

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL CENTER

POLICY NUMBER: AG CENTER PS-42

VERSION: 4

EFFECTIVE: February 12, 1987

REVISED: April 1, 2024

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER: VP, Human Resource Management

CATEGORY: Research, Extension & Academics

PROMOTION AND TENURE

I. PURPOSE

This policy establishes the guidelines and criteria that govern the promotion and tenure of LSU Agricultural Center research and extension faculty. It applies to the following ranks and their equivalents:

Field Faculty (term faculty appointments)

Assistant Agent, Associate Agent, Agent

Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (indeterminate faculty appointments)

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

Other Non-Tenure Track Faculty (term faculty appointments)

Assistant Professor-Extension, Assistant Professor-Research, Associate Professor-Extension, Associate Professor-Research, Professor-Extension, Professor-Research, Assistant Communications Specialist, Associate Communications Specialist, Communications Specialist

Validation of scholarly pursuit on the part of the faculty member involves objective peer, supervisor, and/or clientele review as appropriate. The following sections provide details on general promotion and retention review procedures.

II. PROMOTION CRITERIA

Central to the accomplishment of the mission of the LSU Agricultural Center is a faculty with high levels of technical, educational, and public service skills. General expectations with respect to position, function, and performance for all faculty must be organizationally consistent, well-defined, and articulated to all faculty if the organization is going to be effective in its mission. Scholarship forms the basis for performance expectations as outlined in this policy.

Scholarship means the relevance, manner, and effectiveness of faculty in the execution of extension, research and/or service activities. Scholarship includes program creativity, discovery, delivery, initiative, evaluation, and service activities that contribute to the existing body of knowledge and improve the understanding, communication, delivery and adoption of ideas or concepts based on technical findings. Faculty programs and activities are to be needs-driven and science-based. The results are to be value-enhancing for AgCenter clientele. Because inputs, protocols, methods, and outputs associated with extension, research and service activities vary, it is important that there be clarity concerning the global expectations for each that reflects scholarship of the individual in the AgCenter.

The following sections address scholarship with respect to each of the functional areas that contribute to the mission of the LSU AgCenter. A job description that reflects the title and responsibilities of the individual faculty member will serve as a reference point from which to begin the evaluation.

A. Extension

Faculty with extension appointments are expected to develop and implement mission-based educational programs that have a positive impact on the clientele. Included in this expectation are individual diligence, creativity, initiative, teamwork with extension and research faculty, and demonstrated leadership in combination with intellectual vigor to achieve favorable results. The focus of scholarship in extension is grounded in subject matter proficiency, outreach initiatives and technology transfer that leads to adoption, program innovation and continued faculty development activities as appropriate for position responsibilities. Evaluation criteria and evidence of scholarship in work will be used to determine promotion. Examples of these activities are presented in [Appendix A](#).

B. Research

Faculty with research appointments are expected to conduct applied and/or basic mission-based research. This includes efficient development and delivery of scientific knowledge, including teamwork with extension and research faculty, intellectual property, and services resulting from basic, adaptive, and applied research conducted by single scientists or teams. These should add to the existing body of knowledge and improve understanding, communication, and delivery of new and enhanced concepts. The focus of scholarship in research will be based on project description and position responsibilities. Evidence of these will include authorship of publications, intellectual property development, external funding activities, professional and clientele presentations and faculty development activities. Examples of research scholarship criteria are contained in [Appendix A](#).

C. Teaching

Faculty with teaching appointments through the College of Agriculture are expected to develop an outstanding instructional program. Teaching faculty members must maintain their overall teaching load (e.g., courses per teaching FTE), offer class materials in relation to each course's credit hour designation, and contribute to departmental curriculum development. Teaching faculty members are expected to inspire life-long learning using active and collaborative learning, cutting-edge technology, and the integration of research into the classroom. Evaluation criteria and evidence of teaching contributions and quality will be used to determine promotion. Criteria and documentation for the teaching function can be found in [Appendix A](#).

D. Service

Service, as a subset of the above functions, is expected of each faculty member in areas pertaining to the conduct and effectiveness of the LSU AgCenter's mission. Such activities are to be conducted in a manner that reflects the scholarly expectations of the faculty member's position responsibilities. This expectation includes participation in internal and external committees, taskforces and outreach activities that enhance delivery and conduct of the faculty members' position responsibilities. Examples of service activities are found in [Appendix A](#).

III. DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS AND TIMEFRAME

The faculty member is responsible for preparing and submitting the appropriate documentation to initiate promotion and tenure proceedings. This will generally follow consultation with their immediate supervisor.

Documentation will include the official Promotion/Tenure Review Request Form and supporting documentation to adequately demonstrate that the faculty member meets the required criteria. Also included will be a copy of the current job description.

The specific time frame for submission and review of promotion documentation will be detailed in memoranda distributed annually. Faculty will be provided with a date (typically July 1) and method by which they must report their intention to submit a promotion and tenure request. Generally, completed promotion and tenure documents will be due to HRM in late summer. The entire process, including approval by the LSU President and Board of Supervisors, is usually completed in April or May of the following year.

The standard for an early P&T review is rare and should only be considered if the research, teaching, or extension record is truly exceptional and the candidate is invited by a (preferably) unanimous recommendation from the senior faculty at the departmental level. A review is considered early if it is one or more years before the typical five-year review for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion to full professor is considered early if it is one or more years before the fifth year at the associate professor level. The candidate can withdraw from an early review and reapply in future P&T cycles. A candidate's unfavorable early decision does not preclude future reviews. Even though a candidate goes up early, dates for the normal tenure process remain intact.

All candidates have the right to initiate a review in any year. A candidate may voluntarily withdraw from a review at any stage prior to the submission of recommendations to the Vice President. Such withdrawal must be in writing.

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS

The faculty member's supervisor is responsible for ensuring that adequate feedback is available to the faculty member in years leading up to preparation of the promotion and tenure document. The supervisor, as part of annual reviews and in routine interactions, should counsel the faculty member on professional development and progress toward promotion and tenure. Within six months of hire, the department head

must appoint a mentoring committee to meet on a regular basis with the faculty member to offer suggestions and constructive criticism. Mentoring committees must provide written feedback to the candidate following scheduled meetings at least once per year.

A. Unit Review

Promotion documentation must be reviewed, and a vote taken of senior faculty in the candidate's primary unit (parish, region, station, department, school, etc.). Relative to agent and communications ranks, the vote is taken of all higher-ranking agents or specialists. Relative to professorial ranks, the vote is taken of tenured faculty senior in rank to the candidate, with tenured associate professors considered to be of higher rank than tenure-track associate professors.

1. PROFESSORIAL RANKS & EQUIVALENTS (TENURE AND NON-TENURE TRACK)

- a. If there are fewer than five senior faculty in the primary unit, appropriate senior faculty from a similar knowledge area or discipline from outside the unit must be added by the unit administrator (department head, school director, regional director or equivalent) to bring the review committee to at least five members. In addition, if a tenure track or tenured faculty member has a joint appointment between two units, eligible faculty from the secondary unit should be added to the review committee so that the final committee reflects the approximate percentage appointment in each unit. The head of the primary unit will determine the number of additional faculty needed and will contact the unit head of the secondary unit to obtain names of faculty to be added to the committee. This is optional for non-tenure track faculty.
- b. The immediate supervisor and/or department head/regional director, school director or equivalent must identify faculty members at other universities with similar responsibilities and of higher rank to serve as external reviewers. There must be at least three external reviewer letters from those who meet this criterion included in the submission.
 - i. The faculty member may recommend individuals who should be considered as external reviewers.
 - ii. The immediate supervisor should consult with the eligible voting faculty members to identify the final list of external reviewers.
 - iii. Considerations in identifying appropriate external reviewers should include such factors as the ranking of the proposed reviewer's employing institution, involving multiple institutions, and avoiding reviewers who have had a past interaction with the candidate such as a previous employer, co-PI, or student/advisor relationship with the candidate.
 - iv. External reviewer letters may only be re-used in a candidate's submission with prior documented consent of the reviewer. A copy of such documentation must be included in the submission.

2. EXTENSION AGENT RANKS

- a. If there are fewer than five higher-ranking faculty in the primary unit, appropriate higher-ranking faculty from a similar knowledge area or discipline from outside the unit must be added by the unit administrator (department head, school director, regional director or equivalent) to bring the review committee to at least five members.
 - b. For extension parish agent positions, the voting members must include at least one higher-ranking faculty member with the same program assignment (50% or more 4-H, FCS, or agriculture) as the candidate. If necessary, a higher-ranking faculty member with the same program assignment from outside the unit must be included.
 - c. The immediate supervisor and/or regional director must identify faculty member(s) external to the parish faculty with similar responsibilities and of higher rank to serve as external reviewer(s). A minimum of three external reviewers is required.
3. For professorial ranks, the final list of external reviewers must be submitted to the appropriate Executive Associate Vice President for approval. The list should be accompanied by a short biography or explanation of credentials of each suggested reviewer.
 4. When soliciting input, the immediate supervisor will send it to the external reviewers approved by the Executive Associate Vice President a completed set of promotion forms along with the job description and other documents deemed important in an unbiased review of the individual's evaluation for promotion along with a letter outlining the reviewer's role in the review process. Copies of prior evaluations will not be sent. The documents must be sent with a cover letter outlining the reviewer's role in the review process (see Appendix D).
 5. Input from external reviewers must be made available to the voting faculty members prior to their discussion and vote.
 6. The candidate will not be advised of the names of the external reviewers, nor will information in their letters be divulged to the candidate.
 7. The sample letters found in Appendix D should be used as a guide for preparing letters soliciting input from external reviewers.
 8. Clientele reviewers may also be solicited for field faculty and tenure track faculty from clientele within the candidate's knowledge area or discipline (including commodity-based groups).
 9. The vote and *overall evaluation* must be recorded on the Promotion/Tenure Request Form.
 - a. The form must specify the number voting for and against, the number abstaining, and the number absent (as opposed to simply documenting whether the overall vote was "for" or "against"). All eligible voting faculty members in the unit must be accounted for.
 - b. Similarly, the *overall evaluation* should generally be prepared by the unit's voting members and represent their overall assessment (as opposed to listing the feedback from each voting member).

- c. For tenure-track faculty, a committee must be appointed from within the primary unit to write a faculty majority opinion letter that will be approved by the voting faculty within the primary unit and will be included in the promotion packet that goes forward. This letter will list perceived strengths and deficiencies of the candidate and should reflect the votes and evaluations of both the primary unit and same discipline reviewers.
10. The unit head may be present for the faculty discussion, but their role is generally to provide procedural or factual information.
 11. The unit head will advise the faculty member of the outcome of the unit review. Additionally, prior to forwarding the P&T request to the HRM Office, the unit head will provide the faculty member with copies of the unit head evaluation and the unit committee evaluation. The faculty member will have an opportunity to provide a written response to be included with the final P&T request.

B. Campus Review Committees

There will be two *campus* committees: faculty and unit heads. These committees will review and make recommendations on promotion documents for each AgCenter faculty member. For tenure track positions, the committees' review and recommendation will also include the issue of tenure.

1. The unit head committee will consist of all department heads, regional directors, and other unit heads of comparable rank designated by the Executive Associate Vice Presidents or Vice President to serve on this committee. Only tenured unit heads senior in rank to the candidate may vote, though this does not preclude their participation in the discussion. Tenured associate professors are considered to be of higher rank than tenure-track associate professors.
2. The faculty committee will be based on the following criteria.
 - a. The faculty committee will consist of 22 members, half from the rank of professor and half from the rank of agent.
 - b. Only those committee members with the rank of professor will review documents for professorial ranks. Only those committee members with the rank of agent will review documents for agent ranks.
 - c. It is intended that the committee be representative of the AgCenter's various disciplines, functions, organizational units, etc. In selecting committee members, the following are considerations.
 - provide for a wide range of disciplines
 - provide appropriate representation from both extension and research functions
 - provide representation from both departments and regions (including stations and parishes)
 - provide representation across regions and departments
 - promote the principles of equal employment opportunity
3. Selection of the faculty committee annually will be as follows:

- a. Five (5) members of the elected faculty council from the ranks of **full** professor and **full** agent. The Vice President will select the five members from a list of members submitted by the Executive Associate Vice Presidents for extension and research and Executive Associate Dean (or their designee(s)) in consultation with the Faculty Council officers.
 - b. Seventeen (17) additional committee members. The Vice President will select the seventeen members from a list of eligible names submitted by the Executive Associate Vice Presidents for extension and research (or their designee(s)) in consultation with the Faculty Council officers.
4. The charge of the two campus promotion and tenure committees is as follows:
- a. to provide an objective review and recommendation.
 - b. to ensure that review and recommendation are in accordance with the performance criteria of PS-42
 - c. to ensure that review and recommendation are based on the assigned responsibilities and function of the position
 - d. to help provide consistency for the campus as a whole
5. Only committee members present at the committee review meeting will be eligible to vote.
6. The committee should include positive and negative comments for improvement and feedback to any person up for review.
- a. If the overall vote is negative, these comments are required.
 - b. Comments will not become part of the packet but will be sent to the individual candidate, the unit head, and the appropriate Executive Associate Vice President and/or Executive Associate Dean.
7. If a P&T request being considered by the Campus Faculty Review Committee is for a faculty member in the professorial ranks who is from a unit not represented on the committee, the unit head should have a representative from the unit review committee attend the portion of the Campus Faculty Review Committee meeting during which that P&T request will be heard. The role of the representative will be informational to:
- a. answer questions the committee may have about the request and/or
 - b. make a short presentation (about 5 minutes) addressing the individual's background, accomplishments, and the unit committee's rationale for its recommendation.
8. The Vice President, the Executive Associate Vice President(s), Executive Associate Dean and/or their designees will meet with each committee annually to discuss the above responsibilities.
9. The intent of this policy is for each campus committee member to be given only one vote on the promotion and tenure of any faculty member. Therefore, campus committee members who voted on the

promotion and tenure of a faculty member at the unit level may participate in campus committee discussions on that faculty member but may not cast a vote at the campus committee level.

C. Documentation and Recommendations

The votes and evaluation of all LSU AgCenter faculty described above must be recorded on the Promotion/Tenure Request Form. The documentation must be reviewed, and a recommendation made from each administrative level as applicable: parish chair or resident coordinator; department head, regional director, school director or equivalent; campus review committees; vice-chancellor(s); and Vice President. The documentation is then submitted to the president for approval.

1. The candidate faculty member will be advised in a timely manner by the unit head (regional director, department head or equivalent), either orally or in writing, of the recommendation at the unit level before forwarding the documentation to the next level. At the next levels, the candidate will be advised, either orally or in writing, of a negative recommendation before forwarding the documentation to the next level.
2. A candidate faculty member who wishes to continue the process following a negative recommendation or to discontinue the process following a positive recommendation must do so in writing.
3. A negative recommendation at any level does not prevent the request from being forwarded to the next level if the faculty member wishes to continue the process.
4. It is expected that the individual at each administrative level will consider the recommendation and information provided at previous levels. It is also expected that information may be solicited from others with knowledge of the employee's work, such as field coordinators, Executive Associate Vice President(s), Executive Associate Dean, and clientele.

D. Optional Review by Faculty in Related Areas

A faculty member may request that their promotion documents be reviewed by AgCenter faculty members outside his/her unit who have a related area of responsibility. This review is optional to the faculty member and generally should be discussed in advance with the unit head. It is in addition to the required external reviews and campus review committees. This review may be useful under several circumstances, such as where the faculty member has extensive AgCenter collaborative projects outside their unit, and the input of collaborators who are knowledgeable of the candidate's accomplishments would be beneficial or where the other faculty in the unit generally are not in the same specific discipline as the faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure. The recommendations of the related area faculty will be returned to the unit head and made available for consideration during all levels of review.

1. The review must be requested in writing and received in the unit head's office (department head, regional director, school director or equivalent) by the deadline established annually by the Vice President's office.

2. The unit head will identify a reasonable number of faculty members, not to exceed ten, who the unit head deems to have a related area of responsibility. The final list will be submitted to the appropriate Exec. Associate Vice President for approval.
3. The promotion documents will be forwarded to the related area faculty with a request that they review the documents and provide a recommendation. Their recommendations will be returned to the unit head.
4. The faculty member in question may suggest names for this committee. Those suggestions must be submitted at the same time as the written request for this review.

V. FIELD FACULTY PROMOTION REVIEW PROVISIONS

Promotion provisions of this section apply only to the following ranks: assistant agent, associate agent, and agent. The purpose of the review is to assess the faculty member's progress toward achieving scholarship in extension work.

The agents of higher rank in the faculty member's primary unit must review eligible field faculty in the unit no later than the end of the third year in rank. The review committee must include a minimum of five faculty of higher rank from the primary unit. In units without the required number of eligible faculty members, the unit's regional director must add eligible faculty from outside the primary unit. Following the review, the committee will provide a list of additional achievements, if any, needed to meet promotion criteria.

Assistant agents may serve on annual term appointments no longer than seven years within rank. Additional education and experience requirements for faculty in agent ranks, and the maximum timeframes for meeting those requirements are contained in Appendix B. Faculty in agent ranks who do not meet the requirements of Appendix B will be terminated. Appropriate promotion documents demonstrating that all requirements for promotion have been met must be submitted by the faculty member in time to allow for the full review and approval process and meet the notice requirements set forth by the Executive Associate Vice President and Director of Extension. Failure by a faculty member to submit the required documents will not extend the time allotted for term appointments to be reviewed. Such failure may cause denial of promotion and may ultimately lead to termination.

VI. TENURE-TRACK FACULTY PROMOTION REVIEW PROVISIONS

Tenure provisions of this section apply only to the following professorial ranks: assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The purpose of the review is to assess the faculty member's progress toward gaining tenure and to provide additional guidance where needed.

Tenure track faculty members generally submit their request for promotion and/or tenure on or after their fifth year of service to the university. Prior to that review, all tenure tenure-track faculty members will undergo a three-year reappointment review as outlined in Appendix C.

The tenured faculty in the candidate's primary unit must review faculty in tenure-track positions no later than the end of the third year in rank. This pre-tenure review committee must include a minimum of five tenured faculty from the primary unit. In units without the required number of eligible faculty members, appropriate faculty from outside the primary unit must be added by the unit's administrator (department head, school director, regional director or equivalent). The report of the review committee will include a list of additional achievements, if any, needed to meet promotion/tenure criteria. Copies of the documentation must be forwarded to the unit/department head or regional director.

Promotion and/or tenure reviews for non-tenured assistant professors, associate professors, and professors must be conducted no later than the latest time that will allow for completion of the process and at least a one-year notification of non-reappointment if necessary. Assistant professors may serve a maximum of seven years in that rank. Associate professors and professors may serve a maximum of five years in that rank without tenure. Nothing in this set of procedures prevents the unit head from holding more frequent reviews and more frequent reviews are encouraged.

The official Promotion/Tenure Review Request Form and supporting documentation must be submitted by the faculty member in time to allow for the full review and approval process and to meet the notice requirements of Section 2 of the By-Laws of the LSU Board of Supervisors. Failure by a faculty member to submit the required documents will not extend the time allowed on tenure-track, term appointments. Such failure may be considered a cause for denying tenure and may ultimately lead to termination.

VII. OTHER PROVISIONS

Promotion and tenure decisions will be made in accordance with the provisions of LSU System PM-23, PM-69, and the By-Laws of the LSU Board of Supervisors. Notice requirements are made following Section 2 of the By-Laws.

Promotion and tenure evaluations should be based on expectations that reflect the relative apportionment of time commitment on the candidate's job description. When evaluating candidates with split appointments, the voting faculty should base their decisions on productivity indicators that are commensurate with and appropriate for the relative extension, teaching, and/or research appointments of the candidates.

Faculty on joint appointments with the LSU and A&M College must also meet that campus's academic performance criteria applicable to the LSU and A&M College portion of their appointment.

Employees with a joint appointment with another campus should complete one set of promotion and/or tenure documents only. If the primary appointment is with the AgCenter, the format used should be that of the AgCenter. If the primary appointment is with another campus, the format used may be that of the other campus. Note that for joint teaching appointments, regardless of the percent appointment, the following criteria will apply to the AgCenter research and/or extension functions.

Faculty not in positions assigned to extension or research functions may be reviewed under this policy based on criteria applicable to their position. Per the LSU Board of Supervisors by-laws, the titles of Assistant Communications Specialist, Associate Communications Specialist, and Communications

Specialist are non-tenure track titles specifically for the LSU AgCenter Communications Department faculty who perform professional level research, educations, and outreach responsibilities which are an integral part of the research and outreach programs of the AgCenter.

All candidates have the right to initiate a review in any year. A candidate may voluntarily withdraw from a review at any stage prior to the submission of recommendations to the president. Such withdrawal must be in writing.

AgCenter PS-7, Confidentiality of Personnel Records, will govern access to records.

A faculty member will have voting rights only in the primary unit unless that faculty member has been asked to participate in the review process in another unit, typically because that unit lacks an adequate number of eligible faculty.

No faculty member may vote for the same candidate in more than one unit or make a formal recommendation at more than one level.

Preparation and submission of the appropriate documentation to initiate promotion and tenure proceedings is the responsibility of the faculty member. Failure to properly submit the appropriate documentation will not serve to extend applicable timeframes and deadlines.

Promotion and tenure decisions will be made in accordance with principles of equal employment opportunity and may not be based on age, disability, national origin, race, religion, color, sex, creed, sexual orientation, veteran's status, or marital status.

This policy statement does not increase or diminish the legally enforceable rights of the AgCenter and its employees. In such matters, provisions in PS-38 and PS-39 may be applicable.

APPENDIX A.
**CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION
AND/OR TENURE REQUESTS**

The standard Promotion and Tenure Form must be completed for each request. The request should incorporate the criteria for promotion and/or tenure described below and address the requested documentation. Note the following additional instructions.

- *Please keep all pages of the promotion/tenure review form together and attach biographical data behind Page 4 of the form.*
- *The required number of copies will be specified in annual instructions.*
- *It is recommended that documentation be included in the order provided for in PS-42 and that it be well organized and labeled.*
- *Attach to the documentation a copy of the current job description.*
- *The documentation should reference publications and similar documents, but the documents themselves should not be attached in their entirety, if at all.*
- *Employees with a joint appointment with another campus should complete one set of promotion and/or tenure documents only. HRM will route to other administrative offices as needed. If the primary appointment is with the AgCenter, the format used should be that of the AgCenter. If the primary appointment is with another campus, the format used may be that of the other campus. Note that for joint teaching appointments, regardless of the percent appointment, the following criteria will apply to the AgCenter research and/or extension functions.*

CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION FOR THE EXTENSION FUNCTION

The extension faculty member's educational program must agree theirs/her current job description and the LSU AgCenter mission. The purpose of the program is to bring about change in clientele by adoption of recommended practices. Effective educational programs should stimulate intellectual interest and enthusiasm, apply innovative teaching methods, be responsive to critical issues and produce results that can be effectively evaluated. Essential to effective educational program planning, execution and evaluation is the clientele/user group advisory process. Service to the AgCenter, LSU System and the community is expected of each faculty member. **Required documentation is as follows:**

Extension Activities - fully describe extension activities and impact and address the following items as appropriate to the position.

1. Documentation of major program areas and initiatives
2. Advisory process and critical issue responsiveness
3. Innovative teaching methods, knowledge, and application of new technology (verification programs, method, and result demonstrations, etc.)
4. Program delivery effectiveness demonstrated by evaluation, change, and adoption
5. Development and presentation of research-based materials
6. Publications (print and electronic)
7. Mass media (television, newspaper, radio) and electronic outreach (social networking, extension.org, Facebook, blogs, web pages, etc.).

8. Other educational materials such as exhibits, curriculum, lesson plans, audio tapes, videos, etc.
9. Cooperation/collaboration with other faculty
10. External funding, material support and grants
11. Refereed journal articles
12. Presentations at professional and clientele-targeted conferences
13. Participation in and leadership of professional organizations/committees
14. Continued coursework, in-service training, sabbaticals, professional improvement
15. Participation in public policy and community issues
16. Awards and recognition
17. Multi-institution, agency, and state collaboration
18. Other scholarly or creative activities or other contributions to the profession

Service Activities – as appropriate to the position, describe activities and address the following:

1. Organizations advised
2. Recruitment of students and faculty
3. University service (department, region, station, parish, committees, etc.)
4. Professional service
5. Other external and community service

CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION FOR THE RESEARCH FUNCTION

Research Program -- The faculty member's research program must agree with their CRIS project descriptions, the responsibilities of their position description, and the overall AgCenter mission. The program should be comprehensive and appropriately focused. The short or long-term benefits and probable impacts on clientele should be considered. The faculty member should be engaged in appropriate collaborative research where possible and appropriate.

Publications (including web-based) -- A faculty member should produce various publication types as senior or co-author that present new findings to the scientific community and the public. Publications may present new knowledge, new methods or be editorial contributions and should have some impact on the discipline. The most important of these are peer-reviewed research articles in significant journals of the discipline. Such publications validate program success and bring national and international recognition to the program. Books and book chapters are also significant publications. Other suitable publications include bulletins, circulars, proceedings, abstracts, and popular press.

Grant activity -- Faculty should seek extramural funding from several agencies and sources as individuals, teams, and collaborative projects. Sources of grant funding include federal and state competitive granting agencies (e.g., NSF, NRI, USDA, CSREES, IFAFS, LADEQ, etc.); commodity boards and unrestricted grants.

Professional improvement activities -- Faculty should participate in and provide leadership in national, international, regional and state professional society meetings, including annual meetings of the profession. Participation levels can include volunteer or invited presentations (oral or poster), society officer, session chair or organizer). Faculty should participate in professional seminars and technical workshops as a participant or organizer and use sabbaticals as appropriate.

Outreach -- Faculty members are expected to interact with clientele groups to the mutual benefit of the clientele, faculty member and LSU AgCenter. Outreach activities include speaker at producer-oriented forums, contact with clientele at field days and individual on-site visits to address specific problems, trade shows and expos, cooperation/ collaboration with Extension specialists and field agents (training meetings, research activities and demonstrations).

Service Activities -- Service to the faculty member's unit, the LSU AgCenter, other LSU campuses, professional organizations and societies, and the community is an important component of professional responsibility. All faculty members are expected to participate in service activities in areas pertaining to the conduct and effectiveness of the LSU AgCenter's mission. These activities may include community activities such as judging science fairs, visiting schools to promote the discipline and/or AgCenter programs, serving as major professor, committee member, or mentor of graduate students, community involvement (only as it relates to the AgCenter mission), participation in local service clubs (Lions, Rotary), serving on LSU AgCenter Committees such as Promotion and Tenure, Faculty Council, commodity groups, strategic planning, unit or departmental committees, and others as appropriate; serving in regional and national professional organizations such as editor, associate editor or reviewer of journals, officer or session chair; serving as a resource for clientele in the state or region. Other service activities would include direct clientele contact through field days and other presentations, assisting field agents and professionals with preparing and presenting educational material, and maintaining educational websites.

Required documentation is as follows:

Research Activities - fully describe research activities and impact and address the following items as appropriate to the position.

1. Listing of research publications (published items only)
2. Listing of other publications accepted for publication but not yet published
3. Other creative and artistic contributions
4. Participation in professional meetings, symposia, workshops, and conferences (other than artistic performances)
5. Other scholarly or creative activities or other contributions to the profession
6. Other awards, lectureships, or prizes that show recognition of scholarly or artistic achievement
7. Research support/grant activities
8. Theses/dissertations directed (numbers only)
9. Major areas of research interest
10. Outreach – field days, tradeshow, direct clientele contact
11. Cooperative/collaborative efforts with other faculty
12. Community involvement (as it relates to the AgCenter mission)
13. Overall program impact

Service Activities – as appropriate to the position, describe activities and address the following:

1. Organizations advised
2. Recruitment of students and faculty
3. University service (department, region, station, parish, committees, etc.)
4. Professional service

5. Other external and community service

CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION FOR THE TEACHING FUNCTION

Faculty with a joint appointment with another campus for the teaching function must also address the teaching function as appropriate by submitting the **documentation** listed below. Note that the other campus's guidelines for teaching documentation may be consulted.

1. Documentation of teaching activities and effectiveness
2. Listing of publications concerning instruction
3. Listing of publications concerning instruction accepted for publication but not yet published
4. Participation in professional meetings, symposia, workshops, and conferences on teaching and local instructional activities
5. Other instructional activities or other contributions to the profession
6. Awards, lectureships, or prizes that show recognition of teaching achievement
7. Support/grant activities

APPENDIX B.
EXPERIENCE AND EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS
FOR PROMOTION OF EXTENSION AGENTS

LSU System PM-23 establishes the minimum requirements for appointment and promotion involving the ranks of assistant agent, associate agent, and agent. This Appendix establishes additional LSU Agricultural Center education and experience requirements.

1. The maximum period a faculty member may serve at the Assistant Agent rank is seven (7) years. Assistant Agents who have not met all necessary requirements in time for promotion to the rank of associate agent by the end of seven years will be terminated.
2. In addition to meeting criteria for promotion in Appendix A, promotion to the rank of ASSOCIATE AGENT requires that the agent have either:
 - a. a minimum of three (3) years of extension experience (as of the July 1 *prior* to submission of the promotion documents) and a master's degree or 15 hours of successful graduate-level coursework in appropriate and approved disciplines OR
 - b. six (6) years of extension experience.
3. Promotion to the rank of AGENT requires:
 - a. a minimum of eight (8) years of extension experience (as of July 1 *prior* to submission of the promotion documents) AND
 - b. a master's degree in an appropriate discipline.
4. No faculty member will be promoted to the agent rank (full) without a master's degree.
5. Agents will have two years from the date of employment to complete the required extension coursework or they will be terminated. When circumstances justify it and with prior written approval of the Regional Director, the coursework deadline may be extended an additional year.
6. It is the extension faculty member's (agent's) responsibility to meet the above requirements.

APPENDIX C.
PROCEDURE FOR TENURE-TRACK
FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT REVIEWS

1. General Guidelines

Generally, a person entering a tenure-track appointment is initially offered a three-year appointment that carries no assurance of reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Reappointment is made solely at the discretion of the AgCenter and the College of Agriculture. To be reappointed, tenure-track candidates must demonstrate reasonable progress toward meeting the criteria for the award of tenure.

2. Responsible Parties and Duties

Unit Head: The unit leader will notify the department faculty of the faculty member's years of service toward tenure and the end date of the current term. The Unit Head is responsible for administering the procedure outlined herein.

Faculty Member: The faculty member is responsible for preparing their CV and supporting materials for review by the department faculty and unit head in accordance with parameters established by the unit head. Reference AgCenter PS-42 for guidance on relevant materials to be included.

Mentor/Advisory Committee: The advisory committee is responsible for meeting with the faculty member regularly in the period leading up to the review to offer suggestions and constructive criticism relative to the faculty member's scholarly activities and progress towards tenure. The committee should provide the unit head with a written report of the faculty member's progress at least annually. The committee should consider providing more frequent reports to the unit head if there are concerns.

Department/Unit Faculty: The department faculty are responsible for reviewing the prepared scholarly materials and providing their recommendation to the unit head regarding the reappointment of the faculty member. Only faculty at a higher rank than the faculty member being considered may participate in the review.

3. Procedure

a. Timeline

The AgCenter's promotion and tenure cycle begins on July 1 each year. Reappointment reviews are normally conducted following the third year of service. The reappointment review will occur based on the dates provided in the initial offer of employment, taking into consideration any previously approved extension of the tenure clock request.

b. Steps within the Unit

- i. Reappointment reviews will be conducted by the eligible voting faculty. The unit leader will give the faculty member appropriate notice of not less than 30 days to provide their updated CV and a comprehensive report documenting their scholarly and professional activities.

- ii. The unit leader will provide a copy of the faculty member's CV and supporting documentation to any secondary unit in which the faculty member has at least a 25% appointment. Written input from these units will be added to the faculty member's file.
- iii. The unit leader will schedule a faculty meeting for all eligible voting faculty to consider the file, discuss the faculty member's job performance, and vote on whether to recommend reappointment. The unit leader will not be included in the vote. The results of the vote and the report of the departmental recommendation will be placed in the faculty member's file.
- iv. The unit leader will consider the report of the eligible voting faculty and will prepare a statement for the file indicating the unit leader's recommendation on reappointment.
- v. The unit leader will meet with the faculty member to communicate the recommendation, provide copies of the departmental reports, and explain the options and procedural steps that will follow. The faculty member has the right to provide a formal letter of response or rebuttal, with materials in support thereof, within seven calendar days of the meeting with their unit head. The unit leader must include any response in the faculty member's file.
- vi. The faculty member must sign the unit leader's report and recommendation.

c. Report to the VP for Agriculture

The unit leader will provide the VP with the department's faculty vote and report, the unit leader's recommendation, and any response from the faculty member. Generally, the VP will make the final decision. The VP will communicate their decision to the unit leader. If the decision is not to reappoint, the unit leader will in a timely fashion meet with the faculty member to communicate the non-reappointment decision and provide written notice of non-reappointment. A sample letter can be provided by AgCenter HRM.

APPENDIX D.
SAMPLE LETTERS

Sample Letter to External Reviewer I
Typically for Reviewers External to the LSU System

Dear _____:

[Candidate name], who is currently a [academic rank – assistant/associate professor or assistant/associate agent] in the [unit], is being considered for promotion to [proposed rank] [with tenure – *professorial ranks only*]. [She/he] has a ____% research, ____% extension, and ____ teaching%* appointment. I would appreciate your help in evaluating [her/his] contributions through your response to the following:

State if you know the candidate personally. If so, how long and in what capacity have you known the candidate?

Rank the candidate against other scholars in the same discipline with similar time in rank.

Comment upon the degree of recognition already achieved by the candidate in [his/her] discipline, noting any distinctive contributions.

Evaluate the scope and significance of the candidate's scholarly interests and activities in terms of their importance and [his/her] promise for further growth as a scholar.

Comment on the candidate's contributions to [his/her] discipline.

Evaluate the candidate's degree of university and professional service.

Provide any additional insights that may be helpful in evaluating the candidate for promotion [and/or tenure].

For your convenience, I have enclosed [candidate name's] vitae, job description, and supporting materials.

* I would appreciate a reply by [DATE].

The published LSU Agricultural Center policy stipulates that letters of evaluation will be regarded as confidential and will not be provided to the candidate. Unless you state explicitly that the letter is not to be regarded as confidential, your letter and identity will be shared only with those individuals who are authorized to review and make recommendations on the candidate. The only exception to this policy would come in the event of a direct court order to release the data on a specific candidate to that candidate or his/her representative(s).

The LSU Agricultural Center appreciates your help in this matter. If you need further information, please contact me at [phone #], [fax #], or [email address].

Sincerely,

Unit Head

***Do not send copies of evaluations, letters of recommendation or other materials of a similar nature.**

Sample Letter to External Reviewer II
Typically for Reviewers External to the Unit, But Not the
AgCenter – Generally Applies to Agent Ranks

Dear _____:

[Candidate name], who is currently an extension [academic rank – assistant/associate agent] in the [unit], is being considered for promotion to [proposed rank]. I would appreciate your help in evaluating [her/his] contributions through your response to the following:

State if you know the candidate personally. If so, how long and in what capacity have you known the candidate?

Rank the candidate against other scholars in the same area with similar time in rank.

Comment upon the degree of recognition already achieved by the candidate in [his/her] area, noting any distinctive contributions.

Evaluate the scope and significance of the candidate's scholarly interests and activities in terms of their importance and [his/her] promise for further growth as a scholar.

Comment on the candidate's contributions to [his/her] area.

Comment on the candidate's contributions to [his/her] clientele.

Evaluate the candidate's degree of university and professional service.

Provide any additional insights that may be helpful in evaluating the candidate for promotion [and/or tenure].

For your convenience, I have enclosed [candidate name's] vitae, job description, and supporting materials.

* I would appreciate a reply by [DATE].

The published LSU Agricultural Center policy stipulates that letters of evaluation will be regarded as confidential and will not be provided to the candidate. Unless you state explicitly that the letter is not to be regarded as confidential, your letter and identity will be shared only with those individuals who are authorized to review and make recommendations on the candidate. The only exception to this policy would come in the event of a direct court order to release the data on a specific candidate to that candidate or his/her representative(s).

Thank you for your help in this matter. If you need further information, please contact me at [phone #], [fax #], or [email address].

Sincerely,

Unit Head

****Do not send copies of evaluations, letters of recommendation or other materials of a similar nature.***

Sample Letter to External Reviewer III
Typically for Reviewers External to the AgCenter
Who Are Clientele – Generally Applies to Agent Ranks

Dear _____:

[Candidate name], who is currently an extension [academic rank – assistant/associate agent] in the [unit], is being considered for promotion to [proposed rank]. I would appreciate your help in evaluating [her/his] contributions through your response to the following:

State if you know the candidate personally. If so, how long and in what capacity have you known the candidate?

If possible, rank the candidate against other faculty members you are familiar with who have similar job responsibilities and time in rank.

Comment upon the degree of recognition already achieved by the candidate in [his/her] area, noting any distinctive contributions.

Evaluate the scope and significance of the candidate's activities in terms of their importance and [his/her] promise for further development.

Comment on the candidate's contributions to [his/her] clientele.

Provide any additional insights that may be helpful in evaluating the candidate for promotion [and/or tenure].

For your convenience, I have enclosed [candidate name's] vitae, job description, and supporting materials.

* I would appreciate a reply by [DATE].

The published LSU Agricultural Center policy stipulates that letters of evaluation will be regarded as confidential and will not be provided to the candidate. Unless you state explicitly that the letter is not to be regarded as confidential, your letter and identity will be shared only with those individuals who are authorized to review and make recommendations on the candidate. The only exception to this policy would come in the event of a direct court order to release the data on a specific candidate to that candidate or his/her representative(s).

Thank you for your help in this matter. If you need further information, please contact me at [phone #], [fax #], or [email address].

Sincerely,

Unit Head

****Do not send copies of evaluations, letters of recommendation or other materials of a similar nature.***