

College of Human Sciences and Education
Louisiana State University and A&M College

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

OVERVIEW

Louisiana State University and A&M College, hereafter referred to as LSU, has published a number of Policy Statements, (including Policy Statements concerning the general criteria for appointments, reappointments, promotions, tenure, annual reviews, and enhancement of job performance for tenure-track and tenured faculty (PS-36-T: [http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/4d8b193f0753c7e48625714000672ba4/9810721F6C7A3F19862575C90076C063/\\$File/PS36-T+FINAL+2009.pdf](http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/4d8b193f0753c7e48625714000672ba4/9810721F6C7A3F19862575C90076C063/$File/PS36-T+FINAL+2009.pdf)) as well as the general criteria for initial appointments, reappointments, annual reviews, and promotions for faculty other than tenure-track and tenured (PS-36-NT: [http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/4d8b193f0753c7e48625714000672ba4/4E1807CA341C8007862575C900776A4F/\\$File/PS36-NT+FINAL+2009.pdf](http://appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/4d8b193f0753c7e48625714000672ba4/4E1807CA341C8007862575C900776A4F/$File/PS36-NT+FINAL+2009.pdf)). The purpose of this document is to provide the perspective of the College of Human Sciences and Education (CHSE) regarding *minimum* criteria to apply for consideration for tenure and/or promotion. Accordingly, this document does not reiterate all of the information contained in the aforementioned materials, but it does clarify minimum performance expectations within the College for tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty positions. As such, this document is intended to enhance internal communication within the College concerning performance expectations as well as clarify the College's tenure and promotion standards within the context of the larger University. School Directors and faculty mentors are encouraged to use this document to guide junior faculty as they strive to meet standards for promotion and tenure when applicable. For individuals working toward mandatory promotion and tenure reviews, the document can be used in the annual review process and at the third year review to evaluate progress toward meeting and exceeding the minimum performance expectations. Additionally, the document can provide a structure to provide clear feedback throughout the mentoring process.

This document was developed by an ad hoc CHSE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee that was formed in the spring semester of 2014 by pairing the five Directors of each college-degree-granting school within the College with five senior faculty representatives from each of these five Schools. Throughout the course of the spring semester, this committee met bi-monthly to develop a document that would enhance clarity regarding tenure and promotion criteria across the College. As discussions proceeded on how best to describe such expectations, it was decided that the college-level document would delineate *minimum* expectations for tenure and promotion across the College, and that each of the five schools would then develop their own school-level document to further clarify tenure and promotion criteria within the respective school. Such school-level documents could delineate *minimum* expectations for the school that exceed the College-level expectations, but these expectations must, at minimum, be equal to the *minimum* expectations outlined within the CHSE Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. These documents would require the support of the CHSE Dean for final approval.

After much deliberation the ad hoc CHSE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee ultimately settled on defining *minimum* performance expectations across the College to enhance the preliminary evaluation of tenure and/or promotion candidates. In so doing, the Committee was challenged to define the *minimum* quantity of very high quality outputs that a candidate would need to likely experience success when applying for tenure and/or promotion within the College. As such, it is important to emphasize that a candidate who merely achieves the *minimum* standards outlined in this document in terms of

quantity might still not meet the overall threshold for a successful tenure and/or promotion attempt unless the evaluation committee determines that every output of that candidate was of very high quality. In this manner, these guidelines are intended to inform the initial step of a more comprehensive evaluation process; they are designed to address minimum output quantity, but the ad hoc CHSE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee fully recognizes the significant role that quality plays in the subsequent comprehensive evaluation process. Accordingly, tenure and/or promotion candidates are strongly advised to set personal achievement goals beyond the *minimum* standards outlined in this document in case all outputs are not judged to be of the highest quality in one's discipline. Furthermore, it is important to note that these standards are not aspirational goals we hope to reach in the future. Instead, they reflect the current standards that are presently in use when evaluating tenure and/or promotion candidates at the College level. Therefore, this document reflects *minimum* standards as defined at the time of its development, and the document should be routinely considered for modification in order to best reflect actual performance standards.

MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

In accordance with PS-36-T and PS-36-NT, the evaluation of CHSE faculty can include evaluations of research, teaching, and service. The tables below outline minimum expectations for tenure-track faculty as well as promotable non-tenure-track faculty (within the "Professor of Practice" and "Professor of Research" designations). The minimum required points for each subsection are simply double (i.e., a 2.0 multiplier) the average workload percentages during the most productive five years of service in the current rank (e.g., a faculty member averaging a 20% service workload over the most productive five years in the current rank would need a *minimum* of 40 points in the category of service) with only one exception: the *minimum* research expectations for tenure-track Associate Professors requesting promotion to Full Professor are calculated with a 2.5 multiplier to capture the higher expectation of research maturity and efficiency for a Full Professor (i.e., a tenure-track Associate Professor averaging a 40% research workload during the five most productive years at the Associate Professor rank must achieve a *minimum* of 100 points in the Research sub-section to qualify for promotion to Full Professor). A *minimum* point system was drafted to account for any differences that might occur via the College's flexible workload policy. Required *minimum* point values can be adjusted when assignments deviate from the workload designations identified (e.g., when an individual uses grant funding to replace instructional duties with research duties). Table 1 highlights standard faculty workload percentages and *minimum* point equivalents, along with an example of an assistant professor who is applying for tenure in the sixth year of service and received a workload substitution swapping one course reduction for additional research workload during the first year.

Table 1. Faculty workload percentages and calculated minimum point expectations

Current rank	Research workload avg.*	Multiplier	Min. research points	Teaching workload avg.*	Multiplier	Min. teaching points	Service workload avg.*	Multiplier	Min. service points
Assistant Professor	50% [[50+50+50+50+50]/5 = 50%]	2.0	100	40% [[40+40+40+40+40]/5 = 40%]	2.0	80	10% [[10+10+10+10+10]/5 = 10%]	2.0	20
Associate Professor	40% [[40+40+40+40+40]/5 = 40%]	2.5	100	40% [[40+40+40+40+40]/5 = 40%]	2.0	80	20% [[20+20+20+20+20]/5 = 20%]	2.0	40
Asst./Assoc. Prof. of Practice	0% [[0+0+0+0+0]/5 = 0%]	2.0	0	80% [[80+80+80+80+80]/5 = 80%]	2.0	160	20% [[20+20+20+20+20]/5 = 20%]	2.0	40
Asst./Assoc. Prof. of Research	80% [[80+80+80+80+80]/5 = 80%]	2.0	160	0% [[0+0+0+0+0]/5 = 0%]	2.0	0	20% [[20+20+20+20+20]/5 = 20%]	2.0	40
Assistant Professor w/workload substitution during first year	52% [[60+50+50+50+50]/5 = 52%]	2.0	104	38% [[30+40+40+40+40]/5 = 38%]	2.0	76	10% [[10+10+10+10+10]/5 = 10%]	2.0	20

*Note: Table examples depict five years of service in rank

While Table 1 adequately captures *minimum* expectations for the majority of tenure and promotion applicants, a few situations require further explanation. For example, if a tenure track faculty member is hired at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure and wishes to subsequently apply for tenure, the *minimum* expectations for tenure would be equivalent to the standard identified expectation for an Assistant Professor with a 50% research, 40% teaching, and 10% service workload average over the previous five years in rank. As such, the untenured Associate Professor would need to minimally demonstrate the accumulation of 100 research points, 80 teaching points, and 20 service points in order to satisfy the *minimum* standards outlined in these guidelines.

Another example requiring further explanation would be a faculty member desiring to apply for early tenure and/or promotion as defined by University policy. In such cases, the faculty member’s record should exceed the minimum expectations for tenure and/or promotion as if the candidate had served the full term of service in the current rank. Therefore, an Associate Professor desiring to apply early for promotion to Professor with only three years or less of service at the rank of Associate Professor would need to exceed the minimum point expectations for four years of service at the rank of Associate Professor in only three years or less (i.e., using the table of the standard faculty workload percentages outlined previously, an Associate Professor desiring to apply early for promotion to Professor with only three years or less of service at the rank of Associate Professor would need to exceed 100 research points, 80 teaching points, and 40 service points in only three years or less; point values do not carry over from one promotion to the next).

Table 2 delineates minimum tenure and/or promotion expectations for research, teaching, and service activity in the College of Human Sciences and Education. The table includes the most common research, teaching, and service outputs for faculty within the College along with relative point values for each output. It is important to note that the table is not necessarily designed to be comprehensive, and there may be current and emerging outputs that are not featured within the table that are still valued contributions. For example, while the procurement of a patent is so rare within the College that it did not warrant inclusion in the table, such a research output is valued by the College and could be negotiated for inclusion on an individual basis.

MODIFICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT

As noted previously, this document reflects minimum standards as defined at the time of its development via an ad hoc CHSE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee. This committee included the following voting members:

- School of Education Director
- School of Education Senior Faculty Representative
- School of Human Resource Education & Workforce Development Director
- School of Human Resource Education & Workforce Development Senior Faculty Representative
- School of Kinesiology Director
- School of Kinesiology Senior Faculty Representative
- School of Library & Information Science Director
- School of Library & Information Science Senior Faculty Representative
- School of Social Work Director
- School of Social Work Senior Faculty Representative

The CHSE Dean served as the non-voting chair of the committee and was responsible for facilitating regular committee meetings. It is anticipated that this document will require regular review and modification. Such a review could be prompted by the CHSE Dean, a majority vote of the CHSE Advisory Committee on Promotion, Tenure, and Retention, or a majority vote of the school Directors. In such instances, the CHSE Dean shall establish and seat a new ad hoc CHSE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Committee to review and potentially modify the College's tenure and promotion guidelines.

Table 2. College of Human Sciences and Education Promotion and Tenure Minimum Expectations

<u>RESEARCH</u> Must: (1) demonstrate focused line of research, (2) publish at least one top-tier journal article, and (3) have at least one primary-authored article		Point value
MINIMUM REQUIRED POINTS (Point values do not carry over from one promotion to the next)		
Tier One Journal Articles	Primary author	10
	Secondary author	8
	Contributing author	3
Tier Two Journal Articles	Primary author	5
	Secondary author	4
	Contributing author	1.5
Books (Scholarly Press) For subsequent editions, multiply point value by percentage of new or significantly revised content	Primary author	100
	Secondary author	50
	Contributing author	25
	Primary editor	40
	Secondary editor	20
	Contributing editor	10
Book Chapters (Scholarly Press) For subsequent editions, multiply point value by percentage of new or significantly revised content	Primary author	10
	Secondary author	8
	Contributing author	3
Conference Presentations (30 points maximum per review period)	International/national meeting primary author	3
	International/national meeting secondary author	2
	International/national meeting contributing author	1
	Regional/state meeting	1
Grants & Contract Proposal Submitted but not funded (per unique proposal; 10 points maximum per review period)		Proposed dollar amount multiplied by 0.0001 (multiplied by assigned percentage effort) to a maximum of 10 points

Grants & Contract Proposal Funded		Funded dollar amount multiplied by 0.0002 (multiplied by assigned percentage effort)
TEACHING		
MINIMUM REQUIRED POINTS (Point values do not carry over from one promotion to the next)		Point value
Courses taught <i>on load</i> with satisfactory evaluations		1.25 points per credit hour
New course development (new to catalog)		10
Significant revisions to an existing course in the catalog		5
Converting traditional course to online format (must meet published LSU Online quality standards) or vice versa		5
Service Learning/CXC course (each section taught)		3
Graduate Advising	Chair, doctoral completer (for promotion to full professor, candidate must chair at least one doctoral completer if a doctoral program is available)	4
	Member, doctoral completer	2
	Chair, masters completer (thesis option)	3
	Member, masters completer (thesis option)	2
	Chair, masters completer (non-thesis option)	2
	Member, masters completer (non-thesis option)	1
Publications regarding teaching or clinical practice	Primary author	5
	Secondary author	2.5
	Contributing author	1
Presentations regarding teaching or clinical practice	International/national meeting primary author	2
	International/national meeting secondary author	1
	International/national meeting contributing author	0.5
	Regional/state meeting	0.5
Textbooks - major press	Primary author	100
	Secondary author	50

For subsequent editions, multiply point value by percentage of new or significantly revised content	Contributing author	25
	Primary editor	40
	Secondary editor	20
	Contributing editor	10
<u>SERVICE</u>		
MINIMUM REQUIRED POINTS (Point values do not carry over from one promotion to the next)		Point value (per year of service except where designated otherwise)
University Service	Chair, school committee	3
	Member, school committee	1
	Chair, college committee	4
	Member, college committee	1
	Chair, university committee	5
	Member, university committee	2
	Student group advisor	2
Professional Service	International/National committee chair	5
	International/National committee member	3
	International/National office	6
	Regional committee chair	2
	Regional committee member	0.5
	Regional office	3
	State/local committee chair	1
	State/local committee member	0.25
	State/local office	1.5
	Journal manuscript reviews	1
	Conference proposal reviews	0.5
	Grant proposal reviews	1
	Journal Editor or co-editor	10
	Journal Editorial Board member	4
	Advisory board member in academic area of expertise	1
	Consulting in academic area of expertise	1 per project