

College of Human Sciences & Education
Louisiana State University and A&M College
Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty Promotion and Tenure Procedure Manual

CONTENTS

Review Process	2
Phase I: Preparing for the Review	2
Template for Information Requested on External Evaluator Bios.....	2
External Evaluator Solicitation Letter	2
Phase II: The Review	3
School Level	3
College Level	3
Review Packet.....	3
Performance Expectations	5
Minimum Standards.....	5
Overview.....	5
Minimum Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion	6
Modification of These Guidelines	10
Timeline of the Promotion and Tenure Process.....	11

Review Process

Phase I: Preparing for the Review

The candidate should submit brief biosketches of proposed external evaluators for approval. Evaluators should be selected from faculty employed at American Association of Universities (AAU) member institutions or Carnegie-designated "very high research" institutions. Any proposed evaluator who is not affiliated with an AAU or "very high research" institution must include a justification, which will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the College-level Tenure and Promotion Committee. The submission should include:

- Name, address, and e-mail address of each evaluator
- Academic rank and institution of employment
- Direct link to their professional profile
- Direct link to their CV (if available)
- A brief statement of their qualifications
- Statement of suitability

CHSE Director of Faculty Affairs will review recommended external reviewers' lists and make necessary recommendations before submitting to the Dean for final approval. The main idea is to provide enough information so that the Dean's office can vet the potential evaluators and approve them. The list should summarize the scholarly work, editorships and other professional accomplishments of the prospective evaluators, plus describe their impact on the field (e.g., publications and citations).

Template for Information Requested on External Evaluator Bios

- Name: First and Last Names, PhD
- Rank:
- University:
- Address:
- Email:
- Website:
- Biography (summarize expertise, scholarly record, & visibility in 5-10 sentences)
- Statement of suitability

External Evaluator Solicitation Letter

The letter from the unit leader should mention any of the following when applicable:

- Whether the candidate was granted a tenure extension
- Whether the candidate is requesting early review as defined by PS-36T
- When the letter is an updated version of one provided within the past 2 years for the candidate, a copy of the original evaluation should be provided

See PS-36T for a sample letter (p. 53)

Phase II: The Review

School Level

Promotion and Tenure Committee

School Director

College Level

CHSE Promotion and Tenure Committee

Dean

Review Packet

List of distinct items needed in P&T packet files from departments, **in the following order:**

- Pages 1-5 of P&T request form
- If applicable, signed faculty review committee evaluation on letterhead from secondary unit inserted following page 5 of the P&T request form
- If applicable, signed evaluation from secondary unit leader on letterhead (e.g., another department or another College)
- Signed faculty review committee evaluation on letterhead from primary unit inserted following page 5 of the P&T request form (or following secondary unit evaluation pages)
- Page 6 of the P&T request form, signed and dated by unit leader
- Signed copy on letterhead of unit leader's evaluation following page 6 of the P&T request form
- Signed statement from candidate that they have read the faculty and unit leader reports and have had a chance to reply if they choose (from PS-36T)
- If applicable, candidate's letter in response to unit leader reports sent within 7 days and then forwarded to the Dean's office
- Pages 7-8 of the P&T request form
- Page 9 of the P&T request form with the unit leader's recommendation, signed and dated by unit leader
- Record of the vetting process of external evaluators
- Qualifications of evaluators who have agreed to write a letter,
 - include the biosketches submitted for approval to the Dean's Office
- Copies of each external evaluation
- Copies of all previous annual evaluations since hire or last appointment
 - Annual evaluations
 - include any separate senior faculty evaluations in addition to the unit leader evaluations, if applicable
 - include any evaluative input from secondary units, if applicable
 - Third-year reviews, if for an Assistant Professor

- should include any evaluative input from secondary units, if any
- Copies of all teaching evaluations since hire date or since previous promotion
- History of candidate's assignments provided by the unit leader, which can be
 - inserted as a separate page
- Candidate's CV
- CHSE minimum requirements spreadsheet
- List of supplemental materials that are NOT included in the primary files
 - Candidate-generated statements of research, teaching, and service
 - Copies of scholarly works or publications
 - Examples of creative and artistic work, if applicable
 - Teaching portfolios, including syllabi, teaching philosophy, instructional material developed, etc.
 - Comments and letters of commendation from students, peers, etc.
 - Appointment letters to commissions, review panels, etc.

Performance Expectations

Minimum Standards

Overview

Louisiana State University and A&M College, hereafter referred to as LSU, has published 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: https://www.lsu.edu/policies/ps/ps_36t.pdf). The purpose of this manual is to provide the perspective of the College of Human Sciences and Education (CHSE) regarding minimum criteria for tenure and promotion. Accordingly, this manual does not reiterate all the information contained in the aforementioned materials, but it does clarify minimum performance expectations within the College for tenure-track and tenured faculty positions. As such, this manual 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. Unit leaders and faculty mentors are encouraged to use this document to guide tenure-track faculty as they strive to meet standards for promotion and tenure, commensurate with mandatory promotion and tenure review timelines. The manual can be used in the annual review process and during the third-year review to evaluate candidate's progress toward meeting and exceeding the minimum performance expectations. Additionally, the manual provides structure when delivering feedback during formal annual reviews and 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 the college-degree-granting schools within the College with five senior faculty representatives from each of these five Schools. Throughout the course of the spring semester, the 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 College-level manual. These school-level documents required the support of the CHSE Dean for final approval.

In 2025-2026, the CHSE Promotion and Tenure Guidelines were reviewed and updated by an ad hoc CHSE Promotion and Tenure Task Force to ensure alignment with LSU's institutional goals of becoming a Top 50 public research university, the University's strategic plan, and national benchmarks associated with the Association of American Universities (AAU). The Task Force was composed of the five School Directors, the five school-level faculty review committee chairs, the Associate Dean for Research and Innovation, the Associate Dean for Academic

Programs and Institutional Effectiveness, the Senior Assistant Dean of Administration, and the Director of Faculty Affairs. This collaborative effort was further informed by input from a wide variety of stakeholders. The revised guidelines reflect a shared commitment to academic excellence, research prominence, inclusive pedagogy, and meaningful service that advances both the mission of LSU and the broader public good.

After much deliberation the ad hoc CHSE Promotion and Tenure Task Force ultimately settled on defining minimum performance expectations across the College. In so doing, the CHSE Task Force defined 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 manual in terms of quantity might still not meet the overall threshold for a successful tenure and/or promotion attempt unless the evaluation committees determine that every output of that candidate was of very high quality. Accordingly, tenure and/or promotion candidates are strongly advised to set personal achievement goals beyond the minimum standards outlined in this manual 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 manual 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, the evaluation of CHSE faculty can include evaluations of scholarship, teaching, and service. The table below outlines minimum expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty. It is important to note that these minimum expectations were developed with the following typical workload designations in mind:

- Assistant Professor: 50% Scholarship/ 40% Teaching/ 10% Service
- Associate/Professor: 40% Scholarship/ 40% Teaching/ 20% Service

The minimum required points for each subsection are simply double (i.e., a 2.0 multiplier) the workload percentages for each area of evaluation (e.g., a faculty member with a 20% service expectation would need a minimum of 40 points in the category of service) with only one exception: the minimum scholarship expectations for Associate Professors requesting promotion to Professor are calculated with a 2.5 multiplier to capture the higher expectation of scholarship maturity and efficiency for a Professor (i.e., an Associate Professor with a typical 40% scholarship workload must achieve a minimum of 100 points in the Scholarship sub-section to qualify for promotion to Professor). A minimum point system was drafted to account for any differences that might occur via the College's flexible workload policy.

College of Human Sciences and Education Promotion and Tenure Point Values for Minimum Expectations					
RESEARCH		Point Value	Asst- Assoc	Assoc- Full	Note
MINIMUM REQUIRED POINTS			100	100	
Tier One Journal Articles	1st author/senior corresponding author	10	y	y	Must have at least 1 top tier journal and 1 sole author or two 1 st or senior corresponding author; focused line of research
	2nd author	8	y	y	
	Contributing author	3	y	y	
Tier Two Journal Articles	1st author/senior corresponding author	5	y	y	
	2nd author	4	y	y	
	Contributing author	1.5	y	y	
Book Chapters (Academic Press)	1st author	10	y	y	
	2nd author	8	y	y	
	Contributing author	3	y	y	
Book Chapters (Non- academic Press)	1st author	5	y	y	
	2nd author	4	y	y	
	Contributing author	1.5	y	y	
Books, Academic Press	Single author	100	y	y	
	Co-author	50	y	y	
	Edited	40	y	y	
	Co-edited	20	y	y	
Books, Non- academic	Single author	40	y	y	
	Co-author	20	y	y	
	Edited	15	y	y	
	Co-edited	10	y	y	
Conference Presentations (30 points maximum)	International/National meeting	2	y	y	
	State/Regional meeting	1	y	y	
Grants & Contract Proposal Submitted but not funded (15 point maximum)	International/National competitive	0.5 point per \$10,000 proposed to a maximum of 10 points	y	y	
	Other	0.5 point per \$20,000 proposed to a maximum of 5 points	y	y	

Grants & Contract Proposal Funded	International/national competitive	1 point per \$10,000 funded	y	y	
	Other	1 point per \$20,000 funded	y	y	
TEACHING		Point Value	Asst- Assoc	Assoc- Full	Notes
MINIMUM REQUIRED POINTS			80	80	
Courses taught on load with satisfactory evaluations (overload teaching may be considered)		1 point per credit hour	y	y	Not including summer or intersession; tenure track faculty must teach at least one graduate course per promotion
New course development (new to catalog)		10	y	y	
Converting traditional course to online format and online course restructuring (must meet published LSU Online quality standards)		5	y	y	
Service-Learning/CXC course (each section taught)		3	y	y	
Graduate and undergraduate advising/mentoring	Chair (co-chair), doctoral completer	4 (3)	y	y	For promotion to professor, candidate must chair at least one doctoral completer if a doctoral program is available in the school
	Member, doctoral completer	2	y	y	
	Chair (co-chair), master's or honors completer	2(1.5)	y	y	
	Member, master's or honors completer	1	y	y	
Journal articles regarding teaching or clinical practice	1st author	5	y	y	
	Contributing author	2.5	y	y	

Presentations regarding teaching or clinical practice	National conference	2	y	y	
	Regional/state	1	y	y	
Textbooks - major press (teaching or clinical practice)	1st author	40		y	
	Contributing author	20		y	
Book chapters (teaching or clinical practice)	1st author	5	y	y	
	2nd author	4	y	y	
	Contributing author	1.5	y	y	
SERVICE		Point value	Asst- Assoc	Assoc- Full	Notes
MINIMUM REQUIRED POINTS			20	40	
University Service	Chair, school committee	3	y	y	
	Member, school committee	1	y	y	
	Chair, college committee	4	y	y	
	Member, college committee	1	y	y	
	Chair, univ committee	5	y	y	
	Member, univ committee	2	y	y	
	Student group advisor	2	y	y	
	Uni (college) award	2(1)	y	y	
	Degree/concentration administration	2	y	y	
	Accreditation reporting	1	y	y	
	Primary facilitator for community partnership	1	y	y	
Professional Service	National committee chair	4	y	y	
	National committee member	2	y	y	
	National office	5		y	
	Regional committee chair	2	y	y	
	Regional committee member	0.5	y	y	
	Regional office	3	y	y	
	State/local committee chair	1	y	y	
	State/local committee member	0.25	y	y	
	State/local office	1.5	y	y	
	Journal manuscript reviews	1	y	y	
	Conference proposal reviews	0.5	y	y	

	Grant proposal reviews	1	y	y	
	Journal Editor or co-editor	5		y	
	Journal Editorial Board member, guest-editor, or associate/section editor	2	y	y	
	Maintenance of Professional Credentials/Certification/License	1	y	y	
	Site visit chair (member) of professional accreditation	2.5(1)	y	y	

Modification of These Guidelines

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 Task Force to review and potentially modify the College's tenure and promotion guidelines.

Timeline of the Promotion and Tenure Process

Regular Cycle	Off Cycle	Steps
Jan – April	Aug-Dec	Candidate informs Director of the intention of going up (in instance of non-mandatory review).
By 05/15	By 12/05	Candidate/School-level promotion and tenure committee submit list of potential reviewers to Director. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SoE: 6-7 from candidate and /10-12 from other faculty • SIS: 3-5 from candidate and 3-5 from other faculty • SoK: 5 from candidate, 5 from other faculty • SSW: 10-12 • SLHRD: 8-10 • SREC: 7-8 from candidate and 5 from other faculty NOTE: LSU prefers 6 review letters but minimum for CHSE is 3
05/15 – 06/01	By 12/12	Director submits list of potential reviewers to Dean.
06/01 – 06/15	12/12-01/09	Director sends emails to potential reviewers until at least # agree.
By 07/30	By 01/09	Director sends the packet (candidate statement, CV, 3-5 reprints) to reviewers.
By 08/30	By 02/20	Director compiles the finalized packet and notifies School-level faculty review committee that packet is ready for review. Packet includes: annual reviews, external letters, T&P minimum requirements spreadsheet, CV, candidate statement and external letters.
By 09/30	By 03/06	Faculty review committee meets and prepares report and submits to the Director.
By 10/30	By 03/15	Director completes evaluation, finalizes the packet, meets with the candidate, and forwards the packet and the evaluation to the Dean.
By Early-November*	By Late March*	College-level Promotion & Tenure Committee meets and makes recommendation to the Dean.
By Mid-November*	By Early April*	Dean meets candidate and forwards the recommendation to OAA.

*Actual dates vary annually. Please see the Office of Academic Affairs website for detailed timelines for regular cycle and off cycle process:

<https://www.lsu.edu/academicaffairs/promotion-tenure/index.php>