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When junior faculty members ask me about promotion and tenure, my advice is “it’s not complicated, but that doesn’t mean that it’s easy”. When we hire tenure-track faculty in the College of Science, we do so with the hope and expectation that they will be successful, and that they will enjoy long and prosperous careers at LSU. This document is intended to demystify the P&T process at LSU and to provide a perspective on expectations for successful tenure and promotion for faculty in the College of Science. I welcome any comments and perspectives that might improve this manual.

Kevin R. Carman
Dean
June 9, 2011
General Comments

Promotion and tenure is a very serious matter, and proper attention to rules and regulations is important. While the College of Science (SCI) and its departments have certain latitude in determining their policies regarding promotion and tenure, all college and departmental policies must be consistent with the policies and procedures outlined in Policy Statement 36 – Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty: Appointments, Reappointment, Promotions, Tenure, Annual Reviews, and Enhancement of Job Performance (08/17/2009 - http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/ByNumber?OpenView]. Thus, the present document is intended to complement but not supersede PS-36-T.

Our goal is to hire outstanding faculty with the explicit hope and expectation that they will have long and distinguished careers at LSU. Toward that end, the college and departments are committed to providing financial support, administrative infrastructure, and mentoring that will facilitate achievement of this desired outcome.

I - Administrative Policy

Mentoring Committees

All untenured, tenure-track faculty members should be assigned a mentoring committee within their first semester of residence. The purpose of the committee is to provide guidance, support, and ‘tough love’ when needed toward the ultimate goal of obtaining tenure. The department chair is responsible for appointing the committee. The committee should consist of three tenured faculty members. At least two members of the committee should come from the candidate’s home department (the department in which tenure will reside). In the case of joint appointments, one of the committee members should come from the department in which the junior faculty member has a minority (< 50%) appointment. Faculty members that have joint appointments with the Center for Computational Technology (CCT) or CAMD should have one committee member from CCT or CAMD. The goal is to appoint a committee whose scientific interests complement those of the junior faculty member; the junior faculty member should feel free to recommend particular faculty members as potential members of their committee.

As the name implies, the charge of the mentoring committee is to provide guidance to the junior faculty member in all aspects of his/her professional development. The following are some examples of what a junior faculty member should expect from a mentoring committee: (1) review drafts of grant proposals and manuscripts and discuss reviews of declined grant proposals and manuscripts, (2) advise on matters such as appropriate levels of service commitments to university and professional organizations, and faculty relations, and (3) advise on teaching methodologies and student relations.

The committee members are expected to be available to provide advice as needed. A junior faculty member should keep his/her mentoring committee well updated on relevant activities, such as submission/acceptance of papers and grant proposals; student evaluations of teaching should also be forwarded to the mentoring committee ASAP.

At least once per semester, at least one member of the mentoring committee should attend a lecture of the junior faculty member and provide constructive criticism. If student evaluations indicate that teaching methods need to be improved, the committee should immediately discuss the situation with the junior faculty member and attempt to resolve the problem.

Early in the spring semester of each year, the junior faculty member should submit his/her annual report to the mentoring committee, along with an updated c.v. The committee should meet with the junior faculty member and discuss her/his progress and any areas of concern. The chair of the mentoring committee should prepare a memo summarizing the points of discussion.
and send it to the department chair (a copy of the memo should be given to the junior faculty member); the memo will be included in the junior faculty member’s permanent file. Most department chairs find these reports to be useful as they prepare their annual evaluations.

**Procedures**

**3rd-year review.** New tenure-track faculty assistant professors are initially given a 3-year appointment. During the 3rd year of the appointment, typically in the 2nd semester of the 3rd year, tenured faculty members are obligated to review progress by the untenured faculty member and make a recommendation to the dean regarding reappointment. In the case of an assistant professor, the tenured faculty can recommend one of three options: (1) An additional 3-year appointment. Such an appointment would carry the assistant professor through the time when mandatory P&T review is required; (2) A reappointment for 1 year. Such a recommendation might occur when tenured faculty members have significant concerns about the progress of an assistant professor. This recommendation would require another review the following year; (3) Non-renewal of appointment. If the tenured faculty concludes that there is sufficient evidence to indicate that an assistant professor would not be successful at obtaining tenure, they can recommend that the appointment not be renewed. Further, in the case of option 2 (1-year reappointment), the faculty has the option of recommending non-renewal of an appointment at any time prior to the 5th year of appointment. P&T review is mandatory in the 6th year. The dean makes the final decision regarding reappointment of assistant professors.

The initial appointment of an untenured associate or full professor is for ≤ 5 years, and they must be considered for tenure no later than their 4th year of residence. If a reappointment is necessary, the final decision rests with the provost (to whom the dean submits a recommendation).

**Promotion & tenure review.** The P&T process typically begins in the spring semester prior to the academic year in which the evaluation will occur (see Table 1 at the end of this document for a summary of P&T timelines). Early in the spring semester, department chairs will be given a list of faculty members who will be up for mandatory review in the next academic year. Chairs will also be asked to identify any other individuals who wish to be considered for promotion (i.e., an early tenure decision or promotion to full professor). In the case of non-mandatory reviews, a vote of approval from the eligible faculty is required in order to proceed with a full review of the case. The following reviews are considered to be “accelerated” unless some specific agreement has been negotiated to the contrary:

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

Following the procedures described below, the department identifies a list of reviewers for each candidate that is being considered for promotion and/or tenure. The department chair presents the list of potential reviewers to the dean for approval. Prior to the end of the spring

---

1. In the case of individuals who began their appointment in January, the process begins in the fall semester preceding mandatory review
semester, all reviewers should be contacted to verify their willingness to review the package. Reviewers will be informed that they will receive the complete promotion package by September 1 and that evaluations will need to be returned by the end of the second week in October (further details about selection of reviewers are provided below).

Departmental promotion and tenure documents must be submitted to the dean's office by a pre-announced date, usually in the first week of November.

The College has two promotion and tenure committees that are advisory to the dean (see below), and both of these committees meet shortly after departments have completed their deliberations and chairs have made their recommendations.

Final recommendations from the dean are generally due to Academic Affairs in November, prior to the Thanksgiving holiday. Formal, recorded recommendations on the promotion and tenure forms to the LSU Board of Supervisors are made by the following units or individuals:

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

Additional input is advisory only:

1. The SCI P&T faculty committee
2. The SCI chairs committee
3. The Dean of the Graduate School (advised by Campus Review Committee)
4. The Provost’s advisory committee

The SCI P&T Committee consists of one elected full professor from each of academic department. An additional 2-3 members may be appointed to the committee by the dean. The Graduate Council, with the Dean of the Graduate School chairing and serving as an *ex officio* member, evaluates and ranks candidates as A, B, C, D, or F. A rank of D or F is considered a vote against promotion/tenure. The rankings of this review committee are forwarded to the Provost by the Dean of the Graduate School.

Subject to the provost’s approval, the Graduate Council annually appoints the Provost’s Advisory Committee from its membership

### Mandatory vs. Accelerated Review

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

The College is willing to consider early decisions, but has a higher standard for early decisions than may be inferred from PS-36-T’s stated requirement that a candidate must...
“…meet…expectations applied in other reviews”. In the College of Science, early tenure and promotion reviews should be considered when an applicant has unambiguously demonstrated excellence in all areas (research, teaching, and service).

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

Tenure-clock extensions. Situations may arise in which it is appropriate to delay a mandatory tenure decision. A serious illness or the birth of a child are examples of circumstances that might justify an extension. It is important to emphasize, however, that tenure-clock extensions must be requested by the untenured faculty member (i.e., there is no situation under which the tenure clock is automatically extended). Requests for an extended tenure clock should be in the form of a memo from the faculty member, addressed to the Provost, and routed through the chair and dean. Requests for an extended tenure clock should be submitted as soon as possible; last-minute requests are less likely to be approved.

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

Review Committees

Department Level. PS-36-T discusses the role of ‘promotion and tenure committees’, a term that causes considerable confusion. Technically, all departments have a P&T committee that is referred to as a “faculty panel” in PS-36-T. For some departments the P&T committee is a representative subset of the tenured faculty that is responsible for organizing P&T packages and making recommendations to the full faculty. For other departments the P&T committee is comprised of all tenured faculty members holding a rank above the faculty member in question. For example, all tenured faculty members with the rank of associate or full professor are eligible to serve on a departmental promotion and tenure committee considering promotions from assistant to associate professor. For consideration of promotions to full professor, only tenured full professors are eligible (see Appendix B in PS-36-T; also appended to this document).

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

Departments may use subcommittees to gather information, organize outside letters and help prepare documentation. The subcommittee may provide the results of its activities to the full faculty committee, but should not formally vote prior to the full committee meeting. All
subcommittee presentations should be factual and objective. Candidates should be apprised of any such committees and their memberships.

**College Level.** Two College committees serve in an advisory capacity to the dean. They are (1) the department chairs of the College, and (2) a committee of faculty members at the rank of full professor. The latter committee consists of one representative elected from each department by vote of all the tenure-track faculty. Add additional faculty members may be appointed by the dean. The chair of the College P&T committee is appointed by the dean. As required by PS-36-T, the votes and general recommendations of these committees are incorporated into the comments and recommendations by the dean.

Individuals such as Institute Directors or Directors of Schools or Centers (e.g., CCT or CAMD) may also provide recommendations to the dean when faculty members belong to Institutes, Schools, or Centers. This recommendation will not be part of the formal record except that it may be incorporated into the comments and recommendation of the dean.

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

**Outside Letters**

The opinions of outside reviewers play an extremely important role in the promotion and tenure process, and thus attention to procedures and thoughtful selection of reviewers is of utmost importance. The candidate is allowed to suggest names of potential reviewers, and may also submit names of potential reviewers that the candidate feels should not be used (any such list should be very short). It is recommended that the candidate submit a list of 5 or 6 potential reviewers. The candidate should bear in mind that half or more of the reviewers will come from individuals not on the candidate’s list. The reason for this is to avoid selecting a set of reviewers that are strongly biased in favor of the candidate. Therefore, the candidate should think carefully about how many reviewers to put on the list, and who to include. For example, if the candidate lists the top 20 people in their field, the committee may have relatively few additional qualified reviewers to call upon.

The department chair and the departmental P&T committee are responsible for choosing evaluators. Approval of outside reviewers by the dean is required, but the dean expects to follow the recommendations of the chair and P&T committee provided that the guidelines outlined below are followed. PS-36-T requires a minimum of 3 outside letters; however, our goal is to have at least 5 letters, and we recommend soliciting 7 or 8 letters, half or less of which will come from the candidate’s list. Chairs submit the list of suggested reviewers to the dean following the standard format appended to this document.

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

- Reviewers below the rank of full professor are not acceptable for candidates being considered for the rank of full professor, and should be avoided, where possible, even for candidates being considered for promotion to associate professor (and then, no more than one associate professor should be used).
• Reviewers should generally be at institutions with a research stature that is comparable or superior to LSU.
• Reviewers with potential conflicts of interest should be avoided. Exclude former thesis advisors, former post-doctoral mentors, co-authors on papers, and collaborators on grants, as well as individuals employed by institutions.
• Avoid reviewers at institutions where the candidate has earned a degree, performed postdoctoral research, or had any other official appointment, regardless of whether the reviewer’s appointment at the institution overlapped with that of the candidate.
• Do not solicit letters from more than one individual at a single institution.
• Minimize the number of reviewers from non-U.S. universities. Researchers from non-U.S. universities often do not understand the U.S. tenure system and the importance of writing a detailed evaluation. Thus, any non-U.S. reviewers should be selected with care, and the College recommends limiting the number to 2 or less.
• At least half of the reviewers should not know the candidate personally. This can be difficult to assess, but is nevertheless important. If the majority of reviewers are close friends with the candidate, the objectivity of the reviewer’s comments may be called into question.

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

Once the dean has approved the proposed list of reviewers, the appropriate departmental representative should contact potential reviewers before the end of the spring semester. The departmental representative should explain to the reviewer that the package will be delivered in the first week of September, and obtain a verbal commitment that the review will be completed by the second Monday of October.

All letters received must be included in the promotion package. An example copy of letters sent to reviewers must also be included in the package that is reviewed by the faculty and forwarded to the dean. A standard solicitation letter is attached to this document. Any substantial changes to this standard letter should be approved by the dean.

II - Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

As outlined in PS-36-T, faculty considered for promotion and tenure will be judged on their performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. However, PS-36-T recognizes that different departments and colleges may well have different expectations, and the relative emphasis among these three areas might vary significantly. The College of Science is the premier research unit at a Research Extensive university, and, as a consequence, considerable emphasis is placed on research for most faculty members. Accordingly, the quality of the letters written by external reviewers plays a very important role in promotion and tenure deliberations. Ordinarily, these reviewers are in a position to comment primarily on the research record, secondarily on the service record, and very little, if at all, on the teaching record.
The above comments on research notwithstanding, demonstration of quality teaching is absolutely essential to successful promotion. Although most everyone will agree that the quality of teaching is important to all universities – including those with Research Extensive status – there has always been a problem in how good teaching is judged and evaluated. Student evaluation is one important component. However, the need for additional methods to evaluate teaching performance has been widely recognized, and this has led to the development of the Teaching Portfolio. This approach is described in greater detail below.

**Research Record**

The research record is normally of critical importance for promotion and tenure consideration. It would be convenient if we could simply require some specified number of papers in refereed journals, and a dollar figure in grants and contracts. However, each candidate is an individual case; no simple numerically based formula can (or should) be applied, and it would be foolish to try to describe minimum requirements in these terms.

**Publications.** The most desirable publication record is one that is steady (publications every year), prolific (lots of papers), and high quality (influential papers in quality peer-reviewed journals). For example, a record of no or minimal publications for several years followed by a sudden burst of papers in the last year may be viewed with skepticism, particularly if those papers appear in marginal journals. Consistent publication in leading journals is preferred to similar or even greater publication rates in journals with lesser reputations. Papers containing original research generally carry greater weight than review or methods papers.

* A few points to consider in preparing a cv for a P&T package:
  * Clearly indicate papers that have been published since coming to LSU, or since the last promotion.
  * Clearly differentiate peer-reviewed from non-peer-reviewed publications.
  * Highlight papers that involve student authors (this is a good thing!), and indicate whether the student was a graduate or undergraduate.
  * Indicate the corresponding author for each publication.
  * Insert a 1- or 2- sentence explanation beneath each multi-authored publication explaining the candidate’s role as an author in the paper [Questions often arise regarding the role of the candidate in multi-author publications. Further, conventions for determining the order of authorship vary substantially among disciplines. Many of the people reviewing P&T packages will not be familiar with these conventions.]
  * Clearly differentiate published papers, papers in press, and papers currently under review. [There is little to be gained by including papers that are “in preparation”, but any such listing should be clearly distinguished from papers that have been published or submitted for review.]

**Funding.** In general, faculty members are expected to successfully compete for funding from major federal agencies (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, ONR, NOAA, USDA, EPA, NASA). In addition to providing the financial resources necessary to maintain a successful research program, federal funding typically requires rigorous peer review by leading researchers. Thus, the ability to attract funding from federal agencies is an important endorsement of a respected research program. The emphasis on federal funding should not be interpreted to mean that funding from
other sources is undesirable. Indeed, faculty members are encouraged to pursue any funding opportunities that will facilitate their research programs. In particular, LEQSF is a very nice source of support for many beginning faculty, and is an important means of attracting funds for various equipment purchases. Industrial support, pass-through programs, and private philanthropic organizations may also provide funding opportunities. All of these sources of support are potentially very valuable, and can significantly facilitate the ability to attract major federal funding. While young faculty members are encouraged to pursue all sources of funding that will allow them to establish their programs, they should not delay in submitting proposals to federal agencies. Funding is often difficult to obtain and rarely does one get it on the first try.

A few points to consider in preparing a CV for a P&T package:

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

Collaborative Research. The college strongly supports collaborative, interdisciplinary research. Still, it is important that untenured faculty demonstrate their ability to do independent work, and the faculty member’s independence and creativity should be evident. For example, if a faculty member’s first few “independent” papers represent collaborations with former mentors who then appear as co-authors, questions are always asked about relative contributions. Outside reviewers and committee members can be very tough on this issue, and many will discount such publications. It is important that one’s own contribution be easily recognizable, and if one is publishing with a senior researcher in a long-standing area of the senior researcher’s research, this point is sometimes hard to make. Similarly, if an individual is one of a number of co-PIs on a grant to a more senior investigator, that individual’s contribution may be questioned, especially in the case of a young researcher. However, in the case of collaboration on a program project, for example, where each contribution is evaluated and funded separately, these issues ordinarily would not be raised.

We emphasize again that collaborative, interdisciplinary research is encouraged and strongly supported by the College. Those junior faculty members who are engaged in interdisciplinary research need to demonstrate that they are contributing substantially and tangibly to collaborative research, and that the success of their research program is not entirely dependent on the success of other researchers. Demonstration of the ability to lead interdisciplinary research is a particularly desirable trait.

Teaching Record

As a university, education is our primary business. Within the College of Science, education includes classroom teaching, instruction in both the teaching and research laboratories, and graduate and undergraduate student mentoring. The College values quality teaching and we should not hire individuals who likely will not be good classroom teachers. All faculty members are expected to take their teaching obligations seriously. The College recommends that the number of new courses taught by untenured faculty should be kept to a minimum (no more than 3 throughout their appointment as assistant professor).
Classroom teaching: Because the evaluation of good teaching is challenging, all faculty should be encouraged to develop and maintain a Teaching Portfolio. The portfolio should include many of the following elements: Student Evaluations, Peer Evaluations (e.g., from members of the mentoring committee), Self-Assessments, Course Outlines and Syllabi, Ancillary Materials (handouts, overheads, etc.), Documentation on Activities Outside the Classroom (field trips, exhibits, etc.), Multimedia Material, Student Projects, a Statement of Teaching Philosophy, and Records of Advising Activities. The meaning of numerical student evaluation scores should be clearly described (i.e., question 1-8, question 9, question 10) and all scores should be included. Also, verbally or graphically indicate how your scores compare to departmental and college averages and standard deviations for comparable classes [Introductory (1***-2***), Upper undergraduate (3***-4***), and Graduate (7***)].

Graduate-student mentoring. As faculty members at a major research university, mentoring of graduate students is an essential element of faculty teaching expectations. Research-active faculty are expected to mentor graduate students and, indeed, graduate-student mentoring is a significant component of justifying reduced teaching obligations for faculty. The teaching portfolio should therefore include a clear documentation of graduate student mentoring. Faculty are also encouraged to engage opportunities to develop their mentoring skills.3

Service Record

The departments, colleges and university expect some service activity from each of its faculty members. Moreover, the question of good departmental citizenship often arises for promotion consideration at the departmental level. Nonetheless, departments are encouraged to keep service activity to a minimum for untenured faculty members. This is often difficult because young people bring new ideas that are quite valuable. Nonetheless, service beyond the satisfactory level is not likely to have much impact on a promotion document unless it has national or international impact. Examples of the latter would include journal editor or society officer, but such opportunities are uncommon for untenured faculty.

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

While much of this document explicitly or implicitly focuses on criteria for obtaining tenure, I wanted to comment on what I look for when considering cases for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. When considering the merits of a case for promotion to Professor, I look for evidence of a mature and internationally recognized research program and solid teaching credentials. In addition to a strong publication record and steady funding from federal agencies, credentials that support promotion to Professor include some compelling combination of the following: service as editor of peer-reviewed journals; invitations to speak at major national and international meetings; national and/or international awards; publication of major review articles, major invited papers, or other significant synthetic scholarly work such as a textbook; service on review panels for major federal funding agencies (e.g., NSF, NIH, DOE, ONR, etc.); a strong teaching portfolio; and evidence of quality graduate-student mentoring (e.g.,

students receiving degrees, peer-reviewed publications with students, awards received by students).

**Pay raises associated with P&T**

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

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

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

Faculty do not receive an automatic raise for “tenure only” decisions.
Table 1. Timelines for promotion and tenure in the College of Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Appointment</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall 1: Initial 3-year appointment begins</td>
<td>Spring 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>Spring 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall 3</td>
<td>Spring 3: 3rd-year review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1Fall 4: 2nd 3-year appointment begins</td>
<td>Spring 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fall 5</td>
<td>Spring 5: Identify P&amp;T reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2Fall 6: Formal P&amp;T review process begins</td>
<td>Spring 6: P&amp;T decision finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3Fall 7: Begin year 1 of appointment as tenured associate professor</td>
<td>Spring 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1If assistant professor is not reappointed, employment ends after 4th year of appointment. Alternatively, reappointment may be for 1 year.
2Reviews beginning prior to the 6th year of service are considered “accelerated”.
3If promotion is not successful, year 7 is the final year of appointment.

Typical timeline for successful promotion of tenured associate professor to professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Appointment</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1Fall 1: 1st year as tenured associate professor</td>
<td>Spring 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>Spring 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall 3</td>
<td>Spring 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fall 4</td>
<td>Spring 4: Identify P&amp;T reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2Fall 5: Promotion review process begins</td>
<td>Spring 5: P&amp;T decision finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3Fall 6: Begin year 1 of appointment as tenured professor</td>
<td>Spring 6:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Equivalent to “Year 7” in the timeline for assistant professors.
2Reviews beginning prior to the 5th year of service are considered “accelerated”.
3If promotion is not successful, appointment as tenured associate professor continues.

Typical timeline for successful promotion of untenured associate professor or professor to tenured associate professor or professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Appointment</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fall 1: 1st year as untenured Associate Professor</td>
<td>Spring 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>Spring 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall 3</td>
<td>Spring 3: Identify P&amp;T reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1Fall 4: Promotion review process begins</td>
<td>Spring 4: P&amp;T decision finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2Fall 5: Begin year 1 of appointment as tenured associate professor or professor</td>
<td>Spring 5:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Reviews beginning prior to the 4th year of service are considered “accelerated”.
2If tenure is not granted, year 5 is the final year of appointment.
**P&T package checklist**

*To be provided by the candidate:*

1. A standard (non-LSU) format c.v., as well as an LSU-format c.v.*
   a. Clearly indicate papers published since coming to LSU and since last promotion.
   b. Indicate papers with student coauthors.
   c. Indicate corresponding author.
   d. Indicate your role in multi-authored papers.
   e. Provide title and full name of funding agency for funded projects.
   f. Indicate your role in funded projects (e.g., PI, Co-PI, or other capacity).
   g. Indicate the duration of funded projects, the amount of funding, and your share of that funding.


3. A Teaching Portfolio, which should include:
   a. A Statement of Teaching Philosophy.
   b. The most recent syllabus for each course taught.
   c. Report of student evaluations that is clearly defined. All three metrics (average 1-8, question 9, and question 10) need to be presented. Means and standard deviations for comparable courses (i.e., lower level, upper level, or graduate) in the department and the college should be indicated (see attached table as a guideline).
   d. Evidence of participation in workshops, etc. to improve teaching.
   e. Any additional material of direct relevance to teaching performance.

4. A collection of all papers published since the previous promotion, or, for faculty being promoted for the first time at LSU, all publications that list LSU as the address for the candidate.

The P&T package that will be forwarded to outside reviewers will include the standard (non-LSU) version of the c.v. Though not required by PS-36-T, departments may include additional supporting material from the list above. The College recommends (but does not require) inclusion of items (2) and (3) and a selection of 3-5 key publications.

The **P&T package that is reviewed by the department will include all of the above as well as:**

1. Letters from external reviewers.
2. Qualifications of external reviewers, summarized in a succinct, 1-short-paragraph description.
3. Names and addresses of everybody from who letters were formally solicited.
4. Sample letter used to request evaluations.
5. The LSU-format c.v.
6. Annual evaluations (copies of official evaluations that have been signed by both the candidate and the chair). *Do NOT include annual reports submitted by faculty.*

The **package that is forwarded to the College will also include all of the above as well as:**

1. The Chair’s recommendation.
2. Faculty reports
3. The faculty member’s written response, if there is one (see PS-36-T).

*Be certain that the non-LSU and LSU c.v.s contain the same essential information.
Date

To:  
***
Dean, College of Science

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

Re:  
External reviewers for Dr. ***

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

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

Potential reviewers suggested by Dr. *** [4-6 names, listed in order of preference]
1. Dr. Reviewer One
   Professor of ***, University of ***
   Administrative title [e.g., chair, dean], if any
   Honorifics [NAS, Society Fellows, etc.]
   Ph.D. Granting institution
   website

2. ….

Potential reviewers suggested by the Department of *** [4-6 names, listed in order of preference]
1. Dr. Reviewer One
   Professor of ***, University of ***
   Administrative title [e.g., chair, dean], if any
   Honorifics [NAS, Society Fellows, etc.]
   Ph.D. Granting institution
   website

2. ….
Dr. XXX, who is currently an Assistant/Associate Professor/Professor in the Department of XXX, at Louisiana State University, is under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure/tenure/Professor. He/she holds a XX% research, XX% teaching appointment with a normal teaching load of X course(s) per year. I appreciate your willingness to evaluate his/her research, teaching, and service contributions, and ask that you specifically respond to the following:

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Professor and Chair

Enclosure
### B. Faculty Panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>RANK*</th>
<th>FACULTY PANEL COMPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>As Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor</td>
<td>All tenure-track and tenured faculty or a committee designated by same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment with Tenure</td>
<td>As Associate Professor</td>
<td>Vote on Tenure: Tenured Associate Professors and Tenured Professors Vote on Appointment: All tenure-track and tenured faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment with Tenure</td>
<td>As Professor</td>
<td>Vote on Tenure: Tenured Professors               Vote on Appointment: All tenure-track and tenured faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment</td>
<td>As Assistant Professor</td>
<td>All tenured faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Tenured Associate Professors and Tenured Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Tenured Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion with Tenure</td>
<td>From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor</td>
<td>Tenured Associate Professors and Tenured Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion with Tenure</td>
<td>From Associate Professor to Professor</td>
<td>Tenured Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (already holds tenure)</td>
<td>From Associate Professor to Professor</td>
<td>Tenured Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement to Tenure</td>
<td>As Associate Professor</td>
<td>Tenured Associate Professors and Tenured Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement to Tenure</td>
<td>As Professor</td>
<td>Tenured Professors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*And equivalent ranks