

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

<i>VIII</i>	<i>Promotion and Tenure Reviews</i>	21
	<i>VIII.A General Provisions</i>	21
	<i>VIII.A.1 When a Review Will Be Conducted</i>	22
	<i>VIII.A.2 Line Officers' Responsibilities</i>	22
	<i>VIII.A.3 Withdrawal from a Mandated Review</i>	22
	<i>VIII.A.4 An Early Review</i>	23
	<i>VIII.A.5 The Review Committee</i>	23
	<i>VIII.B Stage 1: Evaluation by Experts Outside LSU</i>	23
	<i>VIII.B.1 Confidentiality</i>	23
	<i>VIII.B.2 The Use of Letters of Evaluation</i>	24
	<i>VIII.B.3 Choosing Evaluators: Procedure</i>	24
	<i>VIII.B.4 Choosing Evaluators: Requirements</i>	24
	<i>VIII.B.5 Communications with Evaluators</i>	25
	<i>VIII.C Stage 2: Recommendation by the Department</i>	26
	<i>VIII.D Stage 3: Consideration by Higher Offices</i>	27
	<i>VIII.E Contents of the Review File</i>	28
<i>IX</i>	<i>Appeals</i>	28
	<i>IX.A Procedures</i>	28
	<i>IX.B Grounds</i>	29
<i>X</i>	<i>Annual Reviews</i>	30
	<i>X.A Preamble</i>	30
	<i>X.B A Faculty Member's File</i>	30
	<i>X.C The Annual Review Process</i>	31
	<i>X.C.1 Objectives</i>	31
	<i>X.C.2 Preliminary Steps</i>	31
	<i>X.C.3 Next Steps, Tenure-Track Faculty</i>	32
	<i>X.C.4 Next Steps, Tenured Faculty</i>	32
	<i>X.C.5 Final Steps</i>	33
	<i>X.C.6 Evaluation by the Chair</i>	33
<i>XI</i>	<i>Assistance Program to Enhance Job Performance</i>	34
<i>XII</i>	<i>Glossary</i>	35
	<i>Index</i>	39

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 21 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 31.
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 14.
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 28.

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:

1. 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.
2. 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. The same provisions apply also to a college or other academic unit that is the direct employer of its faculty (see V.B, page 9).
3. If a college has two or more subdivisions which are the direct employers of faculty, then the 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.

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 extent and nature of expectations in the three areas may be further specified, under the guidelines of the present Section IV, in the rules of departments and other academic units (see Section III); and in written contracts.

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.

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

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

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 appropriate group of faculty to arrive at a judgment of the importance, originality, influence, persistence, and future promise of the candidate's program of work. 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.

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.

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 appropriate group of 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.refereeing
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 (see Section XII, page 35). These conventions are significant, for example, as follows:

- Every statement about a *department*, with regard to a decision process concerning a faculty member, applies also to an institute, school, center, college, or otherwise-named academic unit which is the direct employer of the faculty member.
- Every statement about a *chair*, with regard to a decision process concerning a faculty member, applies also to a head, director, dean, or otherwise-titled chief academic officer of the academic unit which is the direct employer of the faculty member.
- In cases when there is no academic officer or unit situated between the Provost and the academic unit which is the direct employer of the faculty member, provisions stated with reference to a dean or a college are void.

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 14, 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 The Faculty Panel

The *faculty panel* is the group of faculty constituted to consider and determine, by majority vote, the department's recommendation with regard to a given decision (see item 14, page 36, in Section XII). The faculty panel will consist of all full-time LSU

faculty who hold primary appointment in the department, and who qualify as stated in V.I.1; with exclusions and additions which may have occurred as provided in V.I.2, V.I.3, and V.I.4.

V.I.1 Preliminary Definition of the Faculty Panel

1. For an initial appointment to a tenure-track position, the faculty panel will consist of 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 panel 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 faculty panel will comprise the tenured and tenure-track faculty. For the granting of tenure, the faculty panel will comprise 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 faculty panel will comprise 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 faculty panel will comprise the tenured Associate Professors and Professors.
5. For a promotion to Professor, and for an advancement of a Professor to tenure, the faculty panel will comprise the tenured Professors.

V.I.2 The Chair as Member of the Faculty Panel Even in a case when it is not implied by V.I.1, the chair will be a member of the faculty panel. As the presiding officer at meetings of the panel, 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*. In addition, 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.I.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 faculty panel 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 faculty panel 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 faculty panel 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 faculty panel.

VI.4 Added Members of the Faculty Panel For a decision which is to be made in a primary or secondary department, the members of the faculty panel 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 panel, for the decision in question, by adding members. After consulting the chair and the present members of the panel, and receiving their nominations, he or she may elect to appoint additional members. 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 VI.1. The appointments will be subject to approval by the Provost. VI.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 faculty panels for those decisions.

VI.5 Voting Twice on the Same Decision As a result of provisions above, a person may be a member of the faculty panel 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.J Participation by All Faculty Panel Members

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 members of the faculty panel (see V.I), including those who are on leave and/or 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.K 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 faculty panel (see V.I), 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.J. 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 made and attested to by at least two members of the faculty panel. The tally, including separate counts when

taken, will be reported to the faculty panel. The right of each person to have his or her ballot kept confidential, to the extent possible under the other requirements of PS-36, will be respected. The rules of the department (see Section III, page 3), may further specify and regulate the manner of voting.

V.L Separate Counts

Whenever the faculty panel (see V.I) includes both tenured and tenure-track faculty, the votes of each group will be counted separately, and the tally will be reported for each group as well as for the panel 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 vote of the faculty panel (see item 14, page 36, in Section XII; see also V.I.2).

V.M The Report of a Departmental Recommendation

Whenever the faculty panel in a primary or secondary department completes its deliberations and arrives 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 tally of the vote, separately by categories when V.L applies.
2. The number of panel members who did not vote.
3. The chair's independent judgment and recommendation with regard to the decision.
4. 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.
5. An account of the important factors underlying the panel'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 faculty panel 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 panel, 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 three elements of the report, and a faculty panel representative will prepare the fourth and fifth.

VI.N Required Notice of Nonreappointment

A decision not to reappoint a faculty member may be reached through the procedures of Section VII or Section VIII. Such a decision requires no further administrative or Board of Supervisors' approval. Written notice of the decision will ordinarily be given 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 he or she will not be reappointed, the decision will normally be irrevocable and will not be suspended during an appeal.

VI INITIAL APPOINTMENTS

VI.A Procedure

The following provisions govern the steps leading to the initial appointment of a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, including the recruitment and evaluation of candidates by the department. In special cases, a person may be proposed for an appointment from outside the department; for example, as a result of a search for an administrative officer. For such an appointment, it is still required that the appropriate faculty panel make a recommendation with regard to the appointment (VI.A.3), that the candidate's academic credentials be documented (VI.A.4), and that the approval process of VI.A.5 be followed. In all cases, the provisions of subsections VI.B-VI.F will be observed.

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, determining job descriptions and qualifications in accord with VI.B, 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.I, page 10).

VI.A.3 A Recommendation to Appoint For the department to recommend an appointment, the chair must call a meeting of the faculty panel and take a vote by written ballot, with separate counts when appropriate. See item 2 of V.I.1, page 11; and V.K, page 12. The panel is 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, the panel 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 faculty panel 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. In all other cases, 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 of an Associate Professor or Professor without tenure, the Provost will make the final decision. In the case of an appointment with tenure, 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 the final decision.

When final approval has been secured, the signed contract will be returned through channels to the chair. Only then will the position be officially 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. A line officer may have preliminary discussions with the candidate prior to this time.

VI.B Minimum Qualifications for Appointments

The procedure for making an appointment is stated in VI.A. When the qualifications for a given position are determined, the following guidelines will be observed.

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. In a case when a degree is required but has not been awarded, the University may, at its discretion, extend the offer of the position, but only on this condition: 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. For an alternative provision, see VI.F. Regarding the documentation of credentials required in all cases, see VI.A.4. See also PS-25, entitled **Nepotism**, which 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 faculty panel 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 faculty panel.

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. Regarding possible later adjustments to the tenure clock, see VII.D, page 20. For provisions regarding the probationary period, see Section VII, page 18. Regarding tenure reviews, see Section VIII, page 21.

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.

Regarding possible later adjustments to the tenure clock, see VII.D, page 20.

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.

Regarding possible later adjustments to the tenure clock, see VII.D, page 20.

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 is required for a position, but LSU has not received the certification that the requirements for said degree have been com-

pleted (see VI.B.1). The University may still, at its discretion, make the appointment, under conditions that will be stated in the contract, with the title of Acting Assistant Professor. If LSU receives the certification by the date specified in the contract, and changes the person's title to Assistant Professor, the initial setting of the tenure clock will be determined at that time.

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.

VII.B Timetable Provisions for Reappointments

These provisions are stated in terms of the time on the tenure clock. Regarding the initial setting of the tenure clock, see VI.E, page 17. Regarding possible later adjustments to the tenure clock, see VII.D, page 20.

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 31), 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 faculty panel depends on the rank of the person being reviewed; see item 3 of V.I, page 11.

1. The chair will make the file available to the faculty panel for their study. The chair will also make it available to the faculty panel of each secondary department, if any, through the chair thereof.
2. In each secondary department, the chair will convene the faculty panel 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 faculty panel 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 provide copies of the reports

written under the provisions of items 2 and 3 to the faculty member. The chair will explain the procedural steps that will follow.

5. The faculty member will be asked to sign 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, for inclusion in the file, provided I send it to the chair and to the dean no later than seven working days after the present date.

VII.C.1 Approval Process The chair will send a copy of the file 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 faculty panel 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

For a tenure-track faculty member who is not under notice of nonreappointment, and for whom year six on the tenure clock has not begun, the tenure clock may be stopped

for a specified period of time under the following provisions. Such an adjustment will redefine the timetable which in VII.B is stated in terms of the tenure clock, and in particular will redefine the year of the mandatory tenure review. 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.
3. During the probationary period, the faculty member may make, and may be granted, more than one such request.

Such a request will be considered, for example, under circumstances like the following.

- 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 a faculty member under review, or being considered for a review.

A positive decision on the action in question requires the completion of all three stages of the review process:

1. Evaluation by selected outside experts—VIII.B, page 23. Letters of evaluation will be requested and obtained from selected evaluators external to LSU.
2. Recommendation by the department—VIII.C, page 26.
3. Consideration by higher offices, from the dean through the LSU System—VIII.D, page 27.

Judicious and careful preparation and deliberation are called for at each stage. Accordingly, it may be 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 *When a Review Will Be Conducted* The chair will call a meeting of the appropriate faculty panel (see V.I, page 10) whenever a mandatory tenure review is at hand for an Assistant Professor or an untenured Associate Professor or Professor, and whenever it is time to decide whether to conduct reviews in other cases, and will advise the panel of the procedures to be followed. The panel will consider initiating a review for a candidate if a member of the panel proposes it, or if the candidate has requested a review. If the panel decides by majority vote that a review is warranted, then one will be conducted. If a candidate requests a review but the panel decides against it, then the chair will immediately so advise the person, who may appeal the decision to the next higher officer, whose decision will be final—either to uphold the faculty panel or to order that a review will be conducted. See VIII.A.4.

VIII.A.2 *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.3 *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.4 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. An early review does not entail an adjustment to the tenure clock.

VIII.A.5 The Review Committee The *review committee* for a faculty member under review will be a committee of the faculty panel, 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 members of the faculty panel. As provided in VIII.B.3, 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

Ample time should be allowed for this procedure. Courtesy requires that those who are asked to write letters of evaluation should not be rushed.

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.3. In particular, the candidate will not be informed as to who the evaluators are. During the review, the candidate should 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 faculty panel members, 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.

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.

VIII.B.2 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 current 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.3 Choosing Evaluators: Procedure The review committee will ask the faculty member under review, the chair, and the faculty panel members to suggest outside evaluators; and also to list potential outside evaluators who, by reason of a bias or conflict of interest, should not be chosen. The review committee and the chair will jointly select a list of evaluators to ask for letters, and subsequently may make changes in the list. Each evaluator must be approved by the dean before a contact is made with him or her.

VIII.B.4 Choosing Evaluators: Requirements The following regulations and objectives must be observed.² Exceptions must be approved by the line officer to whom the chair reports.

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 equivalent of 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 a U.S. university whose Carnegie Classification, with regard to research and advanced study, is at least that of LSU.³
4. A person known to have a bias or conflict of interest relevant to the case will not be asked to serve as an evaluator.
5. Letters of evaluation must be obtained from 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.

²For information only: According to HRM, the number of outside letters in a review file is usually five or six.

³As 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.

VIII.B.5 Communications with Evaluators The chair—or, if so provided by the department’s rules (see Section III), the review committee’s designee—will manage communications with the evaluators. He or she may make preliminary contacts with evaluators to determine their ability and willingness to serve; and may request a *C.V.* or other information if one is needed to provide an accurate and appropriate description of an evaluator’s qualifications. The letter asking a person to write a letter of evaluation must comply with the following model, except for variations approved by the officer to whom the chair reports. The candidate’s *C.V.* will be enclosed. The candidate, in consultation with the chair (or the review committee’s designee), may select supporting material to be enclosed also.

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. The letter or the enclosures should make clear the degree of the candidate’s teaching and service responsibilities during the probationary period.*]

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.
 - (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.

If you send your response electronically, please also send a signed, paper original for our files.

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 recommendation of the department is determined by majority vote of the faculty panel (see item 14, Section XII). The definition of the faculty panel depends on the action being considered and the status of the person under review; see V.I, page 10.

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 faculty panel members for their study. The chair will also make it available to the faculty panel 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 faculty panel 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 faculty panel 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 faculty panel. 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 meet with the candidate to advise him or her of the recommendation; V.H applies. The chair will provide copies of the reports written under the provisions of items 2 and 3 to the candidate, excluding the part that must be kept confidential (see item 4 of V.M, page 13), and will advise the candidate of his or her rights under item 6.
5. In any case when the department's recommendation is positive, and in the case of a mandatory tenure review, the chair will forward the review file to the next higher office for consideration. In any case other than a mandatory tenure review, if the department's recommendation is negative, then the final decision will be that the promotion will not be granted—unless the candidate requests in writing that the review file be forwarded to the next higher office for consideration.
6. The candidate may write a formal response for inclusion in the file. If the review file is being forwarded, then the response must be sent to the chair, and also to the officer to whom the chair reports, no later than seven working days after the date when the candidate is advised of the 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. When the department has made a negative recommendation in any case other than a mandatory tenure review and the dean upholds the department's position, the dean's decision is final. The dean will notify the chair and the candidate and will meet with the candidate; V.H applies. These provisions apply to the Provost if the department reports directly to the Provost.
2. Except as provided in item 1, the dean will recommend for or against the action in question and forward the review file to the Provost. The dean will notify the chair and the candidate of his or her decision. If the decision is negative, or if the candidate requests it, the dean will meet with the candidate; V.H applies.
3. The Provost may recommend for or against the action in question, and will then forward the review file to the Chancellor.

4. 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.
5. In each case, the final decision will be made by the LSU System in accord with its policies and procedures.
6. 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 6 of VIII.C.

IX APPEALS

IX.A Procedures

After the completion of a decision process regarding a reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, 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. A current *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, current, 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 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. It might, for example, provide essential support enabling a faculty member (1) to achieve excellence in some new undertaking in scholarship or teaching; or (2) to change the direction of his or her scholarship to adjust to changes in the discipline; and/or (3) to overcome a problem of underperformance. 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. Depending on the case, the plan of action may involve measures to support the faculty member's work, such as (for example) reduced teaching duties, assignment of a graduate research assistant, travel expenses, or the purchase of research materials or equipment. The plan must identify the needed resources, including those that must be requested from higher offices, and the appropriate commitments on the part of the faculty member.

3. If the chair, in consultation with his or her dean, determines that the potential benefits to the department justify the cost of the proposed assistance program, and if the faculty member agrees, they will present the proposal to the Provost or the Provost's designee for approval. If approval is granted, 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 reports directly to the Provost.
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, college, 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 21). With regard to (1), this convention is established in PM-23. See VIII.A.4, page 23.
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. **Faculty panel.** The group of faculty constituted to consider and determine, by majority vote, the department's recommendation with regard to a given decision. See V.I, page 10.
10. **File, a faculty member's.** Established in X.B, page 30 this "official departmental personnel file," is required to contain significant records pertinent to the faculty member's employment at LSU, certain confidential materials excepted.
11. **Full-time.** A full-time employee is one who is employed for 100% of effort.
12. **HRM.** The Office of Human Resource Management.
13. **Line officer.** Chancellor, Provost, dean, or chair. See the definitions of *chair* and *dean* in this Glossary.
14. **Majority vote.** See Robert's Rules, as provided in III.D, page 4, for the definition and all pertinent regulations. The current edition states, in §44: "A *majority vote* . . . means more than half of the votes cast by persons legally entitled to vote, excluding blanks or abstentions, at a regular or properly called meeting at which a quorum is present."
15. **Part-time.** A part-time employee is one who is employed for anything less than 100% of effort.
16. **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.
17. **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.

18. **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 18.
19. **Review committee** Either (1) the committee charged with investigating the case for a promotion or advancement to tenure. (see VIII.A.5, page 23); or (2) the committee charged with a role in the annual review process of an untenured faculty member (see VII.A, page 18).
20. **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.
21. **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.
22. **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.
23. **Semester.** A fall or spring semester, not a summer term.
24. **Terminal degree.** The most advanced degree terminal degree offered in a given discipline, ordinarily required for a faculty position in that discipline.
25. **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 17, 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.
26. **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.
27. **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, 30
- Added members of the faculty panel, 12
- Administrator, 8, 11, 31, 34
- Advisory, 8, 11, 20, 27, 29, 33
- Annual review process, 2, 19, 28, 30–32
 - in case of illness, 31
- Appeals, 28
 - grounds for, 29
- Applicability of PS-36, 2
- Appointment, 11
 - academic credentials for, 15
 - criteria for, 4
 - departmental recommendation of, 13
 - inbreeding provision, 17
 - initial, during summer, 12
 - minimum qualifications for, 16
 - of an Assistant Professor, 17
 - of Associate or full Professor, 17
 - procedure for, 14
 - to tenured position, 11, 16
 - without the terminal degree, 17
- Assistance program, 34–35
- Assistant Curator, 2
- Assistant Librarian, 2
- Assistant Professor, 2, 16–17, 19–21
 - Acting, 18
- Associate Curator, 2
- Associate Librarian, 2
- Associate Professor, 2, 11, 17, 19–21, 23, 36
- Awards, 6
- Ballot
 - email, 12
 - marked, 13
 - online, 12
 - to be kept confidential, 13
 - written, 12
- Board of Supervisors, 14
 - Bylaws, 2
 - Regulations, 2–3
- Boyd Professor, 2
- Built works, 5
- Bylaws, 4, 35, 37
 - Faculty Senate, 29
- Certification board, 8
- Chair, 10
 - defined in broad sense, 9, 35
 - role of, 10, 14
- Chair's recommendation, 13, 21
- Chancellor, 16, 28–29
- Citations, 6
- Classroom instruction, 6
- Clinical work, 7
- College
 - defined in broad sense, 9
- Combative behavior, 5
- Committee service, 8
- Confidentiality, 2, 9, 26–27
 - of ballots, 13
 - of outside letters, 13, 23, 26, 30
- Conflict of interest, 24
- Contracts, 5
 - employment, 15–17

40 INDEX

- rights deriving from, 2
- Credentials, 15
- Criteria
 - for dismissal, 3
 - for evaluations, 4, 27, 30, 33
- Curator, 2
- Dean
 - defined in broad sense, 9, 35
 - role of, 10
- Definitions, 35
- Department
 - defined in broad sense, 9, 35
- Diagnostic support, 8
- Dismissal for cause, 3
- Disruptive behavior, 5
- Documentation of credentials, 15
- Early review, 23, 36
- Economic development, 8
- Editorship, 9
- Educational philosophy, 7
- Educational policy, 6–8
- Email, 12
- Employee Assistance Program, 31
- Ethical conduct, 5
- Exhibitions, 5
- Extensions to the probationary period, 17–18, 21
- External evaluator, 22–23
 - selection of, 24
- Faculty panel, 11–13, 15–16, 19–20, 23–24, 26–27
 - added members of, 12
 - definition of, 10, 36
 - participation in decisions, 12
- File
 - faculty member's, 30, 36
- Freedom of speech, 5
- Full-time
 - definition of, 36
 - tenured appointments understood to be, 2
- Grants, 6–7, 9
- Grievance Committee, 29
- Hospitals, 8
- HRM, 20, 22, 31, 33
 - definition of, 36
- Inbreeding, 17
- Independent study, 6
- Intellectual honesty, 5
- Interview, requirement of an, 16
- Job description, 5, 8, 14, 16
- Leave, 2, 12, 21
- Legally enforceable rights, 2
- Letter of evaluation, 24–25
 - age of, 24
 - form letter requesting, 25
 - outside, 22–23
 - to be kept confidential, 24
 - use of, 24
- Librarian, 2
- Line officer, 10, 22
 - defined, 36
 - recusal of, 10
- LSU System, 2–3, 8–10, 16, 22, 28
- Majority vote, 4, 13, 22, 26, 36
- Major professor, 25
- Mandated reappointment review, 18
- Mandated tenure review, 17, 19, 23, 27, 36
- Maternity leave, 21
- Meeting, 9
- Minority views, 13
- Musical compositions, 5
- Musical performances, 5
- Nepotism, 2, 11, 16
- Nonreappointment
 - when one can occur, 18
- Notice of nonreappointment, 3, 10, 12, 14, 19, 21, 31
- Novels, 5
- Online systems, 12
- Outside evaluator, 6, 22–23
 - selection of, 24
- Parental leave, 21
- Part-time, 21, 36
 - appointment, definition of, 36
 - appointment, regular, 2
 - appointment, temporary, 2, 21
- Patents, 5
- Patient management, 8
- Pedagogy, 7
- Peer advisor
 - right to a, 10, 19–20, 27, 32–33
- Permanent Memoranda, 2
- Plays, 5
- PM-23, 2–3, 36
- Poetry, 5
- Postdoctoral advisor, 25
- Primary appointment, 36
- Primary department, 12–13, 15, 19, 26, 28, 36
- Probationary period, 17–18, 36
- Professional conduct, 5
- Professor, 2, 11, 17, 19–21, 23–24
- Promotion, 4, 13, 30
 - criteria for, 4
- Promotion review, 22
- Provost, 4, 9–10, 12, 15–16, 20, 22–23, 27–29, 33, 35
 - role of, 9
- PS-01, 2
- PS-07, 2
- PS-104, 3
- PS-12, 2
- PS-25, 2, 11
- PS-40, 2, 24, 30
- PS-50, 2
- PS-59, 3, 31
- Rankings, 27, 34

- Reappointment, 4, 11, 13, 19–21, 28, 30–31
 - approval process for a, 20
 - criteria for, 4
- Reappointment review, 18–19, 32–33
- Recusal, 11
 - of a family member, 2, 11
 - of a line officer, 10
 - voluntary, 12
- Refereeing, 9
- Respect for others' rights, 5
- Review committee, 18, 23–28, 32
- Review
 - early, 36
- Review file, 22–24, 26–28
- Reviewing, 9
- Reviewing officer, 31
- Right to dissent, 5
- Robert's Rules of Order, 4, 11
- Rules of an academic unit, 3–5, 8, 10–14, 18, 20, 23, 25, 29–32, 37
 - approval of, 4
 - changes may be required in the, 4
 - must be consistent with policies, 4
- Scholarship, 4–5, 8, 37
 - defined broadly, 5
 - examples of, 5
 - examples of evidence of quality, 6
 - long-term undertakings in, 34
- Scientific expeditions, 5
- Secondary appointment, 37
- Secondary department, 12–13, 15, 19–20, 26, 28, 30, 32–33, 37
- Seminars, 6
- Separate counts, 12–13, 15
- Service, 4–5, 8
 - examples of, 8
 - learning and community, 7
- Stages of a promotion or tenure review, 22
- Summer, 12, 37
- Teaching, 4–6, 8, 34
 - examples of contributions, 6
 - examples of evidence of quality, 7
- Technology, 5, 8
- Tenure, 1–2
 - advancement to, 1, 4–5, 7–8, 10–11, 13, 21, 23, 30–31, 33–34, 37
 - cancellation of, 2
- Tenure clock, 15, 17–19, 21, 23, 37
- Tenure
 - in Board Regulations, 3
 - initial appointment with, 16
- Tenure review, 18–19, 21–22, 33
 - early, 23
 - mandated, 17, 19, 23, 36–37
 - mandated for assistant professor, 19
 - mandated for associate professor or professor, 19
 - withdrawal from, 23
- Tenure system, 1
- Tenure-track faculty, 2, 5, 11–14, 17, 21, 36
 - definition of, 37
- Terminal degree, 16–17, 25, 37
- Textbooks, 7
- Theatrical productions, 5
- Timetables for procedures, 10
- Values
 - educational, 5
 - intellectual, 5
- Visiting faculty, 3
- Visual arts, 5
- Voting
 - the manner of, 12
 - twice on the same decision, 12

Changes:
From the September 2 Version to the October 1 Version
Of the Proposed New PS-36

References to section and page numbers refer to this October 1 version, which will be the version before the Senate at the October 12 meeting.

The PS-36 Committee has made these changes in response to discussion at the September 9 meeting of the Faculty Senate, and to other comments received from Senators and other faculty since that time. Most of the changes are matters of clarification, improvement of wording, additional cross-references, or minor corrections. Some of the changes touch on substantive issues and reflect the Committee's effort better to achieve a consensus position.

We hope that these changes by the Committee represent a satisfactory processing of faculty inputs so far, and will reduce the work to be done when the Senate begins formal consideration of the document. At that time, of course, changes may be made by motion, debate, and vote.

The changes are presented in two lists. The changes on the first list are the more interesting ones. The changes on the second list are minor.

List One

1. In the opening passage of Section IV, page 4, the statements about "fundamental expectations" which were in paragraphs 2 and 3 have been modified and are now the last paragraphs (just before IV.A begins). **Remarks:** At the AAUP website (www.aaup.org), there is an *Academe* article on collegiality, and an article under "Legal." The gist of those two articles consist in these two points: (1) The AAUP, like some faculty at LSU, oppose the elevation of "collegiality" to the status of a fourth major area for evaluation, believing it is too vague and too much related to conformity and subservience. (2) The courts have generally confirmed that collegiality, properly understood, is an inherent expectation in any workplace, and that it is a legitimate criterion in any evaluation of job performance. There are faculty at LSU who believe strongly that the "fundamental expectations" should be affirmed in PS-36. They point out that in 1997 the Faculty Senate quite deliberately inserted the language about "disruptive or combative behavior." The PS-36 Committee has tried to strike a balance, making the affirmation while avoiding the term "collegiality." The related material in the present PS-36 may be found in three places:
 - II.A, paragraph 1.
 - II.A, paragraph 3.
 - Section VIII, glossary, definition of *Collegiality*.
2. We have replaced the term *voting faculty* with the term *faculty panel* in referring to the body of faculty who deliberate and decide on departmental recommendations about a personnel matter. The former term, because it is plural and contains the word *voting*, was awkward and gave rise to misunderstandings.

Twice in Section IV we have used "the appropriate group of faculty," since this Section occurs before the definition of "faculty panel."

3. Section V, page 9, has been rearranged: Subsection V.I, page 10, now occurs earlier, because it seems best to define "faculty panel" before making use of the term.
4. In VI.4, page 12, paragraph 1, sentence 3: We have added the phrase "and receiving their nominations."
5. In V.K, page 12, the sentence "Every count will be verified by at least one witness" has been replaced by "Every count will be made and attested to by at least two members of the faculty panel." Also, in the sentence "The right of each person to have his or her ballot kept confidential, *to the extent possible under the other requirements of PS-36*, will be respected," the italicized words have been added—to avoid seeming to promise a higher degree of confidentiality than is practical.
6. In VI.A, page 14, we have inserted an opening paragraph which is new. In the September version of our proposal, and in the present PS-36, there is no explicit provisions to the established practices whereby appointments are sometimes suggested to departments from outside. This happens under various circumstances, including spousal hires and faculty appointments for a dean, Provost, or Chancellor. Senate Resolution 99-05 called for appointments in such cases to be reviewed by the appropriate academic unit faculty, and has been observed in most (not all cases) in recent years. Our new opening paragraph explicitly recognizes the practice and insists on the appropriate review.
7. In VI.A.1, page 14, we have inserted the phrase "determining job descriptions and qualifications in accord with VI.B."
8. Because of job-market conditions that hold in some disciplines and some periods of time, appointments are sometimes made when the required terminal degree has not yet been attained. Having been advised of some of the difficulties that arise in these situations, including immigration regulations, we have revised VI.F, page 17 and, for reasons of logic, moved one of the statements therein to VI.B.1 (page 16). The purpose of the changes is to prescribe a bit less and allow a bit more discretion, as does the present PS-36.
9. We have corrected an oversight in the September 2 version; we have restored certain provisions in the present PS-36 that apply to a promotion-and-tenure case other than a mandatory tenure review. The provisions in question allow the review to stop at the department level when (1) the faculty panel elects not to conduct a review that the candidate has requested or (2) the departmental recommendation is negative; but also allow the candidate to insist on review at the next higher level. See VIII.A.1, page 22; the second sentence in VIII.C, page 26; and item 1 in VIII.D, page 27.

10. In XI, page 34, we have modified the opening paragraph, item 2, and item 3.

List Two

1. Sentences have been added to items 2 and 3, in III.B, page 4. Three bullets have been added to V.B, page 9, the subsection "Definitions of Certain Terms." These additions are for the sake of clarity. They achieve a certain redundancy, in view of the definitions in the Glossary (Section XII, page 35).
2. The sentence that was at the end of IV.A has been modified and moved to the opening paragraphs of Section IV, page 4. It had said: "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." The sentence now appears in the second paragraph at the beginning of Section IV.
3. For the sake of clarity, the first sentence in V.J, 12, now contains the phrase "including those who are *on leave and/or* not in residence." The italicized words are new.
4. We have placed an entry in the Glossary for "majority vote," confirming that the meaning is as defined in Robert's Rules. Several references to this glossary entry have been inserted in the text, for example in V.L, page 13.
5. In V.M, page 13, we re-worded items 1 and 2, changed the order of items 3 and 4, and re-worded the last sentence of the subsection.
6. In V.N, page 14: We were asked about the meaning of the last sentence in the second paragraph, which was a carryover from the present PS-36. We learned that the attorneys advised including this assertion. We were also asked, by someone reading V.N in isolation, to clarify by reference how a nonreappointment decision is made. In response, we have rearranged and reworded this subsection.
7. In VI.A.5, which begins on page 15, we have revised and re-worded parts of the last three paragraphs for the sake of clarification.
8. In VI.B, page 16, we have inserted a short opening paragraph making reference to VI.A, to make clear that there's a required procedure for making an appointment, as well as minimum qualifications.
9. In the opening paragraph of VI.E, page 17; and also in the opening paragraph of VII.B, page 18, we have added a cross-reference regarding "possible later adjustments to the tenure clock."
10. Items 4 and 5 of VII.C, which begins on page 19, are a revision of the previous items 4, 5, and 6 which corrects some oversights in the previous draft. Also, the deadline for the "formal letter of response or rebuttal" has been changed

from 5 days after a certain deadline to "seven working days after the present date."

11. In the opening sentence of VII.C.1, page 20, we have deleted the parenthetical phrase "omitting unchanged, previously transmitted contents." We have done the same in item 2 of X.C.5, page 33. We were advised it's better to assure completeness of what is sent.
12. In VII.D, page 20, we have inserted the second sentence to make doubly sure that it's clear, that an adjustment in the tenure clock implies a change in the year of the mandatory tenure review. We have added item 3 for the sake of clarity. And we re-worded the phrase that follows item 3.
13. The three paragraphs of VIII.A, page 21, have been revised for the sake of clarity: See the last sentence of paragraph 1; paragraph 2; and the change from "is advisable" to "may be advisable" in paragraph 3. Also, some of the material that was in the opening material has been moved to the new subsection VIII.A.1.
14. The last sentence of VIII.A.4, page 23, is added for clarity: An early review does not entail an adjustment to the tenure clock.
15. We've changed "will" to "should" in the third sentence of VIII.B.1, page 23.
16. In subsection VIII.B, page 23, we have re-arranged the subsections and changed some of their titles.
17. In VIII.B.3, page 24, we have provided that those who nominate outside evaluators will be invited to list persons who may have a conflict of interest. Also, some of the provisions in VIII.B.3 have been moved to the beginning of VIII.B.5.
18. In VIII.B.4, page 24, we've re-worded the opening sentence and items 2, 3, and 4.
19. In VIII.B.5, page 25, end of first paragraph, we've called for letting the evaluator know "the degree of the candidate's teaching and service responsibilities"
20. In item 2 of the form letter in VIII.B.5, we've deleted the unnecessary "if you find it appropriate to do so." In the next-to-last paragraph, we've asked for a paper copy also, in the case the evaluator sends an electronic letter.
21. Items 4, 5, and 6 replace the former item 4 in VIII.C, page 26. The deadline for the "formal letter of response or rebuttal" has been changed from 5 days after a certain deadline to "seven working days after the present date."
22. In VIII.D, page 27, there are 6 items where there were only five. In item 5, "in accord to" has been changed to "in accord with."
23. We have re-worded the first sentence of IX.A, page 28