggest to the other that such a program should be considered. If both agree, then the chair, in consultation with the officer to whom the chair reports and with the faculty member, will appoint an Assistance Team of three or more other appropriately selected tenured faculty members.
2. Within six weeks, the Team, in consultation and negotiation with the faculty member and the chair, will propose a plan for an Assistance Program. The proposal will specify the duration, plan of action, anticipated outcomes, and timelines. The duration will ordinarily not exceed one year. The plan of action, depending on the case, may involve—but need not be limited to—reduced teaching duties, assignment of a graduate research assistant, travel expenses, purchase of research materials or equipment, or other appropriate measures.
3. If the chair, in consultation with his or her supervising officer, determines that the potential benefits to the department justify the cost of the proposed assistance program, and if the faculty member agrees, then the appropriate commitments will be made by the faculty member and by the University officers involved, and the Assistance Program will proceed.
4. The Team will monitor the Assistance Program and provide progress reports to the chair and to the faculty member.
5. Only if the Team concurs will the chair terminate the Assistance Program before it reaches completion, except in case of financial exigency or other unusual circumstance.
6. The faculty member will make a good faith effort to complete the Assistance Program once started. However, the Program will be voluntary, and the faculty member may choose to terminate the process at any time.
7. At the end of the Assistance Program, or as provided in the timelines, three separate written evaluations of the Program and its results will be prepared - by the Team, the chair, and the faculty member. The evaluations, together with a record of the Program through all the steps listed here, will be placed in the faculty member's file.

XII GLOSSARY

1. **Appointment or Initial Appointment** An appointment to a tenure-track or tenured position at LSU of a person who does not currently hold such a position at LSU.

2. **Bylaws.** The primary governance document of a department or other academic unit.
3. **Chair.** The term *chair* means chair, head, director, dean or otherwise-titled chief academic officer of a department, as defined in item 6 below.
4. **College.** College, school, or otherwise-named academic unit which (1) reports directly to the Provost and which (2) is subdivided into two or more other units which are the direct employers of faculty.
5. **Dean.** Dean or otherwise-titled chief academic officer of a college, as defined in item 4. In cases when there is no academic officer or unit situated between the Provost and a department (as defined in item 6), provisions stated with reference to a dean or a college are void.
6. **Department.** Academic department, institute, school, center, or otherwise-named academic unit which is the direct employer of the faculty member(s) in question.
7. **Early review.** Either (1) a review for promotion to Professor that takes place before the faculty member's fifth year of service at LSU in the rank of Associate Professor; or (2) a tenure review that takes place before the year when it is mandated (see Section VIII, page 20). With regard to (1), this convention is established in PM-23. See VIII.A.3, page 22.
8. **Faculty.** The present Policy Statement PS-36, except when it specifies otherwise, applies only to tenured and tenure-track faculty and uses the term *faculty* to refer to tenured and tenure-track faculty only. Nevertheless the term *faculty* in other contexts is more inclusive. The 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." Ranks and their faculty status are defined in detail in PM-23.
9. **File, a faculty member's.** Established in X.B, page 28 this "official departmental personnel file," is required to contain significant records pertinent to the faculty member's employment at LSU, certain confidential materials excepted.
10. **Full-time.** A full-time employee is one who is employed for 100% of effort.
11. **HRM.** The Office of Human Resource Management.
12. **Line officer.** Chancellor, Provost, dean, or chair. See the definitions of *chair* and *dean* in this Glossary.
13. **Part-time.** A part-time employee is one who is employed for anything less than 100% of effort.
14. **Primary appointment, primary department.** A tenured or tenure-track faculty member's primary department is the one in which he or she has tenure or

may earn tenure; also referred to as the home department, or as the department in which he or she has primary appointment. See item 3 of VI.A.5, page 15.

15. **Probationary period.** The period of employment for a faculty member initially appointed without tenure, up to the time when he or she is advanced to tenure or the appointment is terminated.
16. **Reappointment review.** The formal review process, which may take place for an untenured faculty member in certain years, and in which the appropriate tenured faculty make a recommendation concerning reappointment. See Section VII, page 17.
17. **Review committee** Either (1) the committee charged with investigating the case for a promotion or advancement to tenure. (see VIII.A.4, page 22); or (2) the committee charged with a role in the annual review process of an untenured faculty member (see VII.A, page 17).
18. **Rules.** The rules of a department or other academic unit consist of its bylaws, if any, and all other statements of policy, whether contained in one or several documents. Rules that have a bearing on the subject matter of PS-36 must be established in compliance with Section III, page 3.
19. **Scholarship.** This term, defined and discussed in IV.A, is used in a broad sense. Depending on the discipline, it may include, for example, published research, designs and built works, artistic performance, or other creative activity.
20. **Secondary appointment, secondary department** A faculty member may be employed in two or more departments. In such a case, each department involved other than the primary department is, for said faculty member, a secondary department, and he or she holds a secondary appointment therein.
21. **Semester.** A fall or spring semester, not a summer term.
22. **Terminal degree.** The most advanced degree terminal degree offered in a given discipline, ordinarily required for a faculty position in that discipline.
23. **Tenure clock.** The tenure clock counts the time since the initial appointment of a tenure-track faculty member at LSU, except that it may be adjusted under provisions of VI.E, page 16, or VII.D, page 20. PS-36 makes reference to the time on the tenure clock, for example, when defining the year of the mandatory tenure review. The tenure clock has no significance once a faculty member is advanced to tenure or given notice of nonreappointment.
24. **Tenure-track.** A tenure-track faculty member is one who is untenured, but who has been appointed with the expectation that he or she will be promoted to tenure upon the successful completion of certain evaluations, reviews, and procedures.
25. **Voting faculty.** Those who are eligible to consider and vote on a given decision in a given department. See V.L, page 11.

26. **Year, years.** In references to duration of employment service for purposes of PS-36, a *year* normally means either (1) two whole 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.

Index

- Academic freedom, 1, 28
- Added voting faculty, 12
- Advisory, 8, 12, 19, 26–27, 32
- Annual review process, 2, 18, 26, 28, 30–31
 - in case of illness, 29
- Appeals, 27
 - grounds for, 28
- Applicability of PS-36, 2
- Appointment, 11
 - academic credentials for, 14
 - criteria for, 4
 - departmental recommendation of, 13
 - inbreeding provision, 16
 - initial, during summer, 10
 - minimum qualifications for, 15
 - of an Assistant Professor, 16
 - of Associate or full Professor, 16
 - procedure for, 14
 - to tenured position, 11, 15
 - without the terminal degree, 17
- Assistance program, 32–33
- Assistant Curator, 2
- Assistant Librarian, 2
- Assistant Professor, 2, 15–16, 18–19, 21
 - Acting, 17
- Associate Curator, 2
- Associate Librarian, 2
- Associate Professor, 2, 11, 16, 18–19, 21–22, 34
- Ballot
 - email, 10
 - marked, 11
 - online, 10
 - to be kept confidential, 11
 - written, 10
- Board of Supervisors
 - Bylaws, 2
 - Regulations, 2–3
- Boyd Professor, 2
- Bylaws, 4, 34–35
 - Faculty Senate, 27–28
- Chair, 10
 - defined in broad sense, 9, 34
 - role of, 10, 14
- Chancellor, 15, 26–27
- College
 - defined in broad sense, 9
- Confidentiality, 2, 9, 25–26
 - of ballots, 11
 - of outside letters, 13, 22, 25, 29
- Contracts
 - rights deriving from, 2
- Credentials, 14
- Criteria
 - for dismissal, 3
 - for evaluations, 4, 26, 28, 32
- Curator, 2
- Dean
 - defined in broad sense, 9, 34
 - role of, 9
- Definitions, 33–34
- Department
 - defined in broad sense, 9, 34

38 INDEX

- Dismissal for cause, 3
- Documentation of credentials, 14–15
- Early review, 34
- Educational philosophy, 7
- Educational policy, 6–8
- Email, 10
- Employee Assistance Program, 29
- External evaluator, 21–22
 - selection of, 22–23
- File
 - faculty member's, 28, 34
- Full-time
 - definition of, 34
 - tenured appointments understood to be, 2
- Grievance Committee, 27
- HRM, 20–21, 29, 32
 - definition of, 34
- Inbreeding, 16
- Interview, requirement of an, 16
- Legally enforceable rights, 2
- Letter of evaluation, 22–24
 - age of, 23
 - form letter requesting, 24
 - outside, 21–22
 - to be kept confidential, 22
 - use of, 23
- Librarian, 2
- Line officer, 10, 21
 - defined, 34
 - recusal of, 10
- LSU System, 2–3, 8–9, 15, 21, 26
- Major professor, 23
- Mandated reappointment review, 17
- Mandated tenure review, 16, 18, 21–22, 34
- Meeting, 9
- Minority views, 13
- Nepotism, 2, 12, 15
- Nonreappointment
 - when one can occur, 17
- Notice of nonreappointment, 3, 10, 12–13, 18, 20, 29
- Online systems, 10
- Outside evaluator, 21–22
 - selection of, 22–23
- Part-time, 20, 34
 - appointment, definition of, 34
 - appointment, regular, 2
 - appointment, temporary, 2, 20
- Peer advisor
 - right to a, 10, 19–20, 26, 31
- Permanent Memoranda, 2
- PM-23, 2–3, 34
- Postdoctoral advisor, 23
- Primary appointment, 35
- Primary department, 12–15, 18, 25, 27, 34
- Probationary period, 16–17, 35
- Professional conduct, 4
- Professor, 2, 11, 16, 18–19, 21–23
- Promotion, 4, 13, 29
 - criteria for, 4
 - Promotion review, 21
- Provost, 4, 9–10, 12, 15, 19–22, 26–27, 32, 34
 - role of, 9
- PS-01, 2
- PS-07, 2
- PS-104, 3
- PS-12, 2
- PS-25, 2, 12
- PS-40, 2, 22, 28
- PS-50, 2
- PS-59, 3, 29
- Rankings, 26, 32
- Reappointment, 4, 11, 13, 18–20, 27, 29
 - approval process for a, 19
 - criteria for, 4
- Reappointment review, 17–18, 30, 32
- Recusal, 12
 - of a family member, 2, 12
 - of a line officer, 10
 - voluntary, 12
- Review committee, 17, 22–23, 25, 27, 30
- Review
 - early, 34
- Review file, 21–23, 25–26
- Reviewing officer, 29
- Robert's Rules of Order, 4, 12
- Rules
 - college, 4
 - department, 4
- Rules of an academic unit, 3, 6, 8–11, 13–14, 17, 19, 22, 28–29, 31, 35
 - approval of, 4
 - changes may be required in the, 4
 - must be consistent with policies, 4
- Scholarship, 5–6, 8, 35
 - defined broadly, 5
 - examples of, 5
 - examples of evidence of quality, 5
 - long-term undertakings in, 32
- Secondary appointment, 35
- Secondary department, 12–15, 18–19, 25, 27, 29–31, 35
- Separate counts, 11
- Service, 5, 8
 - examples of, 8
 - learning and community, 6
- Stages of a promotion or tenure review, 21
- Summer, 10, 35
- Teaching, 5–6, 8, 32
 - examples of contributions, 6
 - examples of evidence of quality, 7
- Tenure, 1–2
 - advancement to, 1, 4–5, 7–9, 11, 13, 20–21, 29, 32, 35

- cancellation of, 2
- Tenure clock, 15–18, 20, 35
- Tenure
 - in Board Regulations, 3
 - initial appointment with, 15
- Tenure review, 17–18, 20–21, 32
 - early, 22
 - mandated, 16, 18, 21–22, 34–35
 - mandated for assistant professor, 18
 - mandated for associate professor or professor, 18
 - withdrawal from, 22
- Tenure system, 1
- Tenure-track faculty, 2, 5, 11–12, 14, 16, 20, 34
 - definition of, 35
- Terminal degree, 15–17, 23, 35
- Timetables for procedures, 9
- Values
 - educational, 5
 - intellectual, 5
- Visiting faculty, 3
- Voting faculty, 5, 7, 10–14, 16, 18, 20, 22–23, 25–26
 - added, 12
 - definition of, 35
 - participation in decisions, 10
- Voting
 - the manner of, 10
 - twice on the same decision, 12

NOTES:
How the Proposed New PS-36 Differs from the
Present PS-36 (Version of July 1, 1997)

Notes about these NOTES

- These NOTES are organized by sections, subsections, and subsubsections of the present PS-36. The reader should place within view a copy of the present PS-36, which is available on the LSU website.
- "Section II.C" means II.C in the proposed new PS-36.
- "Section *II.C*" means *II.C* in the present PS-36.
- "P1" means paragraph 1.

What's New in the Proposed New PS-36?

The Committee has identified the following important changes and new features.

1. The new PS-36 is restricted to tenured and tenure-track faculty. It is easier to write appropriate policy when one is not trying to cover too many very different cases. A separate Instructor Policy has been approved and recommended by the Senate, which will make it easier for an Instructor to find the regulations that are relevant to Instructors. A separate policy on non-tenure-track professorial-rank faculty is envisaged.
2. **Organization, format, and style.** The new PS-36 is designed for the reader who needs to find a certain topic quickly—not for a reader who will read the whole PS from beginning to end. Accordingly:
 - We break the text into more enumerated items and subsubsections with meaningful titles, than was done in the present PS-36.
 - The Table of Contents is detailed. It is intended to help find a topic quickly.
 - There are lots of cross-references.
 - There is an index.
 - We've restrained the use of commentary and exhortation. Preambles appear in close proximity to the subject matter they apply to.
3. See *II.A General* below. The "Guidelines for Criteria," Section IV, page 4, is significantly different.
 - The "two out of three" doctrine is gone, and the word "notable" does not appear.
 - The term "collegiality" is gone. Certain cases at other universities have made us aware that it may lead to inappropriate considerations. On the

other hand, we believe that properly understood, collegiality is a value that ought to be upheld. We have tried to address the matter properly.

4. The provisions for "rules of an academic unit," Section III, page 3, are new; they assign an important role to rules which are duly adopted by departments and colleges—like those that exist now in the Manship School (see <http://www.math.lsu.edu/~mcgehee/ManshipP102.pdf>) and the School of Library Information and Science (see their home page; you'll find the document link at the bottom of their faculty page).
5. We have used the commonly understood term "tenure clock," and there are new provisions for setting and adjusting the clock. See VI.E, page 16, and VII.D, page 20.
6. Section XI is new, defining a formal assistance program which would work on a volunteer basis.

I. General Policy

The provisions of these 7 paragraphs are all re-worded and relocated in the new document, but not materially changed. Highlights:

- P1: We make reference to PS-01 in subsection II.C instead of repeating PS-01 provisions in PS-36. Repeating provisions from other Policy Statements, instead of referring to them, tends to be a bad idea. In this case, for example, the present PS-36 repeats provisions from an outdated version of PS-01.
- There is an error in the present PS-36: At the end of P1, the reference should be to Section *II*, not Section *IV*.
- P2, last sentence: The right to a peer advisor at certain meetings is, in the new PS-36, stated at the points where the meetings are described. See "peer advisor" in the index.
- P3 and P4: The notification and communication provisions are, in the new PS-36, stated at the appropriate points, where the processes are described. All appeal provisions are in Section IX.
- P5, departmental and college guidelines: Section III defines the status of written departmental and college rules, and places them under faculty control, subject to review.
- P6: The first sentence is rewritten less mysteriously and appears in II.A. The remaining provisions are rewritten and appear in IX.B.

II.A. General

The authors of the present PS-36 had to cover all categories of faculty. That's why they were led into this kind of general statement. As stated in II.A, page 2, the new PS-36 limits itself to tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Taken as a whole, the formulations in *Section II* tend to balance and correct each other. But passages in policy statements tend to be taken in isolation, and then they can cause difficulties. Our Section IV attempts to avoid the pitfalls.

Section II.A is perhaps the most troublesome part of the present PS-36. For example:

- P1 and P3 may be interpreted to elevate "collegiality" to the status of a fourth major area for evaluation, such that one may fear it to mean conformity and subservience. We have avoided the use of the term, which is currently associated with certain unfortunate practices in higher education. On the other hand, surely there's a sense in which collegiality is an appropriate concern. Section IV, page 4, deals with the issue. In the third paragraph of IV, we speak of certain "essential and fundamental expectations" that must be upheld. Serious misbehavior aside, we believe that legitimate components of "collegiality" resolve themselves into measures of effectiveness in the performance of duties in scholarship, teaching, and service, and ought to be addressed under those headings.

- In its rambling discussion of criteria for evaluations, *II.A* meanders among doctrines, and we may detect three tendencies, as follows.

1. One tendency, which makes good sense, is to say that criteria are to be contained within the three traditional areas, but allows the distribution of emphasis to vary. Thus:

- (a) In P2, "Faculty will be judged .. considering ... teaching, research and other creative achievement, and service;" but we will "evaluate ... consistent with job assignments"
- (b) "... tenure-track faculty will not be given major assignments that do not contribute toward tenure." This statement seems to rule out an assignment outside the three areas.
- (c) In P4, we have "overall assessment of the individual's contribution," which taken in isolation implies variation in the way one may qualify for a favorable evaluation, though presumably the criteria consist in some distribution among the three areas.

2. But then, weakly stated in the passive voice, we find the assertion that "... judgments will be made as to whether the individual is engaging in a program of work that is notable in at least two of the areas and satisfactory in the third." That assertion seems to have the underlying premise that every faculty job has those three parts more-or-less in equal measure. Logically, it's consistent with allowing there to be one area in which all faculty are merely "satisfactory"—presumably a lower standard than "notable."

The two-thirds clause is in fact balanced (and contradicted) by other statements in *II.A*, and elsewhere in *Section II*, so that it cannot be called

a central and pervasive doctrine of the present PS-36. Nevertheless it is misleading and unhelpful, and we have removed it.

3. Finally, later in P4 the university "enters new fields of endeavor;" "the work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns;" and all bets are off. This provision seems unnecessarily and dangerously vague.

It seems agreed that the "two out of three" clause in the present PS-36 is unfortunate. It is honored more in the breach than th'observance. In some departments, at least for assistant professors, the two primary concerns are necessarily scholarship and teaching. In others, there's a definite service component to their duties. Departments should be able to define and uphold appropriately high standards in all the areas in which a faculty member must perform. There should be no stated license to uphold a lesser standard in any one of the three areas. PS-36 should recognize the interrelated nature of the three areas, and the fact that they may have various proportions in various academic units. We have rebuilt the guidelines for criteria (Section IV) accordingly.

II.B. Teaching

This subsection is a reasonably good statement about teaching. IV.B, page 6 is a re-write, which uses two lists of examples instead of one. One list is of contributions, the other is of means to judge quality. There are disclaimers: These are examples, the list is not complete, and no example necessarily applies in every department.

II.C. Research and Other Creative Activity

IV.A, page 5, is our re-write of *II.C*. Instead of "research and other creative activity," we use the term "scholarship" to cover everything, and we define it by a list of examples, being careful not to claim that the list is exhaustive or that every item applies to everyone. We provide a separate list of examples of how quality may be determined, with appropriate disclaimers.

II.D. Service

In IV.C, page 8 we have tried to offer a balanced and rounded statement of current understanding and practice. We recognize that in some cases, "specific service will be a substantial and explicit part of a faculty member's work," and also that there are broad and varied areas of citizenship-service in which quality contributions should be recognized when performed.

III.A.1. Minimum Qualifications

See VI.B, page 15. The case of Instructors is not covered in the new PS-36. The case of Boyd Professors is mentioned in item 2 of II.C, page 2.

III.A.2. Inbreeding

We've modified the wording. We've not added any rigid rules. See VI.D, page 16.

III.A.3. Terms of Appointments

- Provisions with regard to Instructors will be located in the new PS on Instructors, not in the new PS-36. Terms of initial appointments of assistant, associate, and full professors are covered in VI.E, page 16.
- P1 of 3.a. means that each extension of term for an Assistant Professor can be for up to three years, but it is subject to another interpretation which contradicts other provisions. See VI.E.1, page 16.
- P2 of 3.b. allows the title of Instructor for someone hired as an assistant professor who, as of the time when the job begins, has not been awarded the Ph.D. In VI.F, page 17, we've ruled out the use of the Instructor title in such a case, because it could easily be thought to imply that the Instructor PS would then apply to the person.
- P1 of 3.c: The higher ranks can already have initial appointments of up to five years, not four; five years is already the current rule because of a change in PM-23. See VI.E.2, page 16.
- 3.d: This provision is not repeated in the new document. We are advised that it serves no purpose.

III.A.4. Joint Appointment

No changes. See items 14 and 20 in Section XII, page 33. See item 3 of VI.A.5, page 14.

III.A.5. Voting Eligibility

- The voting faculty for the various decisions are identified all in one place in the new document. See V.L, page 11.
- 5.a: The case of Instructors will be covered by a different PS.
- The provision in 5.b is modified so that the use of a committee must be duly established in a department's rules (instead of "on an annual basis"); see item 1 in V.L and Section III, page 3.
- P3 in 5.c: The "consulted" provision is too vague to be in a PS and has been discarded.
- P4 in 5.c: There's no provision for "enfranchisement" in the new document.
- P5 in 5.c: See the last paragraph of VI.A.5, page 14.
- See also the comments below under V.A.3.

III.B.1. Recruitment and Screening

With regard to the material of these two paragraphs, see item 1 (page 2) in II.C; and VI.A.1, VI.A.2, and other material in Section VI, which begins on page 14.

III.B.2. Interview

The statement has been rewritten. No rigid rule has been introduced. See VI.C, page 16.

III.B.3. Department Review and Recommendation

The following comment arrived by email from a faculty member: "[The present] PS-36 seems to envision that the question to be voted on is so simple and universally acknowledged that it doesn't even need to be stated. But in a real search this is rarely the case. A typical example: We have 3 candidates, and we don't merely want to select the one best; rather, we want to make a first choice AND have a second choice ready so that, in the event of a declination, the chair and dean can move quickly without convening another meeting. . . . The question is, should all of the possibilities for a given search be spelled out in gory detail by the chair ahead of the meeting, so that absentee ballots can be solicited on all of them? Or should absentee ballots be solicited on a small number of well-defined questions, with the idea that absentee ballots may not be counted for subsequent unanticipated questions? If the question changes, is the chair entitled to decide whether absentee ballots are relevant enough to count? The absentees don't hear the substance of the discussion. So although I may favor candidate X going into the meeting, but am swayed toward candidate Y by the discussion, the absentees continue voting the same way throughout the meeting. Is this right? The PS-36 position is also interesting because it seems very different from Robert, who says absentees should not vote except under very tightly regulated conditions."

In the way we have written VI.A.3, page 14, we have taken into account the concerns expressed in that note. We have retained provisions giving absent faculty members the right to participate in decisions; see VI, page 10. and VI.A.2, page 10 for examples. We think those provisions are appropriate and important, and not impractical to observe, in the academic setting, though of course they are at variance with Robert's Rules. We allow departmental rules to address details.

III.B.4, III.B.5, III.B.6, III.B.7. College Review and Recommendation, University Review, LSU System Review, Offer of Employment

See VI.A.5, page 14.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

See Section X, page 28, entitled ANNUAL DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY, where the material of the old Section IV has been re-worked. The procedure is more fully spelled out, and the "faculty member's file" is now located in the department (not in HRM) with assured ready access by the faculty member. Departmental rules may further specify.

It should be noted that Section *IV* of the present PS-36 has already been superseded (as of July 17, 2003) by Section C of PS-109. Section X of the proposed new document would supersede, and does not differ substantially in substance from, Section C of PS-109—which in turn is quite similar to "the May 15 document" as discussed by the Faculty Senate in April and May of 2003.

V.A.1. General

See I, page 1, which refers to a "rigorous, careful process of examination and deliberation" that must precede advancement to tenure, and the expectations implied by advancing someone to tenure. See also item 24, page 35. The cautionary precepts expressed in *V.A.1*, it seems to us, are adequately embodied in the provisions for reappointment reviews.

V.A.2. Candidate Eligibility

- Part a: Instructors are not covered in the new document.
- PM-23 now sets a limit of five years total employment for a Professor or Associate Professor who is hired without tenure - until and unless he or she is advanced to tenure. This change has been observed on this campus since PM-23 was changed. Otherwise, the provisions in the new document are consistent with *V.A.2*. See *V.N*, page 13; item 13, page 3; and *V.F*, page 10, regarding notice requirements.
- Regarding the length of term for an initial appointment, see all of *VI.E*, page 16, and *VI.F*.
- Regarding the length of term for a reappointment, see item 3 of *VII.C*, page 19.

V.A.3. Voting Eligibility

- P1 is affirmed in *V.L.2*, page 11. Instructors will be covered in a separate PS.
- In the definitions of voting faculty, there is no discrimination against faculty who have decided to retire or resign from LSU.
- The definitions of the voting faculty that apply for various decisions appear in one place; see *V.L*, page 11.
- The provision "Faculty without tenure ...," allows an informal participation. The new document contains no such statement, since it takes the point of view that there is no need to regulate, in PS-36, informal consultation and participation.
- The passage "Faculty holding joint appointment ..." and the recusal requirements correspond to *V.L.5*, page 12 and *V.L.3*, page 12.

V.B.1. Nomination

The determination of when a reappointment review will be conducted is discussed in VII.B, 18. The procedure is described fully in VII.C, page 18. The Provost and dean are required to promulgate timetables and deadlines; see V.E and V.D, page 9.

V.B.2. Department Review and Recommendation

- P1: The annual review process, which is designed to keep the file up to date, is set forth in detail; see Section X, page 28.
- P2: Just as in current practice, reappointment reviews are mandated at certain times and discretionary at others; see Section VII, page 17, particularly subsections VII.A and VII.B.
- P3: The steps of the procedure for a reappointment review are described in VII.C, page 18.
- P4-P5: The voting provisions are in V.L; see in particular V.K, page 11, V.L.2, and V.M.
- P6: The manner of the departmental report, somewhat modified, is in V.M, page 13.
- P7: Regarding joint appointments, see items 1-2 of VII.C, page 18.
- P8-P10: This material is covered in items 4-6 of VII.C.

V.B.3-V.B.4. College Review and Recommendation; University Review

These provisions, excluding those for Instructors, are re-stated in VII.C.1, page 19.

V.B.5. Timetable for Notice of Nonrenewal

See V.N, page 13; item 13, page 3; and V.F, page 10, regarding notice requirements.

VI.A.1. General

The provisions of this summary-section are unchanged, and appear in the appropriate places.

VI.A.2. Review Schedule

- The general advice about the timetable appears in the last paragraph of VIII.A, page 20. The details of a timetable are to be promulgated by the Provost and dean; see V.D, page 9, and V.E.
- Last paragraph: The "without prejudice" clause appears now in VIII.A.3, page 22.

VI.A.3. Accelerated Review

The term *early review* is used instead. The provisions are found in VIII.A.3, page 22.

VI.A.4. Mandatory Reviews

- P1-P6: These provisions are stated in terms of the initial setting of the tenure clock, VI.E, page 16; and later adjustments to the tenure clock, VII.D, page 20. The latter passage makes provisions for childcare, following AAUP guidelines; and certain other situations including dependent care or disability, following provisions at the University of Wisconsin. These are consistent with current LSU practice. At present, the LSU System must approve adjustments to the tenure clock, hence the wording that calls for approval "... of such other officers as may be required ..."
- P7: This provision appears in II.B, page 2.
- P8: This provision appears in VIII.A.2, page 21.

VI.A.5. Candidate Eligibility

See VIII.A, page 20. For the definition of when a tenure review is mandated, see VI.E, page 16.

VI.A.6. Voting Eligibility

The definitions of the voting faculty that apply for various decisions appear in one place; see V.L, page 11. See the comments above under V.A.3. With regard to the last paragraph, the appointment of added faculty to those who vote on a decision: The provision in the new document is somewhat modified, but still provides only for discretionary action. It is found in V.L.4, page 12.

VI.B.1. Nominations

See VIII.A and VIII.A.1, page 21.

VI.B.2. External Evaluation

We use the term "outside evaluation." See VIII.B, page 22. VIII.B.2 represents a modification of restrictions on the choice of outside evaluators. VIII.B.3 provides guidelines as to when letters that have been received must be used.

VI.B.3-4-5-6-7-8-9. Department Review, College Recommendation, University Review, LSU System Review, Notification

This material is treated in VIII.D, page 26.

VII. APPEAL PROCEDURES

Compare with Section IX, page 27.

VIII.A. Definitions

This subsection is replaced by Section XII, page 33, entitled "Glossary." The new glossary was built from scratch, with terms added as needed. It seems a bad idea to state policy in the Glossary, as is done in *VIII.A* with regard to (for example) "eligible voting faculty" and "enfranchised faculty."

- The term "collegiality," which is defined variously in *VIII.A* and *II.A*, is not used in the new document. The concept is addressed in IV, page 4.
- As for "eligible voting faculty," see V.L, page 11; note that in the definitions of voting faculty, there is no discrimination against faculty who have decided to retire or resign from LSU.
- The "enfranchised faculty" definition in *VIII.A* is very generous and is out of line with PM-23 and with current practice so far as we know. There's no such provision for "enfranchisement" in the new document.
- The "official personnel file," located in HRM according to the present PS-3, will certainly continue to exist. However, the new document assigns a central role to the "official departmental personnel file;" see X.B, page 28.

VIII.B. Documentation and Supporting Material

This standard form for a *C.V.* is the occasion for more complaints than any other aspect of the present PS-36. We note that the form is required by the LSU System. Under the provisions of the new document (V.D, page 9, and *VIII.A.1*, page 21), the Provost is charged with promulgating whatever form-and-content requirements are in force. So this form would still be easily accessible online. On the other hand, we are proposing that it **not** be part of PS-36.

The Senate should point out the reasons for the general unhappiness with this form and seek to have more flexible guidelines. Faculty members using this form as a guide find it confusing and interpret its categories variously, even within the same department. Faculty members often need a *C.V.* in connection with visiting positions, grant applications, and such, and for those purposes this form is at best odd. At worst it causes problems. External participants in program reviews find it strange and inconvenient, since what they expect to see is a standard *C.V.* for the discipline and profession in question.

VIII.C Sample Letter to External Evaluator

See *VIII.B.5*, page 24. We have made extensive modifications to the wording of the form letter, to accommodate various situations more flexibly. Further variations are still allowed with the approval of the dean.