# FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES, STANDARDS & CRITERIA

School of Health Professions
LSU Health Sciences Center
– New Orleans
August 2026

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


**I. PREAMBLE ..... 4**
A. Purpose of Promotion and Tenure ..... 4
B. Governing Policies and Documents ..... 4
C. Promotion and Tenure Committee Structure ..... 4
D. Areas of Evaluation ..... 4
E. Institutional Commitment to Equal Opportunity ..... 5
F. Faculty Tracks and Academic Ranks ..... 5

**II. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT/PROMOTION (TENURE TRACK) ..... 5**
A. Assistant Professor ..... 5
B. Associate Professor ..... 6
C. Professor ..... 6
D. Additional Considerations for Tenure-Track Faculty ..... 7

**III. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT/PROMOTION (CLINICAL TRACK) ..... 7**
A. Instructor ..... 7
B. Assistant Professor of Clinical ..... 8
C. Associate Professor of Clinical ..... 9
D. Professor of Clinical ..... 10
E. Additional Considerations for Clinical Track Faculty ..... 10

**IV. PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE ..... 11**
A. Eligibility for Promotion ..... 11
B. Formative Review ..... 12
C. Steps of the Promotion and/or Tenure Process ..... 14
D. Evaluations for Promotion ..... 16
E. Action on Promotion ..... 17

**V. PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS ..... 18**
A. Definition of Excellence ..... 18
B. Research and Scholarship Standard ..... 19
C. Teaching Standard ..... 22
D. Service Standard ..... 23

**VI. PREPARATION OF THE TOTAL DOSSIER ..... 26**
A. Purpose and Organization of the Dossier ..... 26
B. Required Documentation Areas ..... 26
C. PDF Preparation and Submission Procedures ..... 27
D. Department Head Submission Responsibilities ..... 27
E. Signatory Page Requirements ..... 27

**VII. CRITERIA FOR CHANGING TRACKS (TENURE OR CLINICAL) AND PROMOTION .....-..... 27**
A. Eligibility and Limitations for Track Changes ..... 28
B. School Promotion and Tenure Committee Review Requirements ……..... 28
C. Minimum Service Requirement in the New Track …….....28
D. Evaluation Standards Following a Track Change .....28
E. Institutional Tenure Timeline Requirements ..... 28
F. Documentation of Tenure Timeline and Track Change Agreement ……28
G. Transfer to Clinical Track Following Denial of Tenure ……..29
H. Following Denial of Promotion ..…….29

**Committee Members ----------30**

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A. Timeline of Preparation for Promotion and/or Tenure ..... 31**

**Appendix B. Items to Be Included in Dossier ..... 33**

**Appendix C. Sample Letter to Request Evaluation from Outside Authority …..... 37**

**Appendix D. Track Change Agreement (Tenure Track ↔ Clinical Track) ..... 39**

**Appendix E. Expectations of the Department Head ..... 42**

**Appendix F. Considered by Promotion and Tenure Committee in Assessing a Candidate's Dossier ..... 43**

# LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
# NEW ORLEANS
# SCHOOL OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS

## FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE
## PROCEDURES, STANDARDS & CRITERIA

## I. PREAMBLE

A. Purpose of Promotion and Tenure

Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans (LSUHSC-NO) seeks to sustain and improve its academic stature. Maintaining and improving the quality of the faculty are a primary means of achieving these ends. Promotion in academic rank is a means by which the Health Sciences Center encourages, recognizes, and rewards faculty members for excellence in the performance of their duties. Appendix A shows a timeline of preparation for promotion and/or tenure.

B. Governing Policies and Documents

The criteria that follow are an addendum to the Faculty Handbook of LSUHSC-NO, Permanent Memorandum 23 (PM-23), and Permanent Memorandum 69 (PM-69). Faculty members should familiarize themselves with these documents.

C. Promotion and Tenure Committee Structure

Decisions on granting promotion and/or tenure, which are then forwarded to the dean, are initially made by the School of Health Professions (SHP) Promotion and Tenure Committee, which comprises senior SAHP faculty members from both the tenure and clinical tracks. Committee membership shall be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Clinical track committee members may only vote on promotion decisions for faculty on the same track and who are below the committee member's rank. Tenure track committee members may vote on promotion and/or tenure decisions for candidates on both tracks who are below the committee member's rank.

D. Areas of Evaluation

Categories of evaluation for promotion and tenure of Health Professions faculty include: 1) teaching, 2) research or scholarly activities, and 3) service. For promotion, activities within each of these categories must have been carried out during the candidate’s term in present rank. For tenure, all activities from initial appointment date will be considered and are to be identified.

E. Institutional Commitment to Equal Opportunity

The SAHP is in compliance with the LSUHSC-NO Affirmative Action Program in assuring that sex, race, religion, age, handicap, or national origin will in no way interfere with promotion or tenure of a faculty member.

F. Faculty Tracks and Academic Ranks

Descriptions and criteria for academic ranks and tracks are described in detail in the LSUHSC-NO Faculty Handbook and PM-23. Appointment to the rank of instructor, on any appointment track, normally requires that the candidate hold the highest (terminal) degree in the discipline and demonstrate promise of the ability to perform successfully the duties for which they were employed or may be assigned in the future. Tenure may not be granted at the rank of instructor.

The ranks and titles for each track are:

| **Tenure Track** | **Clinical Track** |
|---|---|
| Assistant Professor | Assistant Professor of Clinical* |
| Associate Professor | Associate Professor of Clinical* |
| Professor | Professor of Clinical* |

*Indicates the department or program name

## II. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT/PROMOTION (TENURE TRACK)

A. Assistant Professor

1. Criteria

The individual shall typically possess a doctoral degree or other terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. In addition, the individual must exhibit clear evidence of potential for excellence in teaching, research or other scholarly activity, and service, consistent with the faculty member's assigned responsibilities. If the initial appointment is at the rank of instructor, the individual will normally have at least three (3) years of service at that rank.

2. Faculty status

Assistant professors have faculty status.

3. Tenure and appointment

Term appointments at this rank are for one-, two-, or three-year periods and may be renewed based on annual evaluation and progress toward tenure, in accordance with

LSUHSC-NO policies. A formal tenure review will normally be conducted during the sixth year of service in rank so that notification is provided prior to the start of the seventh year, in accordance with PM-23 (Permanent Memorandum 23). Assistant professors may be awarded tenure following successful review in accordance with LSU System policies; however, tenure is typically considered in conjunction with promotion to Associate Professor.

B. Associate Professor

1. Criteria

The individual shall possess a doctoral degree or other terminal degree appropriate to the discipline. In addition, the individual shall have established a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching, research or other scholarly activity, and service, with evidence of excellence in research and scholarly contributions**.** The candidate should demonstrate recognition in the discipline or profession beyond the department or program, consistent with assigned responsibilities. The individual will have served at least three (3) years as an assistant professor.

2. Faculty status

Associate professors are senior members of the faculty.

3. Tenure and appointment

Application for promotion to associate professor and for tenure typically occurs concurrently. However, faculty may apply for promotion and tenure separately when appropriate. In such cases, the timing and sequence of applications must be determined in consultation with the department head and dean and must comply with LSUHSC-NO policies regarding tenure eligibility and timelines.

In cases where an individual holds the rank of associate professor without tenure, tenure review must occur sufficiently early to ensure that a final decision is made no later than the end of the fifth year in rank, in accordance with PM-23. The specific timeline for tenure review will be determined at the time of appointment or promotion and must be documented in writing to ensure compliance with institutional policy.

C. Professor

1. Criteria

An individual appointed or promoted to the rank of professor shall possess all qualifications required for associate professor and shall demonstrate sustained excellence in research or other scholarly activity, and at least one additional domain, with demonstrated leadership and high effectiveness in the remaining area(s), consistent with assigned responsibilities. The faculty member shall have established a

substantial academic or professional reputation through publications, other scholarly or creative work, leadership, and other impactful contributions to the discipline or profession. The individual will have had at least five (5) years of successful service as an associate professor.

2. Faculty status

   Professors are senior members of the faculty.

3. Tenure and appointment

   Most professors are tenured and are appointed for an indefinite period. A person may be appointed or promoted to the rank of professor without tenure. In such cases, tenure review must occur sufficiently early to ensure that a final decision is made no later than the end of the fifth year in rank, in accordance with PM-23. The timeline for tenure review shall be determined at the time of appointment or promotion and documented in writing to ensure compliance with institutional policy.

D. Additional Considerations for Tenure-Track Faculty

Evaluation for promotion and tenure is based on accomplishments in teaching, research or scholarly activity, and service, with consideration given to the faculty member's assigned responsibilities. Expectations for achievement and recognition increase with rank and include evidence of progression, dissemination, and recognition of scholarly and professional contributions.

## III. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT/PROMOTION (CLINICAL TRACK)

A. Instructor

1. Criteria

   a. The individual shall possess the requisite academic degree appropriate to the discipline (e.g., a master's or higher degree as defined by the department).

   b. The candidate must demonstrate potential for effective performance in assigned duties, including teaching, clinical service, and/or professional practice.

   c. The candidate should show promise in one or more of the following domains:
      - Teaching effectiveness and educational involvement
      - Clinical excellence and quality patient care
      - Initial engagement in scholarly or professional activities

d. Instructors are expected to develop a professional portfolio demonstrating progress in teaching, scholarship, service, and clinical or educational practice, consistent with assigned responsibilities and career goals. This includes:
    - Instructional activities, student feedback, and course development
    - Participation in research, presentations, or scholarly projects
    - Departmental, institutional, or community engagement
    - Contributions to clinical or educational programs

e. Documentation should reflect developing competence, engagement, and progression over time.

f. Candidates are encouraged to articulate plans for professional development and advancement toward higher faculty ranks during annual evaluations.

g. These expectations are informed by the standards for teaching, scholarship, and service outlined in Section II of this document.

2. Faculty status

   Instructors hold faculty status but are not eligible for tenure.

3. Appointment

   Appointments to the rank of instructor are for a specified term in accordance with LSU policy.

B. Assistant Professor of Clinical

1. Criteria for appointment

   a. The individual will normally have a doctorate or other terminal degree as defined by the discipline.

   b. The individual shall meet the criteria for appointment to the rank of instructor, as described in this section and informed by the standards outlined in Section II of this document.

   c. In addition, the individual must exhibit clear evidence of potential for excellence in teaching and service, and, where appropriate, scholarly or professional activities.

   d. The individual will normally have at least three (3) years of service at the rank of instructor or equivalent experience.

2. Faculty status

Assistant professors of clinical have faculty status.

3. Appointment

    a. Appointments at this rank are term appointments.

    b. Tenure is not awarded to individuals on the clinical track.

    c. The individual shall meet the criteria for appointment to the rank of instructor and demonstrate further development consistent with the standards outlined in Section V of this document.

C. Associate Professor of Clinical

1. Criteria

    a. The individual shall typically possess a doctoral degree or other terminal degree appropriate to the discipline.

    b. Although the individual should show progress in teaching, scholarship, and service, they shall have established a sustained record of excellence in at least **one area** with demonstrated high-quality productivity and recognition appropriate to the faculty member's role.

    c. Typically, the individual will have served at least three (3) years at the level of assistant professor regardless of track.

    d. Demonstrated excellence in the primary area of responsibility (teaching and/or service), with meaningful contributions in scholarly activity consistent with assigned duties.

2. Faculty status

    a. Associate professors of clinical are senior members of the faculty.

3. Appointment

    a. Appointments at this rank are term appointments.

    b. Tenure is not awarded to individuals on the clinical track.

    c. The individual shall meet the criteria for appointment to the rank of assistant professor of clinical and demonstrate sustained advancement, including consistent excellence and increased leadership, responsibility, and recognition in teaching, service, and other assigned domains, in alignment with the standards outlined in Section V of this document.

D. Professor of Clinical

1. Criteria

    a. The individual shall meet all criteria for associate professor of clinical rank and demonstrate sustained excellence.

    b. The faculty member shall have established an outstanding and widely recognized professional or clinical reputation through teaching, service, publications, and other scholarly or creative work.

    c. Normally, the individual will have at least five (5) years at the associate professor level.

2. Faculty status

    a. Professors of clinical are senior members of the faculty.

3. Appointment

    a. Appointments at this rank are term appointments.

    b. Tenure is not awarded to individuals on the clinical track.

    c. Sustained excellence in the primary area of responsibility (teaching and/or service), with demonstrated leadership, professional recognition, and continued contributions in scholarly activity

E. Additional Considerations for Clinical Track Faculty

1. Evaluation for promotion is based on demonstrated excellence in assigned responsibilities, typically in teaching and/or service, with appropriate participation in scholarly or professional activities.

2. Expectations increase with rank and include:

    a. Sustained productivity

    b. Leadership

    c. Professional recognition

    d. Impact beyond the program or department, where appropriate

3. Scholarship on the clinical track may include:

a. Clinical innovation

b. Educational development

c. Applied or collaborative scholarly work

## IV. PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. Eligibility for promotion

1. Eligibility and evaluation of full-time faculty

   Faculty members holding full-time appointments as defined by Human Resource Management are eligible to apply for promotion in rank upon meeting the standards and qualifications outlined in Section 7.1 "Eligibility for Promotion," Section 2.1 "Faculty Ranks," and Section 6.0 "Faculty Evaluation" of the LSUHSC-NO Faculty Handbook.

   The following principles apply:

   a. Standards of quality: Full-time faculty must meet the qualitative standards of excellence defined in Section V of this document. Promotion requires evidence of achievement appropriate to the rank sought, including leadership, independence, and sustained contributions within the assigned track.

   b. Evidence of progression and impact: The dossier must document a clear trajectory of professional growth, increasing responsibility, and recognized impact in areas consistent with the faculty member's assigned responsibilities, faculty track, and rank sought. Evidence may include peer-reviewed publications, grant activity, innovative teaching practices, leadership roles, professional recognition, and contributions to institutional or community initiatives.

   c. Documentation of assigned duties: In all cases, the dossier must clearly describe assigned effort distribution during the review period. Annual evaluations and documented workload assignments (e.g., letter of offer, annual Faculty Performance Plan Letter) shall serve as documentation of expected and achieved performance. Promotion evaluations shall consider accomplishments in relation to assigned responsibilities during the review period. However, some level of accomplishment in all three areas remains an expectation.
   d. Tenure eligibility (if applicable): For faculty on the tenure track, eligibility and probationary timelines shall follow LSUHSC PM-23 and Faculty Handbook provisions.

e. External review requirements: External letters of evaluation are required for promotion to associate professor or professor on both the clinical and tenure tracks, consistent with established institutional procedures.

2. Eligibility and evaluation of part-time faculty

a. Faculty members holding part-time appointments are eligible to apply for promotion in rank, provided they meet the standards of excellence required for the rank and track under consideration, as outlined in this document and the Faculty Handbook.

b. Promotion for part-time faculty shall be based on the quality, impact, and sustained progression of accomplishments in assigned areas of responsibility. Reduced FTE does not reduce the qualitative standards required for promotion.

c. Expectations for quantity of productivity (e.g., teaching load, scholarly output, service assignments) shall be interpreted proportionally in relation to documented workload agreements and annual evaluations. The dossier must clearly describe assigned effort distribution during the review period.

d. For part-time faculty on the tenure track, tenure eligibility and probationary timelines shall follow LSUHSC PM-23 and Faculty Handbook provisions. External letters of evaluation are required for promotion to associate professor or professor, consistent with institutional policy.

3. Eligibility and evaluation of adjunct/gratis faculty

a. Promotion in rank of adjunct or gratis faculty will follow the same procedures described above (Section IV).

b. Evaluation will be based on the standards for teaching, service, and scholarly or professional activity outlined in this document; however, expectations will be applied in a manner appropriate to the faculty member's assigned responsibilities, level of engagement, and role within the School.

c. Evidence of achievement should demonstrate meaningful contributions consistent with rank expectations, adjusted for the part-time or voluntary nature of the appointment.

B. Formative Review

1. For faculty on the tenure track, the formative review serves as the required mid-tenure review. All tenure-track faculty members at the rank of assistant professor must undergo a formative review following the third anniversary of appointment or promotion to that rank. The formative review dossier must be submitted to the department head prior to the end of the first month following the third anniversary of appointment or promotion to that

rank. Tenure-track faculty members at the rank of associate professor may request one optional formative review to assess their progress toward promotion to Professor or, if not yet tenured, toward promotion and/or tenure, as applicable.

2. Faculty members on the clinical track may request an optional formative review to assess their progress toward promotion to the next academic rank. Because the purpose of the formative review is to provide sufficient opportunity for continued professional development before formal consideration for promotion, the review must be requested at least one year prior to the anticipated formal application for promotion.

3. Only one formative review at the current academic rank is permitted for each faculty member.

4. The primary purpose of the formative review is to evaluate the faculty member's progress toward meeting the applicable criteria and standards for promotion and/or tenure and to provide developmental, non-binding feedback. The review is intended to identify areas of strength, areas requiring further development, and priorities for continued professional growth so that the faculty member has sufficient opportunity to strengthen their record before formal application for promotion and/or tenure. A formative review does not constitute or guarantee a future favorable decision regarding promotion and/or tenure.

5. To provide meaningful preparation for the formal promotion and/or tenure process, the formative review dossier should mirror the content, organization, documentation, and general preparation requirements of the formal promotion and/or tenure dossier, as applicable to the faculty member's track and anticipated rank. However, LSU System forms, internal review committee evaluations, and external letters of evaluation are not required for the formative review. The formative review follows an earlier submission timeline See the table below) to allow the P&T Committee to complete formative reviews before beginning its formal promotion and/or tenure reviews.

| Time Frame | Item |
|---|---|
| March 1 | Department head will notify P&T committee of faculty who intend to submit a formative review dossier. |
| July 1 | A completed formative review dossier must be submitted to the department head for review. |
| July 15 | Deadline for candidate to submit the formative review dossier to the P&T committee chair. |
| December 31 | Deadline for feedback to candidate |

6. The faculty member must submit one electronic copy (PDF) of the formative review dossier to the department head. The department head will review the dossier for completeness and forward it to the chair of the School Promotion and Tenure Committee through (https://files.lsuhsc.edu/). The Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the dossier using the standards and criteria applicable to the faculty member's track and anticipated rank.

7. Following completion of the formative review, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide written feedback identifying the faculty member's areas of strength, areas requiring further development, and recommendations or priorities for continued progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Written feedback will be provided to the faculty member and department head no later than the end of December of the formative review year.

C. Steps of the Promotion and/or Tenure Process

Normally, the nomination for promotion and/or tenure application of a faculty member is initiated by the department head. If a faculty member has an appointment in more than one department or school, the nomination for promotion and/or tenure application is usually initiated by the department head where the primary appointment is held. A faculty member may self-nominate in instances when the department head does not do so, provided the department head is notified. Promotion and/or tenure applications of department heads are initiated by the dean of the School or by self-nomination.

1. To begin the promotion and/or tenure process, the candidate must complete the following:

   a. Page one of the Louisiana State University System Promotion/Tenure Review Request form (henceforth referred to as the LSU System form) in the format specified in the instructions that accompany the LSU System form and submit it electronically to the department head.

   b. https://alliedhealth.lsuhsc.edu/Admin/docs/lsu_promotion_tenure_form.pdf Curriculum vitae in the format specified by LSUHSC-NO.

   c. An electronic dossier (PDF) that contains the sections outlined in Appendix B.

   d. Deadlines for submission of documents:

| Time Frame | Item |
|---|---|
| March 1 of the application year | P&T committee chair will request that all faculty who intend to apply for promotion in the current calendar year inform their department head and the P&T committee chair. |
| July 1 of the application year | A completed dossier must be submitted to the department head. |
| July 1 through October 1 of the application year | Candidates may submit documentation of newly accepted or completed scholarly or professional accomplishments to the department head for inclusion in the dossier. |

| | |
|---|---|
| October 1 of the application year | Department head submission deadline to the School Promotion and Tenure Committee |

2. After receiving a complete dossier no later than July 1, the department head shall have up to three months to complete the departmental review process prior to the October 1 submission deadline to the dean and School Promotion and Tenure Committee.

3. The department head will form an internal review committee (IRC) consisting of a minimum of three faculty members at or above the rank sought, will appoint the chair of the IRC, and is responsible for ensuring that the IRC letter is submitted to the department head by September 1.

    a. For candidates on the clinical track, the committee shall include associate professors and professors from the clinical and/or tenure tracks within the candidate's department and/or LSUHSC-NO campus.

    b. For candidates on the tenure track, the committee shall include tenured faculty within the candidate's department and/or LSUHSC-NO campus.

    c. Whenever possible, committee members will be from the candidate's department. If there are insufficient faculty at the appropriate rank in the department, qualified faculty from within the School or University shall be appointed. Members are selected by the department head, or by the dean if the candidate is a department head.

4. The chair of the IRC will lead the review and complete the following:

    a. A summary in the form of a letter addressed to the department head of the committee's recommendation that includes the vote tally by rank level, as instructed on page 2 of the LSU Systems form.

    b. The letter must include signatures of all committee members.

    c. Submit the review letter to the department head by September 1.

5. For promotion to associate professor or professor (clinical or tenure track~~,~~ the department head shall solicit three external letters of evaluation.

    The candidate shall provide a minimum of three suggested external reviewers from recognized experts in the candidate's academic field. The department head (or the dean, if the candidate is a department head) may identify additional qualified reviewers and shall select and solicit at least three external evaluators from the combined pool.

    External reviewers must:

a. be external to LSUHSC-NO.

b. hold a rank equal to or higher than the rank sought.

c. be recognized experts in the candidate's academic field.

d. be free from real or perceived conflicts of interest.

Individuals who have served as the candidate's dissertation advisor, postdoctoral mentor, recent collaborator, or close personal associate are not eligible to serve as external reviewers.

Each reviewer shall receive the candidate's dossier. A sample request letter is provided in Appendix C.

Upon receipt of the three external letters of evaluation, the department head completes the relevant section on page 3 of the LSU Systems form and inserts the three external letters of evaluation (if necessary) into the dossier.

6. Submission of the completed dossier and required supporting materials by the department head to the dean of the School and the chair of the SAHP Promotion and Tenure Committee shall follow the procedures outlined in Sections IV.C.1–5 and Section VI.

D. Evaluations for Promotion

Applications for advancement in rank must be accompanied by recommendations from the sources listed in Section IV.C and documented on the LSU System form, as indicated above. These recommendations must specifically address the degree to which the candidate meets the appropriate standards and criteria.

Each external reviewer shall receive the school's promotion and tenure guideline along with the candidate's dossier. A sample request letter is provided in Appendix C.

1. Special circumstances for Promotion from instructor to assistant professor

For promotion from instructor to assistant professor, an internal review letter is required, but external letters of evaluation are not, unless deemed necessary by the Dean.

2. Special circumstances for Promotion of a department head

If a department head is applying for promotion or tenure, the dean or the dean's designee shall solicit all required internal and external evaluations.

3. Permissible post-submission additions (between July 1 and October 1) include the items below. Such additions must represent completed achievements and may not include substantive revisions to previously submitted materials.

    a. Research: manuscripts accepted or published; presentations accepted or delivered; grant proposals funded.

    b. Teaching: course evaluations for courses completed in the spring semester of the application year.

    c. Service: formal notification of election or appointment to professional committees or scholarly panels.

E. Action on Promotion

1. Decisions regarding promotion represent a succession of judgments as to whether the candidate meets the criteria set forth in this document. Submission of the completed promotion and tenure packet to the School, including required materials and routing procedures, shall follow the process described in the preceding section.

2. The School Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews the nomination and supporting materials and provides a written recommendation to the dean of the School. The dean reviews the recommendation of the committee together with the candidate's dossier and may agree or disagree with the committee's recommendation.

3. Supportive recommendations are submitted by the dean to the appropriate institutional committees or administrative councils for further action. Unsupportive recommendations, with which the dean concurs, are returned to the department head. The final school-level decisions are indicated on the promotion form, and appropriate signatures are affixed.

4. After completion of the School's review process, the dean forwards a summary packet for consideration by the vice chancellor for academic affairs (VCAA) and the senior vice chancellor (SVC) of LSUHSC-NO. This packet typically includes:

    a. the LSU System Promotion/Tenure Review Request Form documenting the recommendations of the department head, School Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the dean;

    b. the candidate's curriculum vitae.

    c. internal and external evaluation letters.

    d. the last three years' annual performance appraisals.

    These materials provide institutional administrators with the essential documentation

of the School-level review and recommendation.

If a faculty member has an appointment in more than one department or school, each department or school involved must participate in the promotion process (i.e., review by the appropriate faculty committees and administrative councils of all schools/departments involved).

The VCAA will forward the application to the SVC of LSUHSC-NO. Upon completion of review, the SVC will forward the application to the chancellor of the LSU System. When a recommendation for promotion is approved the promotion in rank will usually become effective at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

## V. PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS

A. Definition of Excellence

1. For purposes of promotion and tenure, excellence is defined as sustained, high-quality performance with demonstrated impact and progression in assigned areas of responsibility.

   Excellence requires more than satisfactory performance or completion of assigned duties. It is evidenced by:

   a. Quality – work that meets or exceeds professional and disciplinary standards.

   b. Impact – documented outcomes, recognition, or measurable contribution at the program, school, university, professional, or community level.

   c. Progression – increasing responsibility, independence, leadership, innovation, or scholarly development consistent with rank expectations.

Expectations for excellence are rank-specific and track-specific. Advancement in rank requires demonstration of achievement appropriate to the level sought, including sustained contributions and, where applicable, regional, national, or international recognition.

Promotion and tenure decisions shall be based on the candidate's documented accomplishments relative to the published criteria, assigned responsibilities, and disciplinary norms. Candidates shall not be evaluated through direct comparison with other individual faculty members.

2. In general, progression of excellence is reflected as follows:

   a. Seeking appointment to assistant professor:

The candidate demonstrates strong performance and emerging excellence within the department or program, with a clear trajectory toward independence, increasing responsibility and developing professional visibility.

b. Seeking appointment to associate professor:

The candidate demonstrates sustained excellence and established recognition beyond the department, with evidence of regional, state, or national impact appropriate to the discipline and track. Contributions should reflect increasing independence, leadership, and professional recognition.

c. Seeking appointment to professor:

The candidate demonstrates distinguished and sustained excellence with clear evidence of leadership and recognized impact at the national or international level appropriate to the discipline and track. Performance at this rank should reflect a record of significant achievement, influence, and ongoing professional productivity.

The level and scope of recognition will be interpreted considering disciplinary standards and assigned responsibilities.

B. Research and Scholarship Standard

The term *scholarship* is used here to encompass the traditional area of research, as well as other scholarly activities. *Research* is defined as basic or applied studies that follow an accepted method. The quality of research must enrich the body of scientific knowledge. Results must appear in referred publications. *Other scholarly activities* include those activities, methods, or publications that enrich or upgrade the health professions. The quality of these activities must be methodologically sound and show evidence of scholarly endeavor.

Expectations of scholarship differ according to the faculty track (tenure vs. clinical) and the rank that is being sought. Individuals seeking promotion to senior faculty ranks on the tenure track are expected to present a record of sustained productivity, especially as evidenced by primary or senior authorship of peer-reviewed publications and books, grants, and presentations at state, national, and/or international professional meetings. Successful candidates for senior ranks on the tenure track normally have developed a line of research, have disseminated findings, and have achieved a high degree of recognition in the field.

Candidates for senior faculty ranks (associate professor and above) on the clinical track are also expected to present a record of sustained productivity; however, the type of scholarship and the methods used may differ from the traditional research model. Successful candidates for senior ranks on the clinical track normally have published peer-reviewed clinical case studies, literature reviews, qualitative or quantitative

research studies, clinical outcomes or program evaluation studies, descriptions of innovative interventions (educational, technological, or clinical), clinical practice guidelines or consensus statements, and implementation or quality improvement studies. Scholarly productivity may reflect clinically oriented, educational, translational, or collaborative work that demonstrates methodological rigor and contributes to the advancement of clinical practice, health professions education, or healthcare delivery. Successful candidates typically have a consistent record of peer-reviewed presentations at state, national, and/or international professional meetings. Their research experiences are likely to result in collaborative works, but not necessarily as a primary or senior author.

1. Criteria used to assess the quality of research and scholarly activities include the following:

    a. Evidence of progression in scholarly productivity and impact during the candidate's term in rank, reflecting a developing and sustained program of scholarship appropriate to the faculty track.

    b. Recognition of the candidate's scholarly contributions by colleagues within and outside the Health Sciences Center. Indicators may include citations of published work, invitations to present at professional meetings, participation in collaborative research, service as a reviewer or editorial board member, competitive funding, awards, or other evidence of professional reputation.

    c. Dissemination of scholarly work through peer-reviewed venues, including publications in referred journals or other scholarly outlets, manuscripts accepted or in press, scholarly books or book chapters, and intellectual property.

2. Sustained scholarly productivity

    a. For faculty whose assigned responsibilities include research and/or scholarship, sustained scholarly productivity is expected as evidence of ongoing engagement in the advancement and dissemination of knowledge appropriate to the faculty member's track and rank.

    b. Sustained productivity reflects regular, continuing scholarly activity over time rather than episodic or isolated accomplishments. In general, this includes consistent peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarly work through publications, presentations, or other recognized scholarly outputs appropriate to the discipline.

3. Scholarly productivity may include, but is not limited to:

    a. peer-reviewed publications in reputable journals.

    b. peer-reviewed or juried presentations at regional, national, or international professional meetings.

c. competitive grant submissions and awards.

d. scholarly books, book chapters, or monographs.

e. development and dissemination of innovative curricula or clinical methodologies when externally reviewed or adopted.

f. invited scholarly publications, editorials, or consensus statements.

g. intellectual property such as patents, copyrighted materials, or clinical tools.

4. For advancement in rank, evidence of scholarly productivity should demonstrate increasing independence, impact, and recognition consistent with rank expectations.

   a. Seeking appointment to assistant professor:

      The candidate exhibits evidence of an emerging and developing scholarly identity, demonstrated by dissemination of scholarly work through scholarly publications and presentations, participation in activities that enhance research and scholarly writing skills, service as a reviewer for scholarly abstracts or publications, and other recognized scholarly contributions.

   b. Seeking appointment to associate professor:

      The candidate has a sustained record of peer-reviewed scholarly productivity with evidence of independent scholarly contribution and established professional recognition beyond the institution, with emerging or established regional or national reputation, as demonstrated by citations, invited presentations, funded projects, or other indicators of scholarly impact.

   c. Seeking appointment to professor:

      The candidate exhibits distinguished and sustained peer-reviewed scholarly productivity with clear evidence of scholarly leadership and a sustained national or international reputation, reflected by influential publications, leadership in funded research or major scholarly initiatives, invited national or international presentations, or other indicators of significant impact in the field.

      Expectations for scholarly productivity shall be interpreted considering disciplinary norms, pathway expectations, and the faculty member's assigned workload distribution. Faculty whose designated effort includes a significant proportion of research are expected to demonstrate sustained and substantial peer-reviewed productivity consistent with their rank and pathway. Faculty whose primary responsibilities emphasize teaching, clinical service, or administration are expected to demonstrate scholarly engagement appropriate to those assignments,

which may include educational scholarship, clinical innovation, outcomes dissemination, or collaborative contributions, rather than high-volume traditional research output. Scholarly productivity will be evaluated proportionally in relation to documented workload agreements and annual evaluations.

C. Teaching Standard

*Teaching* is defined as formal or informal instruction to any number of students in any appropriate setting including classroom, laboratory, clinic, tutorial, and fieldwork or thesis/dissertation supervision. The quality of teaching must aim toward continual improvement and excellence.

LSUHSC-NO recognizes that teaching is a primary responsibility of most faculty members. Teaching activities should demonstrate that course content and instructional approaches remain current with advances in the profession, incorporating contemporary knowledge, evidence-based practice, and evolving clinical or educational methods. Effective teaching should also demonstrate meaningful educational impact and recognition from students, colleagues, and other appropriate individuals within and outside the Health Sciences Center.

1. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, evidence in the following areas:

    a. Student evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, teaching awards, invitations to teach or present educational materials.
    b.
    c. Mastery of subject matter and currency of knowledge, demonstrated by expertise in the discipline and incorporation of current scientific, clinical, and professional knowledge into teaching.

    d. Instructional effectiveness and communication, demonstrated by the ability to communicate concepts clearly, organize instructional material effectively, and facilitate student learning in classroom, laboratory, clinical, or online settings.

    e. Course and curriculum development, demonstrated by the ability to plan, design, implement, and continuously improve courses, curricula, and learning activities.

    f. Student engagement and learning outcomes, demonstrated by the ability to promote active learning and student engagement, as reflected in student evaluations, learning outcomes, or student performance on certification or licensure examinations.

    g. Student mentoring and advising, demonstrated through mentoring, advising, supervision of student research or clinical projects, and support of students' professional development.

h. Educational innovation, demonstrated through the development or implementation of innovative teaching methods, curricula, or educational technologies that enhance student learning or educational outcomes.

2. For advancement in rank, evidence of teaching effectiveness should demonstrate increasing responsibility, impact, and recognition consistent with rank expectations.

   a. Seeking appointment to assistant professor:

      The candidate exhibits evidence of effective teaching and an emerging educational role. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate competence in teaching assigned courses or clinical instruction, regular engagement in instructional activities, and effective contributions to student learning and mentoring.

   b. Seeking appointment to associate professor:

      The candidate exhibits a sustained record of teaching effectiveness with increasing responsibility in educational activities. Faculty members typically demonstrate leadership in course or curriculum development, mentoring of students or trainees, and recognition for teaching effectiveness within or beyond the Health Sciences Center.

   c. Seeking appointment to professor:

      The candidate exhibits a distinguished and sustained record of excellence in teaching with clear evidence of educational leadership and recognized impact (e.g., award in education). Faculty members typically demonstrate leadership in curriculum development, educational innovation, or mentoring programs, and recognition of teaching contributions at the institutional, regional, national, or international level, as appropriate to the discipline and faculty track.

      Expectations for teaching effectiveness shall be interpreted considering disciplinary norms, pathway expectations, and the faculty member's assigned workload distribution. Faculty with substantial teaching responsibilities are expected to demonstrate sustained effectiveness in instructional activities, course or curriculum development, mentoring, and other educational contributions consistent with their rank and pathway. Faculty whose primary responsibilities emphasize research, clinical service, or administration are expected to contribute to teaching in ways appropriate to those assignments.

      Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated in relation to documented workload agreements and annual evaluations.

D. Service Standard

*Service* is defined as participation in those activities supportive of the mission of the LSU Health Sciences Center including service to the University, the professions, the community, and patient care. The quality of service must be outstanding in that it receives recognition by individuals within the Health Sciences Center or agencies or institutions outside the Health Sciences Center.

Community service shall be evaluated in relation to the faculty member's professional expertise and its contribution to the mission of the School and the University. Activities may include community engaged clinical programs, public health initiatives, professional advocacy, policy development, continuing education outreach, service on advisory boards, or other service activities directly connected to the faculty member's discipline.

Greater weight shall be given to leadership roles, program development, policy impact, sustained contributions, or service demonstrating measurable outcomes or external recognition.

General volunteer activities unrelated to the faculty member's academic role may be acknowledged but will not ordinarily constitute primary evidence of excellence for promotion.

1. Criteria used to assess quality of service include the following:

    a. Active participation in service activities**,** including contributions to committees, boards, task forces, professional organizations, and other institutional or community initiatives.

    b. Increasing levels of responsibility and leadership in service assignments over time, such as chairing committees, coordinating programs, or leading institutional, professional, or community initiatives.

    c. Demonstrated contributions and meaningful outcomes resulting from service activities, including completion of important projects, program development, policy contributions, or other tangible achievements that benefit the institution, profession, or community.

    d. Recognition of service contributions by colleagues, professional organizations, or community partners, which may include appointments to leadership roles, invitations to serve in professional organizations, or receipt of service-related awards or honors.

2. Institutional, professional, and community services

    For advancement in rank, evidence of institutional, professional, and community service should demonstrate increasing responsibility, impact, and recognition consistent with rank expectations.

a. Seeking appointment to assistant professor:

The candidate exhibits evidence of active and exemplary participation in service activities with an emerging service role. Faculty members are expected to make meaningful contributions to departmental, School, University, professional, or community service activities and to be recognized as reliable and effective contributors. Service should extend beyond simple membership and demonstrate substantive engagement, accomplishment, and professional commitment.

b. Seeking appointment to associate professor:

The candidate exhibits a sustained record of exemplary service with increasing responsibility and leadership. Faculty members typically demonstrate leadership by chairing departmental or School committees, overseeing SAHP programs or major events, serving on LSUHSC-wide committees, holding leadership roles in local and state professional organizations, serving on advisory boards, participating in accreditation activities, and contributing as regular manuscript, abstract, or grant reviewers. Service at this rank should result in tangible accomplishments and recognition beyond the immediate department, including at the School, University, local, state, regional, or national level.

c. Seeking appointment to professor:

The candidate exhibits distinguished and sustained excellence in service with clear evidence of leadership and recognized impact. Faculty members typically demonstrate major leadership roles within the institution, such as chairing significant School or University committees or leading major institutional initiatives, as well as holding elected or appointed leadership positions (serving as an officer, board member, or committee chair) in national or international professional organizations, accreditation bodies, certification boards, and scholarly journals. Service at this rank should reflect substantial and sustained contributions with recognized impact at the national or international level.

3. Clinical service and patient care

For faculty with assigned clinical responsibilities, evidence of clinical service should demonstrate increasing responsibility, impact, leadership, and recognition consistent with rank expectations. Clinic service and patient care are distinct from institutional, professional and community service activities. Such activities encompass contributions to the governance and advancement of the institution, profession, and community through committee work, leadership in professional organizations, accreditation activities, editorial and peer-review contributions, and community engagement, whereas clinical service in patient care focuses on the direct provision, administration, and innovation of healthcare services.

a. Seeking appointment to assistant professor:

The candidate exhibits evidence of effective and reliable clinical practice with an emerging role in patient care and clinical operations. Faculty members are expected to provide high-quality patient care, demonstrate sound clinical judgment, maintain appropriate clinical productivity and professional competency, and contribute to the effective operation, quality, and advancement of clinical services.

b. Seeking appointment to associate professor:

The candidate exhibits a sustained record of excellence in clinical practice with increasing responsibility and leadership. Faculty members typically demonstrate leadership in clinical program development, quality improvement initiatives, patient safety, evidence-based practice implementation, interprofessional collaboration, supervision of clinical operations, interprofessional collaboration, and development of innovative models of care. Clinical service at this rank should show measurable impact increasing responsibility and recognition beyond the immediate practice setting.

c. Seeking appointment to professor:

The candidate exhibits distinguished and sustained excellence in clinical service with clear evidence of clinical leadership and recognized impact. Faculty members typically demonstrate leadership in major clinical programs, development of innovative models of care, significant quality improvement initiatives, policy development, and recognition of clinical expertise at the institutional, regional, national, or international level.

## VI. PREPARATION OF THE TOTAL DOSSIER

A. Purpose and Organization of the Dossier

The overall goal is to create a dossier that highlights strengths and evidence of accomplishments that are relevant to the categories upon which promotion and tenure are based. The dossier should be compiled on an ongoing basis throughout a person's academic career. See Appendix D, Factors Considered by the Promotion and Tenure Committee in Assessing a Candidate's Dossier, for additional information.

B. Required Documentation Areas and Narrative Organization

Areas in which documentation should be provided include teaching, research, and service. These three domains of expected achievement in academia must be organized into separate sections. A narrative overview that contextualizes the materials should be supported by the various documents contained in the appended sections. Each section

must include a self-reflection that orients the reader, assesses the range of the documents included, and demonstrates how accomplishments fit within the overall picture of continuing career development. A representative selection of dossier documents should be referenced and briefly explained within each reflective narrative. See Appendix B for a detailed description of items that should be included in the dossier.

C. PDF Preparation and Submission Procedures

A PDF of the dossier should be created using Microsoft Word and Adobe Acrobat to combine files. A table of contents and page numbers are not required, but the correct sequence of documents must be followed (see LSU System form instructions).

1. Each section of the dossier must be bookmarked and labeled using Adobe Acrobat.

2. After the candidate completes the dossier, a PDF must be submitted to the department head no later than July 1 of the application year.

3. Scanned color versions of the letters of recommendation and evaluation must be inserted into the dossier by the department head (or the dean if it is for a dossier of a department head) after the curriculum vitae.

D. Department Head Submission Responsibilities

1. The department head must then send the completed PDF of the dossier to the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee using LSU Health FileS no later than October 1 of the application year.

2. The department head must also submit original unstapled versions of the LSU System form, the candidate's curriculum vitae, last three years' annual performance appraisals, and internal and external letters of evaluation to the dean of the School on October 1 or earlier.

E. Signatory Page and Tenure Timeline Requirements

For applicants on the tenure track, the date of hire will determine whether application for tenure occurs in the 5th or 6th year of service. The SAHP signatory page must be submitted with the dossier. This document attests to the candidate having read all promotion guidelines and that the dossier's contents are accurate and complete.
.

## VII. CRITERIA FOR CHANGING TRACKS (TENURE OR CLINICAL) AND PROMOTION

This section outlines the institutional expectations and limitations applicable to faculty members requesting a change in track following an unfavorable promotion and/or tenure decision.

A. Eligibility and Limitations for Track Changes

A change in track between the tenure track and clinical track may occur only once during a faculty member's career at LSUHSC. A request for a change in track may be initiated by the faculty member or the department head and must be reviewed and approved by the department head, the dean, and appropriate administrative authorities (e.g., Faculty Affairs and/or Human Resources), in accordance with LSUHSC-NO policy.

B. School Promotion and Tenure Committee Review Requirements

The proposed change in track shall be reviewed by the School Promotion and Tenure Committee when the change involves entry into the tenure track or has implications for tenure eligibility, timeline, or expectations. For other track changes, review by the School Promotion and Tenure Committee may be requested by the department head or dean to ensure alignment of expectations and criteria.

C. Minimum Service Requirement in the New Track

Assistant and associate professors must serve a minimum of one (1) year on the new track before becoming eligible for promotion or tenure consideration.

D. Evaluation Standards Following a Track Change

Following a change in track, all promotion and tenure applications will be evaluated according to the standards, procedures, and eligibility criteria outlined in this document, with expectations applied in a manner consistent with the faculty member's assigned responsibilities in the new track.

E. Institutional Tenure Timeline Requirements

Tenure-track faculty must undergo tenure review in accordance with LSU System policy (PM-23: Permanent Memorandum 23), which requires that a faculty member be notified of the outcome of the tenure review prior to the start of the seventh year of service.

F. Documentation of Tenure Timeline and Track Change Agreement

The impact of a track change on the tenure timeline will be determined at the time of the change and documented in a formal written agreement (Appendix D: Track Change Agreement) approved by the department head and dean and maintained in the faculty member's official personnel file. All approved track changes must be documented in writing, including the effective date of the change, applicable expectations, revised timelines, and acknowledgment by the faculty member and appropriate administrators.

G. Transfer to Clinical Track Following Denial of Tenure

An assistant or associate professor who is denied tenure may request consideration for transfer to the clinical track, subject to the support of the department head and approval of the dean and appropriate institutional authorities. Requests for transfer must be submitted in writing following formal notification of the tenure decision and must comply with LSU System policies governing tenure timelines and appointments.

H. Following Denial of Promotion

A faculty member denied promotion may reapply in a subsequent review cycle, subject to school and institutional eligibility requirements.

**Committee Members**

I. Franc, Ph.D.
Occupational Therapy

A. Hurley, Ph.D.
Communication Disorders

L. Lopez, PhD
Communication Disorders

H. Liu, Ph.D.
Physical Therapy

M. Majoue, AuD.
Communication Disorders

N. Moreau, Ph.D.
Physical Therapy

J. Zamjahn, Ph.D.
Cardiopulmonary Science

Initial Document: Adopted by Executive Committee - July 1997
Revised Document: Adopted by Executive Committee - June 1999
Revised Document: Adopted by Executive Committee - December 2010
Revised Document: Adopted by Executive Committee - July 2013
Revised Document: Updated July 2020
Revised Document: Updated May 2021
Revised Document: Updated December 2023
Revised Document: Updated March 2024
Revised Document: Updated October 2025
Revised Document: Updated August 2026

## Appendix A: Timeline of Preparation for Promotion and/or Tenure

### Initial Activities for Tenure and Clinical Tracks

1. Receive appointment to your department.

2. Attend the new faculty orientation to SAHP policies and procedures, obtain and read copies of LSUHSC PM-23 and the SAHP guidelines on promotion and tenure (P&T), **early in your first semester of employment.**

### Ongoing Activities for Tenure and Clinical Tracks

1. Develop a plan for making meaningful career development decisions concerning required and optional activities within these domains of teaching, scholarship, and service.

2. Begin the process of compiling your dossier by creating a separate set of files (at least one for each of the three domains for **each year**) and corresponding organizational habits for documenting your activities, contributions, efforts, outcomes, and recognitions. See Appendix B for examples of documentation to compile.

3. Seek clarification and support periodically from senior faculty and other colleagues about their choices and performance in activities with regard to your assigned duties and discretionary professional opportunities.

4. Continue to prioritize and accomplish your teaching, scholarship, and service activities while maintaining the completeness and currency of your dossier.

5. Meet formally with the department head **each year in February** to review your annual faculty evaluation and obtain feedback on your past performance and receive counsel regarding future expectations.

6. Maintain your annual faculty evaluation records.

### ***3rd Year Activities for Tenure Track (Formative Review – Developmental Stage)***

1. Purpose of Formative Review:
   - Assess progress toward promotion and tenure.
   - Provide developmental, non-binding feedback (see Section IV.B).

2. Faculty Responsibilities:
   - Prepare formative review dossier and curriculum vitae.
   - Submit materials to department head within one month following the third anniversary of initial appointment.

3. Review Process:

- The department head will review submitted materials for completeness and facilitate the formative review process.
- The Promotion and Tenure Committee will conduct a formative review.
- External reviewers are not required.
- Written feedback will be provided to the faculty member and their department head.

4. Outcome:
   - Identify strengths and areas for improvement.
   - Refine priorities, activities, and strategies for advancement.

## ***5th-6th Year Activities for Tenure Track (Tenure Review – Evaluation Stage)***

1. Purpose of the Tenure Review:
   - Formal evaluation for promotion and/or tenure decision.

2. Faculty Responsibilities:
   - Prepare your promotion and tenure dossier, curriculum vitae, and required materials for submission.
   - Submit a complete dossier to the department head by **July 1 of the application year** to allow sufficient time for internal review and solicitation of external evaluations.

3. Review Process:
   - The department head will submit the final dossier to the Promotion and Tenure Committee by **October 1**.
   - The full Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the dossier, which includes all required documentation and external/internal evaluations (per policy).

4. Timing:
   - Submission occurs in 5th or 6th year, based on hire date and tenure timeline.
   - Tenure-track faculty must undergo tenure review in accordance with LSU System policy (PM-23: Permanent Memorandum 23) and must be notified of the outcome of the tenure review prior to the start of the seventh year of service.

5. Outcome:
   - Formal decision regarding promotion and/or tenure

## Appendix B: Items to Be Included in Dossier

The dossier must include the sections listed below. Each section must be bookmarked and labeled using Adobe Acrobat. For candidates on the clinical track, the sections for which descriptive evidence of excellence is required will depend on the primary category on which promotion is based (e.g., teaching or service as defined in Section V). Each narrative should be used as a reflective exercise to derive meaning from the evidence.

1. Completed LSU System form
    - LSU System form instructions

2. Curriculum Vitae per current LSUHSC-NO template.

3. Letters from three external evaluators (for all candidates seeking promotion to associate professor or above; to be inserted by the department head/program director).

4. Annual faculty evaluations for the previous three years.

5. Teaching

    a. Narrative self-reflection (recommended length: 1-2 pages)
        - Overview of teaching and education activities (If applicable, informal teaching such as independent studies or tutoring may be included.)
        - Teaching philosophies and challenges; an analysis of teaching abilities and student responses to teaching, as well as what has been learned from teaching experiences, should be included.
        - Descriptive evidence of excellence in teaching.
        - Goals and future professional development as a teacher/educator.
        - Teaching load, to include course descriptions, academic credit, contact hours, numbers of students, and number of new courses developed. Course syllabi with schedule must be included.
            - Generally speaking, the following materials should *not* be included: reading lists, PowerPoint presentations, instructional handouts, exams or quizzes, project assignments, or grading rubrics.
            - However, artifacts that demonstrate excellence in teaching or innovation may be included in limited quantities.

    b. Create a table for summaries of student evaluations of the course and instructor from the most recent 5 years (or less if applicable). Individual course and instructor evaluations for each course should NOT be included. However, the Promotion and Tenure Committee may request complete course evaluation reports, including student comments, from the candidate's department head if additional information is needed during the review process.

    c. A template table is shown for your reference (next page):

Summary of Courses Taught and Student Teaching Evaluations

| **Courses** | **Role** | **2021-22** | **2022-23** | **2024-25** | **2025-26** | **2026-27** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Course 1 (Name & Number) | Course Director | Enroll: 44<br>Eval: 35 (80%)<br>Score: 3.3 | Enroll: 45<br>Eval: 40 (89%)<br>Score: 3.7 | Enroll: 43<br>Eval: 39 (91%)<br>Score: 3.7 | Enroll: 46<br>Eval: 41 (89%)<br>Score: 3.6 | Teaching now |
| Course 2 (Name & Number) | Course Director | Enroll: 43<br>Eval: 31 (72%)<br>Score: 3.6 | Enroll: 44<br>Eval: 37 (84%)<br>Score: 4.0 | Enroll: 42<br>Eval: 38 (90%)<br>Score: 3.5 | Enroll: 45<br>Eval: 39 (87%)<br>Score: 3.4 | Teaching now |
| Course 3 (Name & Number) | Course Director | Enroll: 43<br>Eval: 36 (84%)<br>Score: 3.4 | Enroll: 44<br>Eval: 34 (77%)<br>Score: 4.0 | Enroll: 45<br>Eval: 39 (87%)<br>Score: 3.5 | Enroll: 46<br>Eval: 40 (87%)<br>Score: 3.5 | Enroll: 47<br>Eval: 42 (89%)<br>Score: 3.8 |
| Course 4 (Name & Number) | Co-Course Director (2024-25); Lecturer (2025–2026) | NA | NA | Enroll: 44<br>Eval: 37 (84%)<br>Score: 3.4 | Enroll: 45<br>Eval: 39 (87%)<br>Score: 3.5 | Enroll: 46<br>Eval: 41 (89%)<br>Score: 3.6 |
| Course 5 (Name & Number) | Course Director | NA | NA | Enroll: 44<br>Eval: 36 (82%)<br>Score: 3.4 | Enroll: 45<br>Eval: 37 (82%)<br>Score: 3.5 | NA |
| Course 6 (Name & Number) | Lab Director | NA | NA | NA | NA | Enroll: 47<br>Eval: 40 (85%)<br>Score: 3.5 |

*NA = not teaching the course during that academic year.*
*Please add more rows if you have taught more than 6 courses.*
*Please give explanation if there is drop or increment of score over 0.6 points for a course.*

d. Supporting documents (Shown below)

6. Research/scholarly activity

a. Narrative self-reflection (Recommended length: 1-2 pages).
- Research/scholarly activity conducted at LSUHSC.
- Description of the development of the candidate's research agenda, including description/analysis of challenges and success.
- Descriptive evidence of excellence in research/scholarly activity.
- Research/scholarly activity goals, including a description of future research plans.

b. Candidates who are tenured or on the tenure track should use the following template table to summarize scholarly productivity (next page).

Summary of Peer-Reviewed Publications

| Course/Year | 2021-22 (after 8/1/21) | 2022-23 | 2023-24 | 2024-25 | 2025-26 | 2026-27 | Total | # as 1st or corresponding authors (PI or Co-PI) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Articles | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 8 |
| Abstracts | 6 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 32 | 19 |
| Grant activities (submitted) | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 8 |
| Grant activities (funded) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Books/Book Chapters | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 |

c. List of publications with hyperlinked digital object identifiers (DOIs), consistent with the CV.

d. Brief samples (e.g., first page of book chapter, not entire chapter or book) of other scholarly activities. Materials included in the dossier should complement, not duplicate, information provided in the CV.

e. Supporting documents (shown below).

7. Service

a. Narrative self-reflection (Recommended length: 1-2 pages).
   - University, School, departmental service.
   - National/international service.
   - Clinical service.
   - Administrative responsibilities.
   - Community service.
   - Descriptive evidence of excellence in service.

b. Supporting documents (shown below; committee meeting minutes should NOT be included)

8. Signatory page

After completing the dossier, the candidate signs the SAHP signatory page confirming that all guidelines and instructions have been met in completing the dossier. The signatory page must be included as the final section of the dossier.

Examples of activities and/or supporting documents to demonstrate accomplishments in teaching:

1. Innovative instructional methods and/or materials.
2. Organization of a clinical practicum.
3. Innovative supervision techniques.

4. Special awards for teaching.
5. Evidence of being a positive role model or mentor.
6. Leadership or substantive participation in curriculum design and/or renewal or in implementation of curriculum renewal, including interprofessional educational activities.
7. Leadership or recognized excellence in continuing health profession education.
8. Letters of commendation for educational contributions outside the institution.
9. Leadership roles in educational programs (e.g., program chair for professional society's annual meeting).
10. Evaluations from participation in professional and other external teaching programs.

Examples of activities and/or supporting documents to demonstrate accomplishments in research/scholarly activities:

1. Statistics documenting citations of the candidate's work in literature by others.
2. Publication of instructional manuals, audiovisual packages, and computer programs.
3. Development of clinical instruments and/or tools for patient care and/or teaching that have been disseminated through peer-reviewed presentations and/or publications.
4. Invitations for special lectures at professional meetings.
5. Continued participation on editorial boards, associate editorships, and editorships of journals.
6. Special awards for research/scholarship.

Examples of activities and/or supporting documents to demonstrate accomplishments in service:

1. Development of an area of clinical expertise.
2. Establishment of a recognized and productive clinical program.
3. Reputation as a clinician and/or consultant.
4. Clinical productivity.
5. Recognized participation or leadership in departmental, School, University, or hospital committees or special initiatives.
6. Continued participation or leadership in professional organization or society committees and/or governing boards at a local, regional, state, national, or international level.
7. Participation in institutional or program reviews or site visits.
8. Commendable participation in community service or other volunteer activities.
9. Service as a reviewer or editor of peer reviewed research or educational publications, or conferences.
10. Service as a grant reviewer.
11. Leadership roles in national or international professional societies and related meetings

## Appendix C: Sample Letter to Request Evaluation from Outside Authority

Dear (Reviewer):

The School of Health Professions at Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans is considering (Candidate X) for promotion from _____ professor to _____ professor (and tenure if applicable).

Our review process involves a series of evaluations designed to ensure both internal and external assessment of the candidate. Candidate X's performance in teaching, research and scholarship, and service will be evaluated at the department, School, Health Sciences Center, and University System levels to determine whether promotion will be granted. Moreover, our process calls for prominent scholars who are knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise to write letters of evaluation. Because you are considered to be such a person, I am requesting that you provide us with evaluative information about Candidate X.

Enclosed please find a summary of the School's promotion and tenure standards for evaluating quality, impact, and progression in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service. Also enclosed are the candidate's dossier for your review.

In preparing your evaluation, I ask that you:

1. Describe your professional relationship with the candidate and disclose any prior or current collaborations, mentorship, or other associations that may represent a real or perceived conflict of interest.

2. Provide an assessment of the candidate's professional performance and potential, as appropriate to your expertise, in the following areas:
    - Teaching effectiveness and educational contributions
    - Research and/or scholarly activity, including quality, impact, and productivity.
    - Service to the institution, profession, and/or community

3. Comment on the overall quality, originality, impact, and progression of the candidate's work, and the extent to which it contributes to the advancement of the discipline or profession.

4. Indicate whether, in your opinion, the candidate meets the standards for promotion to [proposed rank] at your institution or comparable institutions.

Your evaluation will become an important part of the review process. It will be treated as confidential to the extent permitted by applicable law and institutional policy.

We would appreciate receiving your letter by **[insert date]**. If you are unable to provide an evaluation, please let us know at your earliest convenience.

Please send your letter of evaluation to:

Dr. (department head), Head
Department of _____
School of Health Professions
Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center
1900 Gravier St. (or other if appropriate)
New Orleans, LA 70112

Sincerely,

Department Head
Department of __xxxxxxxx_____
School of Health Professions
Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center
1900 Gravier St. (or other if appropriate)
New Orleans, LA 70112
Phone: 504 -xxx-xxxx
Email: xxxxxx@lsuhsc.edu

Enclosures: (1) Summary of promotion and tenure standards
(2) Candidate X's dossier

**Appendix D: Track Change Agreement (Tenure Track ↔ Clinical Track)**
**LSUHSC - School of Health Professions**

**Faculty Information**

- **Name:** _____
- **Department/Program:** _____
- **Current Rank:** _____
- **Current Track:** ☐ Tenure Track ☐ Clinical Track

**Requested Change**

- **New Track:** ☐ Tenure Track ☐ Clinical Track
- **Effective Date of Change:** _____

**Rationale for Change**

(Brief description of reason for track change; may include changes in role, responsibilities, or career goals.)







**Assigned Responsibilities in New Track** (Indicate primary areas of effort; approximate % if applicable)

- Teaching: _____%
- Scholarship/Research: _____%
- Service/Clinical Practice: _____%

**Tenure Status and Timeline *(if applicable)***

- Tenure Status at Time of Change:
  ☐ Not applicable (clinical track)
  ☐ Pre-tenure (on tenure track)
  ☐ Tenured
- Years Completed in Tenure Track Prior to Change: _____ years.
- Tenure Clock After Track Change:
  ☐ Continues (credit given for prior years)
  ☐ Other (specify): _____
- Tenure Review Deadline (Applicable to faculty on tenure track): _____

**Eligibility for Promotion/Tenure After Change**

- All future promotion and/or tenure evaluations will follow the standards, procedures, and criteria outlined in the SAHP P&T Guidelines, consistent with assigned responsibilities in the new track.

**Acknowledgment of Policy**

The faculty member acknowledges that:

- This is a one-time track change in accordance with LSUHSC-NO policy.
- Tenure (if applicable) must be achieved in accordance with LSU System PM-23 and SAHP guidelines.
- Tenure is not granted through a change in track and must be earned through the established review process.

**Approvals**

**Faculty Member**
Signature: _____ Date: _____

**Department Head**
Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

**Dean**
Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

**Administrative Use**

- Date Received by Department: _____
- Effective Date Approved by Dean: _____
- Date Sent to VCAA:
- Personnel File Updated (Department/HR/Faculty Affairs): ☐ Yes ☐ No
  --- Updated by: _____
  --- Date: _____

## Appendices E. EXPECTATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD

A. Refer each newly appointed member to this *Faculty Promotion and Tenure Procedures, Standards and Criteria* and related documents including those listed in Section IV.

B. Provide guidance and encouragement to faculty members concerning expectations, resources, and opportunities for their professional achievements in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

C. Provide feedback related to annual and formative reviews. These reviews should demonstrate continued progression throughout the academic career.

D. Remind faculty on the tenure track that a formative review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee is <u>required</u> after completion of three years of service.

E. Inform faculty on the tenure track when their dossier for promotion and tenure review should be submitted. Dossier submission is due October 1 and will occur in either the $5^{th}$ or $6^{th}$ year of service, depending on the date of hire.

F. For part-time faculty, the department head shall ensure that workload assignments and annual evaluations clearly define proportional expectations in teaching, scholarship, and service.

# Appendices F. FACTORS CONSIDERED BY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE IN ASSESSING A CANDIDATE'S DOSSIER

The information should be succinctly stated, be applicable to the candidate's performance in rank or while at the Health Sciences Center and should clearly portray the candidate's activities.

A. Teaching

1. Effort and scope

- Time devoted to teaching activities
- Student enrollment in courses taught.
- Number of students supervised (e.g., clinical, research, advising).

2. Roles and responsibilities

- Level of responsibility in teaching (e.g., course director, lecturer, lab instructor, clinical educator).
- Development or coordination of courses, labs, or curricula.

3. Quality and excellence

- Evidence of teaching effectiveness and excellence.
- Innovations in teaching methods or curriculum design.
- Impact on student learning, engagement, and outcomes.

B. Research and Scholarly Activities

1. Effort and productivity

- Time devoted to research and scholarly work.
- Quantity and type of scholarly outputs (e.g., publications, presentations, scholarly products).

2. Impact and recognition

- Impact on the department, School, University, and broader field.
- External peer recognition (e.g., citations, invited presentations, collaborations).
- Evidence that work is innovative or at the cutting edge.

3. Dissemination and quality

- Publications in reputable and/or high-impact journals.
- Evidence of dissemination beyond the individual's department.

- Adoption or use of scholarly work by others.

4. Grants and funding
    - Grant submissions and awarded funding are considered part of scholarly activity.
    - Role on grants (e.g., PI, Co-PI, investigator, collaborator, site leader, consultant).
    - Competitiveness and significance of funding sources.

5. Standards for inclusion

    - Scholarly work must demonstrate rigor and accessibility.
    - Unpublished reports or work with limited scope/availability are generally not sufficient evidence.

C. Service

1. Effort and scope

    - Time devoted to service activities

2. Areas of contribution

    - Service to the department, School, and University.
    - Service to the profession (e.g., organizations, editorial work).
    - Service to the community and/or patient populations.

3. Impact and excellence

    - Contribution to institutional mission and advancement.
    - Leadership roles and meaningful engagement.
    - Evidence of effectiveness and excellence in service.

D. Special Considerations: Human Development Center (HDC) Faculty

1. Service expectations

    - Recognize that HDC faculty/staff are often 100% extramurally funded through non-research grants and contracts.
    - Non-research related grants and contracts do not fall under the category of research and scholarship.
    - Service expectations to the School/University may reasonably differ from standard faculty roles.

2. Contextual evaluation

- Excessive institutional service requirements may fall outside funded responsibilities.
- Evaluation should consider alignment between funded roles and expected service contributions.

3. Clinical appointment context

    - Additional consideration for faculty with clinical appointments at HDC
    - Acknowledge that tenure represents a broader institutional role beyond employment arrangements.