



THE UNIVERSITY *of*
NEW ORLEANS

Office of Academic Affairs

Policies and Procedures for Promotion in Academic Rank and for Tenure

Distributed Fall, 2018

Promotion and tenure are separate actions and hence will be treated separately. However, they have a common basis in that each represents a judgment by those responsible that the candidate has shown excellence in teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service to the University. Each of these actions represents a firm endorsement by the University and is therefore carefully considered by all concerned before being approved.

In some instances, promotion and tenure are a simultaneous process. This is explained below under the section on promotion from assistant professor to associate professor.

The key administrative official in recommending promotion or tenure is the department chair. In general, the faculty of a given department will provide the most reliable professional judgment as to whether promotion and/or tenure is deserved. This assessment will occur after examination of all pertinent information and may include an external review (Appendix A) of a candidate's scholarly work. The chair must take pains to consult thoroughly with all appropriate members of the faculty, as set forth below. It must be remembered, however, that other administrative officials are required to review the chair's recommendation, either endorsing or not endorsing it. Candidates for promotion and tenure must therefore be careful not to assume that the chair's recommendation is final. The University of Louisiana System (ULS) regulations require that the dean of the college, the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President all review and act upon recommendations for promotion and tenure. It must also be emphasized that no recommendation becomes official until it has been approved by the ULS Board of Supervisors.

Department chairs should make certain that all candidates for promotion and/or tenure are fully apprised of the aforementioned review process.

I. PROMOTION

General UL System policy regarding promotion and tenure is set forth in *Chapter III* (Faculty and Staff) *Section X* (Faculty Rank) and *Section XI* (Tenure) of the UL System Bylaws and Rules. The specific criteria and procedures that follow are in accordance with these documents.

Since these guidelines are designed to apply to the entire University (including the Library), they are stated in general terms. The faculty members of each department, working with the department chair, are to establish specific criteria and procedures for that department; and the faculty members of each college, working with the dean, are to establish college-wide guidelines. Both departmental and college-wide guidelines are to be submitted to the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs for approval. Needless to say, departmental and college guidelines must be consistent with the University guidelines set forth below.

Every current faculty member is to be given a copy of departmental and college guidelines, as well as a copy of these University-wide policies and procedures. New faculty members are to be given copies immediately upon appointment.

Promotion recommendations are submitted to the dean by the department chair after consultation with the appropriate members of the faculty. Promotion recommendations for those faculty members serving as department chairs are prepared by the dean of the college in a manner consistent with normal departmental procedures.

Criteria for Promotion

It should be noted that mere length of service in one rank and competent performance of one's assigned duties do not in themselves constitute cause for promotion to the next academic rank. Promotions are always based upon merit and outstanding achievement.

It is assumed that all members of the faculty will make contributions to their disciplines through high-quality research or creative work. It is also assumed that all faculty will contribute to the mission of the University through effective teaching and advising, and through public service and competent participation in the work of University committees.

Decisions on promotion to the tenured ranks are most important. Before recommending such a promotion, the department must be convinced that the candidate will be a valuable member of the faculty for an indefinite period of time.

The following minimum criteria have been established for promotion to the various ranks: Please note, prior work or achievements before joining the University of New Orleans may not be considered for promotion (or tenure).

1. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

- a. normally, at least **three years'** service as assistant professor at UNO and after receiving the terminal degree.
- b. work of high quality sufficient to indicate the beginning of a significant scholarly or (where applicable) creative career. Each department will develop its own criteria, both for publications and for other appropriate categories of professional activity. Only work that has been published or accepted for publication will be considered a publication. Admission to the Graduate Faculty is generally assumed for those areas that have graduate programs.
- c. effective teaching and advising, usually including some teaching on the graduate level for those areas that have graduate programs.
- d. a beginning of competent work in one or more of the following: departmental administration, college or university committees including committee leadership, community service, and professional organizations.

2. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor:¹

- a. normally, at least **five years'** service as associate professor at UNO
- b. effective teaching and advising, including regular graduate teaching and, normally, direction of theses and/or dissertations for those departments with graduate programs.
- c. outstanding and substantial scholarly work, or (where applicable) outstanding creative work of equivalent importance, on a sustained basis. For scholarly publications, only work that has been published or accepted for publication will be considered.
- d. at least one of the following:
 - i. significant and sustained professional activity.
 - ii. outstanding contributions to the development and progress of the University.
- e. evidence of substantial professional development or achievement since promotion to the rank of associate professor.

¹ NOTE: In certain circumstances, promotion to Associate Professor will confer tenure automatically, consistent with University Regulations. This occurs when the candidate will have already served as a full-time faculty member on this campus for at least **four years** at the time the promotion to Associate Professor takes effect.

- f. evidence of **high professional standing** (e.g., as shown by grants, awards, editorships, high office in scholarly organizations).
3. For promotion from **Assistant Professor of Professional Practice to Associate Professor of Professional Practice**:
- a. the appropriate terminal degree, or significant intellectual and creative contributions made during a professional career.
 - b. at least **three years** of service as assistant professor of professional practice at UNO.
 - c. effort of high quality, sufficient to indicate an ongoing significant faculty career.
 - d. effective **teaching**.
 - e. demonstration of competent work in one or more of the following: college or university committees, college or university student life, college or university outreach, community service, and/or professional organizations.
 - f. evidence of **scholarly activity** and/or **creative work**.
4. For promotion from **Associate Professor of Professional Practice to Professor of Professional Practice**:
- a. the appropriate terminal degree, or significant intellectual and creative contributions made since promotion to rank of associate professor of professional practice.
 - b. normally, at least **five years** of service as associate professor of professional practice.
 - c. effort of the highest quality, sufficient to indicate an ongoing significant faculty career.
 - d. outstanding **teaching**.
 - e. evidence of outstanding work in one or more of the following: college or university committees, college or university student life, college or university outreach, community service, and/or professional organizations.
 - f. strong evidence of **scholarly activity** and/or **creative work**.

While all of the above criteria must normally be met, it is conceivable that, in rare instances, truly outstanding performance in one category will carry sufficient weight to balance work that is adequate, but less than outstanding, in another. For example, a candidate may be an especially productive scholar. In such instances, it is the responsibility of the department chair to present a compelling case for promotion, including specific, detailed information that will allow reviewing officials to make an informed evaluation of the recommendation. Such cases, however, will constitute rare exceptions to the normal policy.

In general, it should be remembered that the chair has the responsibility to make a clear and convincing case for any promotion recommended. The recommendation should not be vague and general. Specific evidence of the candidate's academic achievements and concrete detail in support of the chair's evaluations will be required. For example, a statement that the candidate is an effective teacher would have to be documented by the results of a teacher evaluation survey, peer evaluation of departmental seminars, letters or comments from former students,

etc. The presentation should be written so that the merits of the case are fully apparent to persons who are not familiar with the discipline of the individual under consideration.

Procedures for Promotion

Every faculty member who meets the time-in-rank requirements must be considered for promotion each year. It is the responsibility of the departmental chair to ensure that this is done. The only exception is when a faculty member, on his or her own initiative, requests in writing that the chair not review his or her particular case.

Recommendations for promotion should be made only after the members of the departmental faculty (or department tenure and promotion committee) with indeterminate tenure and senior in rank to the candidate have been consulted and have expressed themselves on the recommendation to be made. In cases where promotion will confer indeterminate tenure, all faculty members with indeterminate tenure must be consulted.

1. Departments

To implement these policies, departments will observe the following procedures:

- a. At least a month ahead of time, the chair must send **written notification** to each person eligible for consideration, stating that the review process is about to get underway and advising the candidate to provide any information he/she wishes to have considered by those persons to be consulted. Only work completed prior to December 1 will be reviewed. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide relevant information concerning any work that may otherwise escape attention. Many departments find it helpful to request that all members of the department complete a form reporting their work during the preceding year. Whatever method is used, the candidate must ensure that the information made available is accurate and up-to-date.
- b. The chair will assume responsibility for **collecting and presenting to the faculty members** concerned with each review a curriculum vita of each candidate, as well as a synopsis of that individual's progress and achievements, including effectiveness in teaching, research and writing or (where applicable) the equivalent creative activity, and service to the University and community. These materials will include (if appropriate) the external assessments of the candidate's scholarly work. If significant for the effective discharge of the candidate's responsibilities to the University, information concerning personal qualities and ability to work harmoniously with colleagues and students may also be included. Attention should also be drawn to applicable departmental personnel policies.
- c. These materials will be reviewed and discussed at a **meeting**, conducted by the chair, of all those taking part in the evaluation process. Such a meeting will give all concerned the opportunity to hear any additional information or comments which members of the group may have to contribute. Written notice of the meeting should be given well in advance to all faculty members involved, with a statement of the agenda. The meeting should be conducted so as to afford a reasonable opportunity to discuss the materials presented, to ask questions, and to offer further information and judgments. Confidentiality must be strictly maintained.
- d. Each department will develop its own **system of recording the recommendations** of the appropriate faculty members on whether or not to promote the candidate. Whatever

method is chosen, a verifiable record of the recommendations must be kept, and the result made known to the appropriate faculty. The chair will then consult with each of those faculty members who desire a consultation before reaching a decision.

- e. The chair will notify the appropriate faculty of the departmental decision and the reasons for it. The chair may disagree with the departmental decision and in that case, a separate chair decision is also required. The chair will then forward to the dean the departmental decision along with his/her decision.
- f. The **chair will report to the dean** his/her decision on each eligible candidate whether or not promotion is recommended. In any case in which this decision disagrees with the recommendation of the faculty, the chair will give the dean a written explanation of the disagreement.
- g. A candidate whose **promotion is not being recommended** by the chair must be so informed within **ten** (10) business days after the decision is made. The chair should counsel verbally with the candidate concerning the candidate's areas of weakness, and should provide written formal notification to the candidate in a memorandum within ten academic days. This written notification serves to formalize the chair's decision and ensures that the unsuccessful candidate is not left in a state of uncertainty. The memorandum should be brief and simple but should relate the decision to the relevant criteria. A candidate has the right to write a rebuttal within ten (10) business days. A copy of the memorandum (and rebuttal, if provided) is to be sent to the dean of the college.
- h. Candidates whose promotions are **recommended by the chair** should be so advised in private, informally, within ten (10) business days. They should be reminded of the review process that still remains before the recommendations become official.
- i. A candidate whose promotion is recommended by the chair but **subsequently denied by another reviewing official** must be so notified by the chair in a timely fashion, i.e., within a few days after the chair is told of the decision. As in "g" above, the chair should convey the information verbally, with appropriate counseling, and in a formal memorandum. A copy of this memorandum is to be sent to the dean of the college and the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- j. An unsuccessful candidate for promotion has the right to receive a **verbal explanation** of the reasons underlying the decision from the person who has made the unfavorable determination. If the candidate so wishes, a **written explanation** must also be provided. Unlike the verbal explanation, however, which serves as a counseling mechanism, the written explanation will be brief, categorical, and expressed as a judgment.

2. Colleges

The dean has the responsibility of ensuring that promotion recommendations meet the established criteria and of approving only those recommendations that, in his or her judgment, meet the criteria. The dean will forward all recommendations, including, those that he/she has not endorsed, to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. The dean within ten (10) business days will **advise each department chair** of the decisions that have been made at the college level.

The faculty of each college may recommend whether to establish a formal college-level **advisory group**.

Each dean will **advise the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs** of the decision that is made on this point, furnishing the reasons that have underlain the decision. In colleges where such an advisory group already exists, the dean is to provide the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs with a full explanation of the composition and charge of the advisory group.

3. Office of Academic Affairs

Before making decisions on promotion recommendations, the **Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs** will appoint a committee to review and independently evaluate the requests. The Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will forward all recommendations, including those that he/she has not endorsed, to the **President**. The Provost and Senior Vice President will then notify each dean of the decisions that have been made.

Implicit in all of the above procedures is this basic fact, which deserves emphasis: although a chair is required to consult with the faculty, the final decision whether or not to recommend promotion is the chair's; although the dean may or may not have an advisory group, the decision whether or not to approve a promotion is the dean's; and similarly for the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Hence, the authority and the responsibility for promotion decisions rest with individual officials of the University, except that final approval is always reserved to the ULS Board of Supervisors.

II. TENURE

General UL System policy regarding promotion is set forth in *Chapter III* (Faculty and Staff) *Section XI* (Tenure) of the *UL System Bylaws and Rules*.

- A. **Definition.** Indeterminate tenure, hereafter referred to as tenure, is intended to ensure and enhance faculty members' academic freedom and job effectiveness. Tenure assures the faculty member that employment in the academic discipline at the institution will be renewed annually until the faculty member resigns, retires, or is terminated for cause or financial exigency.
 1. Faculty members shall not be eligible for tenure at the instructor, assistant professor of professional practice, associate professor of professional practice, or professor of professional practice level.
 2. Each recommendation by an institution to grant tenure to a faculty member shall be submitted to the Board of Supervisors at a time designated by the System President, which shall be no later than the date to submit annual budgets for approval.
- B. **Eligibility for Tenure.** The probationary period for tenure consideration in the University of Louisiana System is **six years**. A tenure-track faculty member may apply for tenure during the sixth year. Full-time academic personnel at the level of assistant professor or equivalent shall be eligible for tenure after serving this probationary period.
- C. **Recommendation for Tenure.** Recommendation for tenure of those faculty members who have completed the probationary period shall originate in the various structural units, with tenured faculty and unit heads initiating the recommendations. The recommendation shall be submitted to the institution president for his consideration. His/her action shall be submitted to the System President. Final authority for granting or denying tenure shall rest with the Board of Supervisors. Under no circumstances shall tenure status be achieved without specific action of the Board of Supervisors.
- D. **Notification of Tenure Decision.** At the end of the probationary period, the result of each individual's evaluation shall be provided to that individual. In the event tenure is to be denied, the faculty member shall be notified at least 12 months before the expiration of the appointment. If tenure is to be awarded, the affected faculty member shall be informed in writing and tenure will be effective with the next letter of appointment.
- E. **Early Awarding of Tenure.** In certain unusual cases, the institution may award tenure to faculty members of extraordinarily high merit prior to the end of the sixth probationary year. Any academic unit's recommendation, with faculty input whenever possible, to award tenure before the end of the usual probationary period should be accompanied by an accounting of compelling reasons for this action.
- F. **Decision Not to Grant Tenure.** If the decision is made not to grant tenure in the sixth year, it shall result in a terminal appointment for the seventh year. The notice of terminal appointment shall be made in writing to the faculty member by July 1 immediately after concluding the sixth year.

- G. **Credit for Prior Service.** For the purpose of the probationary period, credit may be given for prior service at other institutions with the mutual consent of the individual institution and the Board of Supervisors.
- H. **Faculty Initially Appointed as Professor or Associate Professor.** Faculty members initially employed at the rank of professor may be granted tenure upon appointment or, at the discretion of the institution, may be required to serve a probationary period not to exceed **four years**. Faculty members initially employed at the rank of associate professor shall serve a probationary period of at least one year, but no more than four years.
- I. **Limitation of Tenure.** Tenure shall be limited to persons in the faculty ranks of associate professor and professor. Administrators shall not earn tenure except as members of an academic discipline.
- J. **Duration of Tenure.** Tenured faculty shall retain their status until they retire, resign, or are terminated for cause or as a result of financial exigency or program discontinuance. Tenure shall be granted and held only within an academic discipline that is offered at the institution and assures renewed appointments only within that discipline.
- K. **Termination for Financial Exigency and/or Program Discontinuance.** Termination related to financial exigency and/or program discontinuance shall be determined by procedures which include faculty participation.
- L. **Policy.** This tenure policy shall supersede all existing policies with the following exceptions:
1. All persons holding tenure on the effective date of this policy shall retain their tenure.
 2. Any person in the employment of an affected institution on the effective date of this policy shall be eligible to earn tenure under the terms and conditions of the policy in force and in effect at the time of that person's employment at that institution. (Revised 2/25/2011)
- M. **Tenure and Rank for Administrative Appointees.** Academic administrators at the level of dean or higher are frequently appointed with academic rank (typically associate professor or professor) and tenure in a specific discipline. A request to offer tenure with appointment must have prior approval by the System President. In the employment of certain academic administrators such as department heads, directors, or deans where the offer of employment does not include immediate tenure, it should be stipulated that a tenure review shall be performed within **one to three years** by the administrator's immediate supervisor. This evaluation should include, among other factors, a review of specific provisions stipulated at time of employment. The review of a dean shall be made by the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs with possible input from department heads in his/her college or school, while the review of a department head shall be made by his/her dean with input from faculty within the department. Administrators (vice presidents, deans, directors) in non-academic areas (finance, student affairs, institutional advancement, and others) shall not be appointed with academic rank or tenure. Exceptions to this rule may include individuals appointed to such a position after having acquired rank and tenure in an academic discipline within the same institution, or in other exceptional cases specifically approved by the Board.

Criteria for Tenure

In the majority of cases, tenure is achieved upon promotion to the rank of associate professor. Exceptions will normally occur only when a person is promoted to, or reappointed as associate professor with **less than four years of full-time service**, in which case tenure is not awarded simultaneously.

Therefore, the criteria for promotion to associate professor will normally serve also as the criteria for tenure. Exceptions will have to be vigorously justified by the department chair. Those criteria are as follows:

- a. work of high quality sufficient to indicate the beginning of a **significant scholarly or (where applicable) creative career**. Each department will develop its own criteria, both for publications and for other appropriate categories of professional activity. Only work
- b. that has been published or accepted will be considered a publication. **effective teaching and advising**, usually including some teaching on the graduate level for those areas that have graduate programs.
- c. a beginning of competent work in one or more of the following: departmental administration, college or university committees, community service, and professional organizations.
- d. Only work since appointment as a tenure-track faculty member at UNO will be considered.

While all of the above criteria must normally be met, it is conceivable that, in rare instances, truly outstanding performance in one category will carry sufficient weight to balance work that is adequate, but less than outstanding, in the others. For example, a candidate may be considered an exceptionally dedicated and brilliant teacher. In such instances, it is the responsibility of the departmental chair to present a compelling case for tenure, including specific, detailed information that will allow reviewing officials to make an informed evaluation of the recommendation. It must be remembered, however, that such cases will constitute rare exceptions to the normal policy.

In general, it should be remembered that it is the chair's responsibility to make a clear and convincing case why tenure should be awarded. The recommendation should not be vague and general. Specific evidence of the candidate's academic achievements and concrete detail in support of the chair's evaluations will be required.

Procedures for Tenure

1. Department

The procedures for making decisions about tenure are **similar to those for making decisions about promotions**, in that the department chair is expected to consult with appropriate members of the faculty before reaching a decision; to provide ample opportunity for the candidate to update his or her file; and to keep candidates apprised of their status as the review process unfolds. Specific procedures are outlined below. Because promotion and tenure decisions are frequently related, and because the procedures are so similar, department chairs will ordinarily find it convenient and appropriate to consider the two at the same time.

It should be noted that tenure, unlike promotion, is attained upon reappointment after a stated number of years. Hence the department chair and the dean must take every precaution to ensure that all faculty members who could potentially attain tenure (i.e., tenure-track faculty) **are reviewed at the appropriate time**, as indicated below.

The formal **Pre-Tenure Review** is a requirement of the UL System. It must be conducted (a) no later than during the **sixth year in rank** for assistant professors whom the department contemplates recommending for tenure, i.e., all those who are not given notice of non-reappointment during the sixth year; and (b) **eighteen months** before reappointment for associate professors and professors, when such reappointment will confer tenure. The purpose of the Pre-Tenure Review is to allow reviewing officials to evaluate the strengths of a candidate for tenure while still observing the University's policy regarding notification of non-reappointment, as set forth above.

Except in the year when this formal Pre-Tenure Review is occurring, each department is to conduct **departmental reviews** beginning with the **second year** in rank for assistant professors. This procedure, which is to be established separately by each department, will provide a mechanism for early, formal counseling by the department chair. The chair must forward to the dean the results of these reviews and may elect to forward them to the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for their comments.

Recommendations for tenure should be made only after the members of the departmental faculty (or department tenure and promotion committee) who already have tenure have expressed themselves on the recommendation to be made. After consulting with these faculty members, the **chair** decides what **recommendation(s)** he or she will make to the dean. Each recommendation that is forwarded must include a statement as to whether or not it has the approval of the tenured members of the faculty and the grounds upon which such approval (or the absence thereof) is based.

In a separate memorandum to the dean, the chair must **indicate the names of eligible candidates who are not being recommended** for tenure. Again, the chair should indicate whether or not the recommendations of the tenured faculty are being followed, and, if not, the reasons why. As a matter of course, an adverse decision of this sort will be followed quite soon by notification of non-reappointment.

To implement these policies, departments will observe the same procedures described under the section "Promotion". The only difference will be the obvious one, that references to "promotion" will be replaced by "tenure". As was noted above, chairs will usually find it desirable

to consult about tenure decisions at the same time as promotion decisions.

Tenure recommendations for those faculty members serving as departmental chairs are submitted by the dean of the college after ascertaining that all criteria have been met. The dean will follow the normal departmental procedures.

2. College

The dean will follow the same procedures for tenure decisions as for promotion decisions. See “Promotion” section, above.

3. Office of Academic Affairs

The Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will follow the same procedures for tenure decisions as for promotion decisions. See “Promotion” section, above.

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES: EXTERNAL REVIEW OF SCHOLARLY WORK

Approved by the University Senate on March 29, 1989
(Formatting corrections and updates, Fall, 2014)

I. Purpose

- A. When judging a candidate for promotion/tenure, the ultimate measure of his/her scholarly work² comes from peer review, most importantly that done by his/her department. A department will normally augment the data it uses for its decision by soliciting reviews of the candidate's work from respected members of the profession from outside the University. External review may be waived if it is agreed that it will add no data useful to the decision process. However, it will be done in any case when requested by the candidate, the department, the dean, or the provost. A department or college may adopt, or be directed to adopt, a policy requiring it for some or all decisions. External review, when done, will follow the guidelines, below.
- B. External review of scholarly work represents only one aspect of the entire promotion/tenure decision process. It is sought in order to provide additional data about the quality, relevance, and impact of a candidate's scholarly work. The external reviewers are only advisory to the department, the dean, and the provost. The primary responsibility for promotion/tenure decisions rests with the department which, following the criteria and procedures of the University, reviews all aspects of a candidate's career—teaching and service, as well as scholarly work.

² The term scholarly work in this document refers to all appropriate research, creative work, and scholarship.

Procedures

It is up to each department to develop its own procedure for external review subject to the following general guidelines:

- C. The reviewers **will not be asked** whether a candidate should be tenured and/or promoted.
- D. Each department shall develop **its own timetables** so that the reviewers may be chosen, contacted, and the reviews received in time for them to be used in the department's decision making.
- E. Responsibility for the administration of the external review process rests with the **department chair** in consultation with the dean.
- F. Reviewers shall be chosen from those professionals who should be expected to be familiar with the candidate's area of work. Reviewers shall be selected in one of the following ways:
 - 1. The candidate and the department chair will develop a mutually acceptable list of **six reviewers**. This list of names shall be submitted to the dean for approval. The chair shall request reviews from all six persons on the list. A minimum of three reviews must be received. If for some reason fewer than three reviewers respond additional names shall be selected in a similar manner.
 - 2. In a case where the candidate and the department chair cannot agree on a mutually acceptable list of six reviewers, the **candidate and the department chair shall each submit a list of six names** with their academic rank and business address to the dean. The dean will provide a copy of each list to both the candidate and the chair and the dean will select at least three reviewers from each list. At least two reviews from each list must be received. If the initial reviewers from each list do not provide reviews, the dean will select additional reviewers from the appropriate lists provided, and if the required number of reviews cannot be obtained using the original lists, additional names shall be selected in the original manner from the candidate, the chair, or both.
- G. A **standard letter** shall be used to request reviews. (See Appendix B.) Modification of this letter may be made by departments with the approval of the dean.
- H. In general, all the **scholarly work submitted by the candidate will be sent out for review**, unless the department and the candidate agree on a subset to be reviewed³. In all cases a complete list of the candidate's scholarly work will accompany the items submitted to the reviewer.

³ The material to be reviewed may include all or a substantial portion of one's published and unpublished work as well as non-publishable documents of a scholarly or pedagogical nature if it will have significance for the department's decision.

- I. The reviews will not, as a matter of course, be made available to the candidate, but only to those involved in making or reviewing the decision.
- J. The department chair, when notifying the candidate of the decision, will provide her/him with a collective summary of the general contents of the reviews without reference to the individual reviewers. In particular, the candidate should be made aware of any significant negative comments made about his/her work. A copy of the chair's summary will be forwarded with the other promotion/tenure materials.
- K. At the completion of the campus decision process, the reviews will be deposited in the Provost's office in a promotion file which is separate from and is not considered a part of the candidate's personnel file.
- L. If a candidate's scholarly work has already been reviewed under this procedure within the past **three years**, the department will include these reviews as part of the current review documentation. Full external reviews will only be repeated when the candidate, the chair, and the dean feel there is a need to update the reviews based on a significant change in the candidate's record.
- M. When there are circumstances unique to a discipline or area of a discipline, a department may propose modifications to the procedures regarding selection of reviewers and the nature of materials to be reviewed. Any such changes must be approved by the dean and the provost. In particular, adaptations will be required in departments where it is impossible to send the actual work (e.g. the performing arts).

APPENDIX B

**EXTERNAL REVIEW GUIDELINES: SAMPLE LETTER
AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM**

[Heading]

[Date]

Dear []:

[] is being considered for promotion to the rank of [] {and/or for tenure} in the Department of [] at the University of New Orleans. Because you are knowledgeable in [his/her] area of specialization, you have been selected as an appropriate reviewer of ['s] scholarly work. While we are not asking your advice on the more general question of should we promote and/or tenure, your comments will be important to us in judging the scholarly contribution of ['s] works.

We do not require reviews of each individual work, but of the body of research. We would particularly like your assessment of the quality of the work and of its relevance in terms of current scholarship in the field. An effective review need not take more than a page or two.

[] will be given a general summary of the contents of the reviews without reference to the individual reviewers. Otherwise your evaluation will be regarded as confidential and will be shared only with those individuals who are authorized to review and make recommendations on the candidate.

Please complete the enclosed acknowledgment form. If you agree to assist us, appropriate materials will be sent to you. We would appreciate your review by (date).

Sincerely,

Chair, Department of []

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM

I have received your letter requesting that I act as a reviewer of ['s] scholarly work.

_____ I am willing to serve.

_____ I am unable to serve.

(signature)

(date)

Please return this form by [specify date] to:

[]