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I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Introduction

Promotion and tenure are separate actions, but they have a common basis in that each represents a judgment by those responsible that the candidate has rendered not only acceptable but outstanding service to the university. Each of these actions represents a firm endorsement by the university and is therefore carefully considered by all concerned before being approved. This document endeavors to facilitate these processes by clarifying policy and procedures for promotion and tenure at each rank.

In some instances, promotion automatically confers tenure. It is understood that the promotion and tenure process is an outgrowth of the annual evaluation process. The criteria listed below in this document are more fully elaborated in the annual evaluation document.

The key administrative official in recommending promotion or tenure for library faculty is the dean. In general, the library faculty will provide the most reliable professional judgment as to whether promotion or tenure is deserved. All eligible faculty members have a collegial responsibility and obligation to participate fully in this process, including attendance at all meetings. This assessment will occur after examination of all pertinent data which will include an external review of a candidate’s professional or scholarly work and service activities. The dean will take pains to consult thoroughly with all appropriate members of the faculty, as set forth below. It must be remembered, however, that other administrative officials are required to act upon the recommendations made by the dean, either granting or declining to grant endorsement in each instance. Candidates for promotion and tenure must therefore be careful not to assume that the dean’s recommendation is final. University of Louisiana System (ULS) regulations require that the Library Dean, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President all review and act upon recommendations for promotion and tenure. It must be emphasized too that no recommendation becomes official until it has been approved by the ULS Board of Supervisors.

The dean will make certain that all candidates for promotion and tenure are fully apprised of the aforementioned review process. By the September faculty meeting, the dean will review and refer to the promotion and tenure document discussing the central elements of the evaluative criteria to be applied to each candidate. Every current faculty member should have a copy of the library’s latest guidelines, as well as a copy of the university and ULS policies and procedures.

Immediately upon appointment, a new Library faculty member will be given a copy of the documents “University of New Orleans Earl K. Long Library Policies and Procedures for Promotion in Academic Rank and for Tenure,” along with copies of university and ULS policies, by Library Administration. The Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee) will schedule a meeting with the new faculty member(s) within six weeks to present a brief overview of the P&T process and assign mentors. In six to nine months, the P&T Committee will schedule a more detailed review. The P&T Committee remains available for consultation with faculty at any time throughout the year.

General UL System policy regarding promotion and tenure is set forth in Chapter III (Faculty and Staff) Section XI (Tenure). General UNO campus policy regarding promotion is set forth in “University of New Orleans Procedures for Promotion in Academic Rank and for Tenure.” Always check for the most recent documents through Academic Affairs. The specific criteria and procedures that follow are in accordance with these documents. Tenure reviews must be conducted during the sixth year for all assistant professors and no later than the fourth year of service for all associate and full professors.
Promotion

Promotion recommendations are submitted by the dean, after consultation with the appropriate members of the library faculty to ascertain that all criteria have been met. Annual evaluations of all aspects of performance will provide evidence of meeting these criteria.

It should be noted that mere length of service in one rank and competent performance of one’s assigned duties do not in themselves constitute cause for promotion to the next academic rank. Promotions are always based upon merit and outstanding achievement. All faculty are expected to contribute to the mission of the university through effective professional performance as a librarian, professional or scholarly research, and service to the university, the profession, and the community.

Decisions on promotion to the tenured ranks are most important; before recommending such a promotion, the faculty must be convinced that the candidate will be a valuable member of the library faculty on an ongoing basis. While at every stage of the promotion process the promotion/tenure file contains materials from the candidate’s entire professional career, it is assumed that a promotion or tenure decision will focus primarily on the time period starting with employment at UNO or since the candidate’s last promotion at UNO.

Tenure

The regulations governing tenure and appointment for librarians are generally comparable to those for assistant and associate professors and professors.

In the majority of cases, tenure is achieved upon promotion to the rank of associate professor. Exceptions will normally occur only when (a) a person is promoted to, or reappointed as, associate professor or professor with less than five years of full-time service, in which case tenure is not awarded simultaneously, or (b) a person is reappointed as assistant professor after seven years of full-time service in that rank, in which case tenure is awarded without promotion. The latter will occur in those cases where a person has not earned promotion to associate professor, yet has been deemed so valuable to the university as to warrant tenure.

The general policy of the university is to award tenure no earlier than the time denoted in the regulations, namely upon reappointment after the fourth year of full-time service for associate and full professors, and upon reappointment after the seventh year of full-time service in rank for assistant professors. Exceptions to this policy are rare.
II. LIBRARY FACULTY RANKS

Assistant Professor

The following minimum criteria have been established for appointment to the rank of assistant professor:

(a) The appropriate terminal degree. The terminal degree for library faculty is a master’s degree in library/information science from an ALA-accredited library school.

(b) An expectation of successful overall performance and the potential for a promising career in librarianship is required. The record achieved in training for librarianship and letters of recommendation from teachers or employers, especially the most recent employer, shall be acceptable evidence of this expectation and potential.

Associate Professor

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

(a) Normally, at least three years’ time-in-rank as assistant professor at the University of New Orleans.

(b) Most critically, meritorious performance of the librarian’s duties, which may include teaching, either formal or informal, and service within the library on committees, task forces, working groups, etc.

(c) Sufficient research of high quality to indicate the beginning of a significant scholarly career in librarianship. Both publications and other appropriate scholarly activity will be considered. Publications may include books, book chapters, articles, and reviews which have actually been published OR accepted for publication. The candidate’s file should include publications in the field of librarianship, but if s/he has other areas of subject expertise, work in those fields will be additional justification for promotion. Published indexes, bibliographies, and bibliographic databases are considered to be within the field of librarianship by virtue of their format. Other scholarly activities may include papers presented at meetings (not merely abstracts or proposals), editorial activities, media presentations, websites, etc.

(d) Beginning of meritorious work in the following: service to the profession, service to the university, and public/community service.

NOTE: In certain circumstances, promotion to associate professor will confer tenure automatically, under university regulations. This occurs when the candidate will have already served as a full-time faculty member on this campus for at least five years at the time the promotion to associate professor takes effect.

It is the department chair’s responsibility to make a clear and convincing case why tenure should be awarded. Specific evidence of the candidate’s professional achievements in librarianship and concrete detail in support of the department chair’s evaluations will be required.

While all of the above criteria must normally be met, it is conceivable that, in some instances, truly outstanding achievement in the performance category will carry sufficient weight to balance work that is adequate, but less than outstanding, in others. In such instances, it is the responsibility of the department chair to present a compelling case for tenure, including specific, detailed information that will allow reviewing officials to make an informed evaluation of the recommendation. Such cases, however, will constitute rare exceptions to the normal policy. Outstanding service or research can never compensate for inadequate job performance.

In all tenure decisions it is to be emphasized that, in addition to the qualifications of the individual candidate for tenure, the general academic needs of the university are an important consideration.

Rev. 10/2018
Professor

For promotion to the rank of professor, all of the following criteria must be met:

(a) Normally, at least five years’ time-in-rank as associate professor at the University of New Orleans

(b) Most critically, meritorious performance of the librarian’s duties, which may include teaching, either formal or informal and service within the library on committees, task forces, working groups, etc.

(c) A record of outstanding and substantial publication and other appropriate scholarly activity (as defined above in (c) under Associate Professor) on a sustained basis.

(d) Either significant and sustained service to the profession, or outstanding contributions to the development and progress of the university.

(e) Evidence that the activities in (b)-(d) above have continued since promotion to the rank of associate professor.

(f) Evidence of high professional standing (e.g., as is documented by response from the off-campus review).

While all of the above criteria must normally be met, it is conceivable that, in an extremely rare instance, truly outstanding job performance may carry sufficient weight to balance research or service that is adequate, but less than outstanding. However, outstanding service or research can never compensate for inadequate job performance. In such instances, it is the responsibility of the department chair to present a compelling case for promotion, including specific, detailed information that will allow reviewing officials to make an informed evaluation of the recommendation. Such cases, however, will constitute rare exceptions to the normal policy.
III. PROCEDURES

Promotion and Tenure

Each year, every faculty member who would meet the time-in-rank requirements by the projected effective date of the promotion and tenure activities must be considered for promotion. It is the responsibility of the dean to ensure that this is done. The only exception is that a faculty member may decline to be considered for promotion using the form mentioned below (Appendix B.2).

Recommendations for promotion should be made only after the members of the library faculty with tenure and senior rank to the candidate have been consulted and have expressed themselves on the recommendation to be made. In cases where promotion will confer tenure, all faculty members with tenure must be consulted.

The procedures for making decisions about tenure are similar to those for making decisions about promotions, in that the dean will provide ample opportunity for the candidate to update his or her file; will consult with appropriate members of the faculty before reaching a decision; and will keep candidates apprised of their status during the review process. Specific procedures are outlined below. Promotions to the associate level are handled at the same time as tenure decisions, because the procedures are so similar.

It should be noted that tenure, unlike promotion, is attained upon reappointment after a stated number of years. Hence the dean will take every precaution to ensure that all faculty members who could potentially attain tenure are reviewed at the appropriate time, as indicated below.

To implement these policies, the library will observe the schedules and instructions provided by Academic Affairs (check for documents on Academic Affairs website), given in Appendices B.1-2 and the following procedures:

1. The dean will send written notification to each person eligible for consideration, and s/he will either agree to be reviewed or decline to be reviewed (Appendix B.2). Failure to reply to the notice will result in an automatic review of the candidate. Those being reviewed will be provided a calendar outlining what is required and when (Appendix B.1). It is the candidate’s responsibility to provide a complete, accurate, and up-to-date promotion dossier, as outlined in Appendix C.2, “Structure of Faculty Promotion/Tenure Review File,” particularly noting any work which in their opinion may otherwise escape attention. It is also the candidate’s responsibility to select and provide those items which will be sent to external reviewers following the schedule in Appendix B.1. The dean will assume responsibility for making available to faculty members of the appropriate rank a complete file for each candidate, as given in Appendix C.2. These materials will include the external assessments of the candidate’s professional or scholarly work and service activities.

PROCEDURES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW begin on p. 9.

2. (a) At the appropriate faculty meeting prior to promotional deliberations, a pool of names composed of all librarians senior in rank to those being considered will be assembled. A subcommittee of three librarians for each candidate will be drawn from this pool by lot. The first name drawn will convene a meeting of the subcommittee within one week and the elected chair’s name will be reported to the library faculty. The candidate’s chair shall be ineligible for membership on the subcommittee. Usually, no faculty member shall be required to serve on more than one subcommittee in an academic year. The dates and times of the formal promotion and tenure meetings will be established at this same faculty meeting. Sufficient advance notice should assure that a simple majority will be present at these important meetings.

(b) The subcommittee will be charged with reviewing each candidate’s dossier, and meeting with the candidate and the candidate’s chair and/or supervisor. The meeting with the candidate’s chair is to discuss job performance. The subcommittee’s meeting with the candidate is to help understand the nature of the candidate’s daily responsibilities, to discuss publications and service activities, and to afford the candidate an opportunity to present information to the subcommittee.
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Written reminder of the review meeting will be given by Library Administration at least one week in advance to all faculty members eligible to take part in the review of the candidate, along with a reminder that the candidate’s file is available for consultation. At the beginning of the scheduled meeting, the dean will refer to the Promotion and Tenure document, discussing the central elements of the evaluative criteria to be applied to the candidate. From a minimum of notes, the subcommittee chair will then report strengths and weaknesses verbally. The subcommittee will make no recommendation regarding the promotion of the candidate. The meeting will be conducted so as to require full participation by all senior faculty members, including the department chair and the dean who ordinarily will make his/her comments last. Each member of the group is expected to discuss the materials presented, to ask questions, and to offer further information and judgments, focusing on first-hand knowledge relevant to Promotion and Tenure criteria. Confidentiality must be strictly maintained. Any notes taken during the entire process could be considered a matter of public record. Should a simple majority of eligible faculty not be present for the meeting, it will be rescheduled. 

On the day following the meeting, a vote will be taken on whether or not to promote a given candidate (Appendices E.2-3). The chair of the subcommittee shall be charged with supervising the voting process (Appendix E.1). Only persons who attended the entire meeting the previous day will be permitted to vote. Although present at the meeting, the department chair and the dean do not vote. Proxy voting (giving someone the right to vote for you) will not be permitted. Absentee ballots should be given to the Assistant to the Dean if for some reason a faculty member who attended the discussion cannot be present for the vote. A copy of the tally, signed by each voting faculty member, becomes the verifiable record of the recommendation (Appendix E.4). Within three working days of the vote, the subcommittee will summarize in writing the deliberations of the senior faculty, which will form the basis for the faculty’s written recommendation. Copies of the written summary will be submitted to the candidate’s department chair and to the dean by the subcommittee chair.

The candidate’s department chair will consider the faculty’s recommendation and confer with any other library faculty members who so desire. Within five working days after receiving the faculty’s recommendation, the chair will make a formal written recommendation to the dean; and, if it conflicts with the faculty’s recommendation reasons must be provided. Upon receipt of the recommendations from the faculty and from the department chair, the dean with due deliberation and consultation if necessary will make his/her recommendation, and the recommendation may disagree with that of the faculty and/or department chair. After informing the chair of his or her decision, the dean will forward all recommendations to Academic Affairs.

In any situation where the department chair is not tenured and/or senior to the candidate, the associate dean assumes the role of chair.

A candidate whose promotion is not being recommended by the chair or by the dean must be so informed by the dean within five working days after the recommendation has been conveyed to Academic Affairs, although whenever possible, earlier notification is desirable. The dean and the department chair will meet with the candidate to provide counseling verbally concerning the candidate’s areas of weakness and will show the candidate the official tally of the vote of the faculty. Within ten working days of this discussion, formal written notification of the decision will be provided to the candidate by the dean. This written notification serves to formalize the decision and ensures that the candidate is not left in a state of uncertainty. The memorandum should be concise and should relate the decision to the relevant criteria. A copy of this memorandum will be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

A candidate whose promotion is recommended by the department chair and the dean will be so advised in private by the dean, informally within five working days, or sooner if possible. The official tally of the vote of the faculty and a summary of faculty comments and external reviews will be shown to the candidate at that time; and, they will be reminded of the review process that still remains before the recommendations become official.

Appropriate senior faculty members will be notified by the dean in writing of the recommendations and the reasons for them, within ten working days, unless the dean’s recommendation differs from that of the faculty, in which case the dean will call a meeting to discuss his/her decision with these same senior faculty members.
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(9) A candidate, whose promotion is recommended by the department chair and the dean but subsequently refused by another reviewing official, e.g., the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Board of Supervisors, will be so notified by the dean within five days after the dean is told of the decision. As in #6 above, the dean and the department chair will convey the information orally, with appropriate counseling. Within ten working days of this discussion, formal written notification of the decision will be provided to the candidate by the dean. A copy of this memorandum is to be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

(10) An unsuccessful candidate for promotion has the right to receive an oral explanation of the reasons underlying the decision from the person who has made the unfavorable determination. If the candidate so wishes, a written explanation will also be provided. Unlike the oral explanation, however, which serves as a counseling mechanism, the written explanation will be brief, categorical, and expressed as a judgment.

Before making decisions on promotion recommendations, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will conduct informal discussions with the Dean of Library Services. The Vice President for Academic Affairs may also choose, in appropriate cases, to seek the advice of the Dean of the Graduate School. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will forward all recommendations, including those that s/he has not endorsed, to the President. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will then notify the dean of the recommendations that have been made.

**Informal Review of Eligible Untenured Assistant Professors**

Beginning no later than the third year in rank, continuing each year thereafter, and ending with the year before the formal pre-tenure review occurs, the library will conduct an informal review of each untenured assistant professor (see Appendix G.2, “Informal Promotion and Tenure Review for Untenured Assistant Professors—Calendar Template”). At least one week in advance of the review, Library Administration will notify all eligible faculty of the review schedule for each person being considered (see Appendix G.1, “Informal Promotion and Tenure Review for Untenured Assistant Professors—Notification Letter Template”). A separate meeting will be scheduled for each person under review. The department chair, regardless of tenure/rank status, will lead the discussion of the person’s strengths and weaknesses, making particular use of the annual performance evaluation and the annual report of activities submitted the previous spring. The P&T Committee will observe the process to ensure that the people being considered are compared with the criteria rather than with each other. Within five working days, the P&T Committee will prepare a written summary report of the review, including the names of those present, and submit it to the chair and to the dean. If the chair wishes to add comments or clarifications, they can be appended to the report and returned to the P&T Committee within four working days. After the Committee has ensured that the review is in order, the Committee will give the report to the librarian being reviewed, the chair, and the dean. A copy will be placed in the librarian’s promotion and tenure file by Library Administration, who will notify eligible senior faculty who participated in the review that the summary will be available for a one-week perusal period. Reports will not become a part of the library personnel file. Within a week, both the chair and the dean will each meet separately with the person being reviewed to further the goal of early, informal counseling. The dean may elect to forward review results to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. However, all concerned must bear in mind that this is an informal, advisory procedure—it does not result in a tenure decision.

**Informal Review of Eligible Untenured Associate Professors**

The candidate shall have at least two informal reviews. Beginning no later than the second year in rank, continuing each year thereafter, and ending with the year before the formal pre-tenure review occurs, the library will conduct an informal review of each untenured associate professor (see Appendix G.4, “Informal Promotion and Tenure Review for Untenured Associate Professors—Calendar Template”). At least one week in advance of the review, Library Administration will notify all eligible faculty of the review schedule for each person being considered (see Appendix G.3, “Informal Promotion and Tenure Review for Untenured Associate Professors—Notification Letter Template”). A separate meeting will be scheduled for each person under review. The department chair, regardless of tenure/rank status, will lead the discussion of the person’s strengths and weaknesses, making particular use of the annual performance evaluation and the annual report of activities submitted the previous spring. The P&T Committee will observe the process to ensure that the people being considered are compared with the criteria rather than with each other. Within five working days, the P&T Committee will prepare a written summary report of the review, including the names of those present, and submit it to the chair and to the dean. If the chair wishes to add comments
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or clarifications, they can be appended to the report and returned to the P&T Committee within four working days. After the Committee has ensured that the review is in order, the Committee will give the report to the librarian being reviewed, the chair, and the dean. A copy will be placed in the librarian’s promotion and tenure file by Library Administration, who will notify eligible senior faculty who participated in the review that the summary will be available for a one-week perusal period. Reports will not become a part of the library personnel file. Within a week, both the chair and the dean will each meet separately with the person being reviewed to further the goal of early, informal counseling. The dean may elect to forward review results to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. However, all concerned must bear in mind that this is an informal, advisory procedure—it does not result in a tenure decision.

Formal Pre-tenure Review

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

For the formal pre-tenure review, the tenured library faculty will meet to make their recommendations using a procedure like that described for promotion decisions (see p. 6-8). After receiving the recommendation from these faculty members, the department chair and the dean will decide what recommendations each will make. Each recommendation that is forwarded to Academic Affairs, for or against tenure, must include a statement as to whether or not it has the approval of the tenured members of the faculty and the grounds upon which such approval (or the absence thereof) is based. An adverse decision of this sort will be followed within ten working days by a formal written notification from the dean and department chair. Subsequent to the Board of Supervisors’ final approval of the one year terminal reappointment, the candidate will receive a “Recommendation for Reappointment” form (Appendix F. 1.). If the candidate has been considered for early tenure and has been denied, the reappointment form will also be for one year, but will not be final.

To implement these policies, the library will observe the same timing and procedures as those established for promotion. The only difference will be the obvious one, that references to “promotion” will be replaced by “tenure.”

External Review: Library Guidelines

I. Purpose

A. When judging a candidate for promotion/tenure, the ultimate measure of his/her scholarly work and service activities comes from peer review -- most importantly the review done by other University of New Orleans librarians. The decision-making process will be enhanced by soliciting reviews of the candidate’s work from respected members of the library profession from outside the University. This external review may be waived if it is agreed that it will add nothing useful to the decision process. However, it will be done in any case when requested by the candidate, the library faculty, department chair, the dean, or the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

B. External review of scholarly work and service represents one aspect of the entire promotion/tenure decision process. Reviewers will not be asked whether a candidate should be tenured and/or promoted; their review is sought in order to provide additional opinions about the quality, relevance, and impact of a candidate’s scholarly work and service activities. However, the external reviewers are only advisory to the library

1This section also appears as Appendix D.1 to facilitate providing it to external reviewers.

2The term scholarly work in this document refers to all appropriate research, creative work, and scholarship. Service activities include service to the library profession, and the university.
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faculty, department chair, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The primary responsibility for promotion/tenure decisions rests with the Library, which, following the criteria and procedures of the University and of the Library, reviews all aspects of a candidate’s career, including job performance as well as scholarly work and service, and makes its recommendation.

II. Procedures—General Guidelines

A. Timetables and calendars will be established and reviewed annually by the P&T Committee in order that reviewers may be chosen, contacted, and the reviews received in time to be used in the subcommittee’s review of the candidate’s file. (Appendix B.1 and 4)

B. Normally, responsibility for the administration of the external review process rests with the candidate’s department chair in consultation with the dean. The P&T Committee may provide oversight and assistance as necessary.

C. Reviewers shall be chosen from those professionals who should be expected to be familiar with the candidate’s area of work. Potential reviewers are generally expected to be librarians. Employment at an institution with faculty rank and/or similar responsibilities for librarians is considered desirable, as is having successfully negotiated the promotion and tenure process at their institution. It is also desirable to include professionals from both within the state and elsewhere as external reviewers. Knowing or having worked with an individual does not necessarily preclude him or her from serving as an external reviewer. The P&T Committee will maintain a list of recommended peer institutions, though the candidate is not limited to this list.

D. Selection Process:

1. The candidate and the department chair will develop a mutually acceptable list of six or more reviewers. The list should include: reviewer name and title, business address, telephone/fax numbers, and, if known, email and academic rank. This list of names shall be submitted to the dean for approval. In a case where the candidate and the department chair cannot agree on a mutually acceptable list of six reviewers, the candidate and the department chair shall each submit a list of six names with complete information to the dean. The dean will provide a copy of each list to both the candidate and the chair, and the dean will select at least three reviewers from each list to seek assurance that at least two reviews from each list will be received. Upon approval from the dean, the list will be given to the chair of the P&T subcommittee. (In cases where the candidate is a department chair, the dean will work with him or her directly in selecting reviewers.)

2. The P&T subcommittee shall contact the first six names on the approved list to ask for their cooperation (see detailed procedures in Appendix D.2). If they agree, confirming letters shall be faxed or emailed to them by Library Administration for their signatures (Appendix D.3). If any of the first group of reviewers do not accept, the committee shall contact as many other potential reviewers on the list as are required to secure commitment from six. If the original list is exhausted, additional names shall be selected as described in the preceding. No later than five working days prior to the calendar deadline for receipt of the review letters, Library Administration shall determine if any letters have not yet been received. If so, they shall contact the reviewer(s) to remind them of the deadline. A minimum of three reviews must be received.

E. A standard letter and acknowledgment form shall be used to secure written confirmation of willingness to act as a reviewer (Appendix D.3).

F. The responsibility of providing packets of materials for review rests with the candidate, who must provide one paper copy for Library Administration and to any external reviewers who request one. The candidate must also provide an electronic packet as an option for external reviewers. Library Administration will inform the candidate how many paper copies are needed. Copyright compliance is the responsibility of the candidate. In general, all the scholarly work and evidence of service activities submitted by the candidate will be sent out for review, unless the
chair, the dean, and the candidate agree on a subset to be reviewed. Members of the P&T Committee will also be available to give advice on the mechanism and inclusion of packet material. The items submitted to the external reviewers are limited solely to the areas of scholarship and service and in all cases include a current curriculum vita and a complete list of the candidate’s scholarly work. Items addressing performance, e.g., performance evaluations, testimonial letters, are excluded from the external review. A brief letter of explanation (Appendix D.4), a copy of the promotion and tenure criteria, and “External Review: Library Guidelines” (Appendix D.1) will complete the packet.

G. The reviews will not, as a matter of course, be made available to the candidate, but only to those involved in making or reviewing the decision.

H. The P&T subcommittee will summarize the faculty recommendation, and the dean will summarize the general contents of the external reviews (without reference to the individual reviewers). When notifying the candidate of the decision, the dean will provide the candidate with both summaries. In particular, the candidate should be made aware of any significant negative comments made about his/her work. A copy of both summaries will be forwarded with the other promotion/tenure materials through university channels.

I. At the completion of the campus decision process, the reviews will be deposited in the Office of Academic Affairs in a promotion file which is separate from and is not considered a part of the candidate’s personnel file.

J. If a candidate’s service and scholarly work has already been reviewed under this procedure within the past three years, the library will include the previous reviews as part of the current review documentation, supplementing them only to the extent deemed necessary by the candidate in consultation with the dean and the department chair. Full external reviews will be repeated only when it is agreed that there is a need to update the reviews based on a significant change in the candidate’s record.

Informal Promotion Review of Tenured Librarians

Tenured associate professors and tenured assistant professors may choose to participate in an informal promotion review process in any year except one in which they have undergone a formal promotion and tenure review. Normally this process will begin in the spring with Library Administration notifying individuals of their eligibility for this review and requesting an official response within two weeks (see Appendix H.1, “Informal Promotion Review for Tenured Librarians—Notification Letter Template). If there is an affirmative response, the Library Administration will draft a schedule to be reviewed by the P&T Committee, which will include dates for the completion of the candidate’s file preparation, review meeting dates, and completion of written summaries (see Appendix H.2, “Informal Promotion Review for Tenured Librarians—Calendar Template). Faculty who are senior to the librarian under review will (1) select a discussion leader and a recorder, (2) review the librarian’s file, and (3) meet to discuss the person’s strengths and weaknesses as they relate to the library’s promotion criteria. If either the discussion leader or the librarian under review wishes to meet prior to the group review, they may do so. The recorder will take notes at the meeting and within five working days of the meeting will prepare a written summary report of the discussion and give copies to the librarian being reviewed, the chair, and the dean. A copy of the report (dated and signed by the chair) will be placed in the candidate’s promotion and tenure file by Library Administration, but it will not become a part of the library personnel file. Within a week the dean will meet with the librarian officially to review the summary, but the librarian may also unofficially consult with other participants in the meeting. This process in no way implies a promotion recommendation to the administration for any faculty member who is reviewed, and will represent only the opinion of the faculty in attendance at the meeting. Although no votes will be taken, in order to provide the most valid assessment, full collegial participation is expected.

---

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

The ULS Board of Supervisors mandates continuing review of faculty ranks in Policy Number FS-III.X.D-1

Review of Faculty Ranks

The library follows the review procedures developed by UNO and detailed in section 2.15 of the UNO Faculty Handbook under “Continuing Review of Faculty Achievements.”
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### Appendix A

**TENURE REVIEW DATES—Examples (Rev. March 2014)**

**UNTENURED LIBRARY FACULTY**

**ALPHABETICALLY ARRANGED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>HIRE DATE</th>
<th>1ST REV</th>
<th>2ND REV</th>
<th>3RD REV</th>
<th>TENURE REVIEW</th>
<th>1ST DAY 7TH YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>Spr 14</td>
<td>Spr 15</td>
<td>Spr 16</td>
<td>Spr 17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1/5/2009</td>
<td>Fall 11</td>
<td>Fall 12</td>
<td>Spr 13</td>
<td>Spr 14</td>
<td>1/5/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>Spr 14</td>
<td>Spr 15</td>
<td>Spr 16</td>
<td>Spr 17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>Spr 14</td>
<td>Spr 15</td>
<td>Spr 16</td>
<td>Spr 17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
<th>HIRE DATE</th>
<th>1ST REV</th>
<th>2ND REV</th>
<th>3RD REV</th>
<th>TENURE REVIEW</th>
<th>1ST DAY 7TH YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1/5/2009</td>
<td>Fall 11</td>
<td>Fall 12</td>
<td>Spr 13</td>
<td>Spr 14</td>
<td>1/5/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>Spr 14</td>
<td>Spr 15</td>
<td>Spr 16</td>
<td>Spr 17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>Spr 14</td>
<td>Spr 15</td>
<td>Spr 16</td>
<td>Spr 17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>Spr 14</td>
<td>Spr 15</td>
<td>Spr 16</td>
<td>Spr 17</td>
<td>2/1/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARRANGED BY SEMESTER**

Under the UL system, all tenure reviews are done in the Spring semester
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FORMAL PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEW TEMPLATE (Spring)

Late August  The Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee will meet to review and confirm the list of candidates. Library Administration will devise and distribute a calendar with explicit dates for use in the process.

Mid Nov.  Notices go out to faculty members who are eligible for promotion and tenure. They will be given one week to respond. A Promotion & Tenure subcommittee is selected at the November faculty meeting.

Early Dec.  Candidate and his/her chair submit a list, approved by the Dean, of at least six prospective external reviewers to the P&T Committee.

Early Jan.  Selection of P&T review subcommittee and review of the formal P&T meeting dates & times at the January faculty meeting. The subcommittee has one week to have its initial meeting and to report the selection of its chair to the P&T committee and to the Dean.

Early Jan.  Deadline for calls to outside reviewers by the P&T Committee and also receipt of their written agreement to review.

Early Jan.  Selection and preparation of materials (1 office packet **) to be included for external review must be completed & submitted to Library Administration by the candidate. Materials will be mailed or a link to the e-packet will be emailed to outside reviewers within two working days of their submission. Candidate must have his/her file ready for review by the senior faculty. []**Additional paper copies of the packet will be required only if external reviewers request a paper copy.]

Early Feb.  Deadline for receipt of all supporting documents concerning the candidate’s eligibility for promotion and tenure, including comments from outside reviewers.

Early Feb.  Senior faculty must receive notification of the date and location of the promotion and tenure meeting (at least 1 week in advance of the meeting).

Early Feb.  Review committee must have completed its review of the candidate’s dossier and have met with the candidate and chair (at least one week in advance of the meeting).

Early Feb.  Promotion and tenure meetings for discussion/vote are held.

Mid-Feb.  Subcommittee’s written summary of the P&T meeting will be submitted to the candidate’s chair and to the dean (within 3 working days of the vote).

Early Mar.  Dean’s recommendations and supporting materials will be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs (one week after receiving dept. chair’s recommendation).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Mar.</td>
<td>Dean will inform the candidate of his/her recommendation (within 5 working days of forwarding it to Academic Affairs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Mar.</td>
<td>If anyone is to receive notice of non-reappointment (i.e., terminal appointment for the next year only), it should be done by this date—or if not by this date, no later than the anniversary of the date the person was hired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Mar.</td>
<td>Dean will notify appropriate senior faculty of his/her recommendation and the reasons for it (within 10 working days of forwarding it to Academic Affairs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Dean notifies candidate of the university’s recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Candidate is notified about UL System decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University of New Orleans

To: Library Faculty

From: [name of Dean]
Dean of Library Services

Date: __________

Subject: Promotion/Tenure Eligibility [Semester/Year] Schedule

The following library faculty are eligible to be considered for promotion:

From Associate Professor to Professor

[Names of those eligible Associate Professors]

___________________
___________________
___________________

From Assistant to Associate Professor

[names of those eligible Assistant Professors]

___________________

A faculty member eligible to be considered for promotion must reply in writing by completing the form at the bottom of this page.** Library Administration must receive all responses by [weekday, month, date, year … one week after letter is sent.] Library Administration will issue the official list of participants immediately following the response date.

Associate Professors and tenured Assistant Professors who do not choose to stand for promotion may elect to participate in an informal promotion review process. This review takes place only in the spring, and a list of eligible faculty will be disseminated by [month date.]

The [Semester/Year] Promotion/Tenure calendar will be distributed at the October faculty meeting.

** Please complete and return to Library Administration by [weekday, month, date, year.] If you do not reply, it will be assumed that you wish to be reviewed for promotion.

I would like to be considered for (promotion) this [Semester]. YES _____ NO ____ (check one)
______________________________ (Signature)

Rev. 5/2014
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University of New Orleans
GENERAL CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT

Background
(Report all items in reverse chronological order.)

Education: Institution, degree or program, dates

Experience
A. Academic: Description with rank, period of appointment
B. Other professional: Position, period of appointment

Scholarly and Creative Productivity
(Report all items within each category in reverse chronological order.)

1. Publications
(List only those items that have actually been published.)

A. Books
(Specify whether you served as an author or editor. Give place, publisher, date of publication, and names of other authors/editors, if any, in the order in which they appear on the publication.)

a. Scholarly books
   i. Refereed
   ii. Non-refereed

b. Text books
   i. Refereed
   ii. Non-refereed

B. Refereed/Invited Publications
(Include the number of printed pages for each publication and list the names of authors in the order in which they appear on the publication. Also, indicate which publications were invited.)

a. Book chapters
b. Journal articles
c. Refereed monographs d. Refereed proceedings

C. Other Publications
   a. Non-refereed academic journal articles (no outside reviewer)
   b. Others (working papers, non-refereed proceedings, abstracts, trade journals, reviews, popular publications)

2. *Items Accepted for Publication but Not Yet Published*  
   (Give as complete information as possible.)

3. *Artistic or Other Creative Contributions*  
   (Exhibits, performances, productions, compositions, software, etc. Group the entries in a manner that is standard for your discipline.)

4. *Participation at Professional Meetings*  
   (Presentations at professional meetings. Provide the title, co-authors (if any), name of the meeting; when and where it took place.)

5. *Other Scholarly or Creative Activities*  
   A. Service in role of discussant, critic, reviewer for professional meeting or publications
   B. Service in role of officer of professional organization, program committee member, session organizer for professional meeting
   C. General editorship of journal, monograph series, book series
   D. Professional society membership

6. *Awards, Lectureships, or Prizes*  
   (List those that show recognition of scholarly or artistic achievement.)

7. *Grants and Contracts*  
   A. Grants and contracts received  
      (Indicate project title, source and amount of grant, and date grant was approved.)
      a. Principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or equivalent
      b. Not principal investigator, etc. (indicate your role)
   B. Grants and contracts applied for
(Indicate project title, source and amount of grant, and date of the application. Do not repeat items listed under 7.A).
   a. Principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or equivalent

   b. Not principal investigator, etc. (indicate your role)

8. Thesis/Dissertation Committee Service
   (Limit entries to thesis/dissertation service during last three years. Indicate the service capacity [committee member or chair], name of student, thesis/dissertation title, date/expected date of completion.)

9. Major Areas of Creative or Research Interest

10. Other Professional Accomplishments
   
      A. Manuscripts under submission
         (Include the title of the manuscript, and when and where it has been submitted.)

      B. Course/Program design and development

      C. Special recognition for teaching

      D. Academic service
         a. On-campus (as administrator, committee member, etc.)

         b. Off-campus (include speaking engagements)

      E. Other service

*All sections must be included in the CV with N/A if the librarian has nothing to include in that section, and the outline numbering and lettering must also be included.
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Structure of Faculty Promotion/Tenure Review File

STANDARD BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SHEET
CURRENT CURRICULUM VITA
FORMAL, PRE-TENURE REVIEW / EXTERNAL REVIEW LETTERS **
INFORMAL, PRE-TENURE REVIEW SUMMARIES **
PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS / REPORTS OF ACTIVITY **

[1.a] PUBLICATIONS - IN PRINT: Books/Chapters/Refereed articles
[1.a] PUBLICATIONS - IN PRINT: Other articles & publications
[1.b-c] PUBLICATIONS - PENDING

[2] OTHER SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE/ARTISTIC CONTRIBUTIONS:
    Performances, exhibits, etc.

[3] PAPERS PRESENTED AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS:
    Peer presentations; panels, poster sessions, workshops, etc.

[4] AWARDS / LECTURESHIPS / PRIZES

[5] CONTRIBUTIONS TO JURIED OR REFEREED PUBLICATIONS:
    Editorships, referee, etc.

[6] GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FUNDED

[7] DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING/INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

[8] MAJOR AREAS OF RESEARCH INTEREST

[9] UNIVERSITY / LIBRARY SERVICE AND ACTIVITIES

[10] PUBLIC / PROFESSIONAL / COMMUNITY SERVICE

MISCELLANEOUS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: ATTENDANCE
    AT CONFERENCES / WORKSHOPS

MISCELLANEOUS: LETTERS OF COMMENDATION

** Supplied by Library Administration
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EXTERNAL REVIEW: LIBRARY GUIDELINES

I. Purpose

A. When judging a candidate for promotion/tenure, the ultimate measure of his/her scholarly work and service activities comes from peer review -- most importantly the review done by other University of New Orleans librarians. The decision-making process will be enhanced by soliciting reviews of the candidate’s work from respected members of the library profession from outside the University. This external review may be waived if it is agreed that it will add nothing useful to the decision process. However, it will be done in any case when requested by the candidate, the library faculty, department chair, the dean, or the Provost.

B. External review of scholarly work and service represents one aspect of the entire promotion/tenure decision process. Reviewers will not be asked whether a candidate should be tenured and/or promoted; their review is sought in order to provide additional opinions about the quality, relevance, and impact of a candidate’s scholarly work and service activities. However, the external reviewers are only advisory to the library faculty, department chair, the dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The primary responsibility for promotion/tenure decisions rests with the Library, which, following the criteria and procedures of the University and of the Library, reviews all aspects of a candidate’s career, including job performance as well as scholarly work and service, and makes its recommendation.

II. Procedures—General Guidelines

A. Timetables and calendars will be established and reviewed annually by the Library’s P&T Committee in order that reviewers may be chosen, contacted, and the reviews received in time to be used in the subcommittee’s review of the candidate’s file.

B. Normally, responsibility for the administration of the external review process rests with the candidate’s department chair in consultation with the dean. The P&T Committee may provide oversight and assistance as necessary.

C. Reviewers shall be chosen from those professionals who should be expected to be familiar with the candidate’s area of work. Potential reviewers are generally expected to be librarians. Employment at an institution with faculty rank and/or similar responsibilities for librarians is considered desirable, as is having successfully negotiated the promotion and tenure process at their institution. It is also desirable to include professionals from both within the state and elsewhere as external reviewers. Knowing or having worked with an individual does not necessarily preclude him or her from serving as an external reviewer. The P&T Committee will maintain a list of recommended peer institutions, though the candidate is not limited to this list.

D. Selection Process

1. The candidate and the department chair will develop a mutually acceptable list of six or more reviewers. The list should include: reviewer name and title, business address, email, telephone/fax numbers, and, if known, academic rank. This list of names shall be submitted to the dean for approval. In a case where the candidate and the department chair cannot agree on a mutually acceptable list of six reviewers, the candidate and the department chair shall each submit a list of six names with complete information to the dean. The dean will provide a copy of each list to both the candidate and the chair, and the dean will

---

4The term scholarly work in this document refers to all appropriate research, creative work, and scholarship. Service activities include service to the library profession and the university.
select at least three reviewers from each list to seek assurance that at least two reviews from each list will be received. Upon approval from the dean, the list will be given to the chair of the library’s P&T subcommittee. (In cases where the candidate is a department chair, the dean will work with him or her directly in selecting reviewers.)

2. The P&T subcommittee shall contact the first six names on the approved list to ask for their cooperation. If they agree, confirming letters shall be faxed or emailed to them by Library Administration for their signatures. If any of the first group of reviewers do not accept, the committee shall contact as many other potential reviewers on the list as are required to secure commitment from six. If the original list is exhausted, additional names shall be selected as described in the preceding. No later than five working days prior to the calendar deadline for receipt of the review letters, Library Administration shall determine if any letters have not yet been received. If so, they shall contact the reviewer(s) to remind them of the deadline. A minimum of three reviews must be received.

E. A standard letter and acknowledgment form shall be used to secure written confirmation of willingness to act as a reviewer.

F. The responsibility of providing packets of materials for review rests with the candidate, who must provide one paper copy for Library Administration and to any external reviewers who request one. The candidate must also provide an electronic packet as an option for external reviewers. Library Administration will inform the candidate how many paper copies are needed. Copyright compliance is the responsibility of the candidate. In general, all the scholarly work and evidence of service activities submitted by the candidate will be sent out for review, unless the chair, the dean, and the candidate agree on a subset to be reviewed. Members of the P&T Committee will also be available to give advice on the mechanism and inclusion of packet material. The items submitted to the external reviewers are limited solely to the areas of scholarship and service and in all cases include a current curriculum vita and a complete list of the candidate’s scholarly work. Items addressing performance, e.g., performance evaluations, testimonial letters, are excluded from the external review. A brief letter of explanation, a copy of the promotion and tenure criteria, and “External Review: Library Guidelines” will complete the packet.

G. The reviews will not, as a matter of course, be made available to the candidate, but only to those involved in making or reviewing the decision.

H. The P&T subcommittee will summarize the faculty recommendation, and will summarize the general contents of the external reviews (without reference to the individual reviewers). When notifying the candidate of the decision, the dean will provide the candidate with both summaries. In particular, the candidate should be made aware of any significant negative comments made about his/her work. A copy of both summaries will be forwarded with the other promotion/tenure materials through university channels.

I. At the completion of the campus decision process, the reviews will be deposited in the Office of Academic Affairs in a promotion file which is separate from and is not considered a part of the candidate’s personnel file.

J. If a candidate’s service and scholarly work has already been reviewed under this procedure within the past three years, the library will include the previous reviews as part of the current review documentation, supplementing them only to the extent deemed necessary by the candidate in consultation with the dean and the department chair. Full external reviews will be repeated only when it is agreed that there is a need to update the reviews based on a significant change in the candidate’s record.

---

5The material to be reviewed may include all or a substantial portion of one’s published and unpublished work as well as non-publishable documents of a scholarly or pedagogical nature if it will have significance for the department’s decision.
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EXTERNAL REVIEWERS – P&T Contact Information

For each candidate, the P&T subcommittee Chair will receive a list of potential external reviewers. According to the P&T document, this list was agreed upon by the candidate and his/her chair and has already been approved by the dean. P&T subcommittee members will meet to decide who contacts whom and to review procedures and timelines. When emailing or calling the potential reviewers, follow these steps:

1. Introduce yourself as a librarian at the University of New Orleans and a member of the Library Promotion & Tenure subcommittee.

2. Librarians have faculty status on our campus. As part of our P&T process, we are required by the university to seek external reviewers who will be asked to comment on the quality, relevance and impact of a candidate's scholarly work and service activities. Reviewers will not be asked whether the candidate should be tenured and/or promoted. As a respected member of the library profession, your name has been submitted to us as a potential reviewer.

3. __________________________, Current rank as (circle) Assist. / Assoc. Professor is a candidate for promotion to the rank of (circle) Assoc. Professor / Professor and also for tenure. Her/his current job description/title is _____________________________

4. If you agree to participate in this process, this is our timeline: We will e-mail or fax a confirmation letter for your immediate signature. If part or all of a candidate’s work is available in electronic format, you will be asked to specify your preference of print or electronic content. Within a week or two, either you will be provided electronic links or a packet will be mailed to you which will contain a copy of our promotion and tenure criteria, the external review guidelines, and the candidate’s curriculum vita with evidence of their scholarly work and service activities. Items addressing job performance are excluded from external review. You will have about three weeks to review the candidate’s credentials and to submit your review to us.

5. **Confirm/add to Approved List information about the reviewer:**
   - Name: ________________________________
   - Title: ________________________________
   - Business address: __________________________ (check, if no change)
   - Phone/Extension: __________________________ (check, if no change)
   - Fax # ________________________________ (check, if no change)
   - Email ________________________________

6. Give the external reviewer your name, phone number, and email address.

Additional comments:
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LETTER TO PROPOSED EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Dear

[name] is being considered for [tenure and/or promotion] to the rank of [rank] in the [name] Department at the University of New Orleans. Because you are knowledgeable in [his/her] area of specialization, you have been selected as an appropriate reviewer of [name]’s service activities and scholarly work. We are not asking for your recommendation on whether we should [promote and/or tenure]; however, your comments will be important to us in judging the service and scholarly contribution of [name]’s works.

We do not require reviews of each publication or activity, but of the body of research and service. We would particularly like your assessment of the candidate’s record and of its relevance in terms of current scholarship and service in the field. An effective review need not take more than a page or two.

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

Please complete the acknowledgment form below and return it to us as soon as possible by fax or email. If you have any questions, you may call or email our Associate Dean at [phone number] [email address.] or [assistant to the dean] at [telephone number]. If you agree to assist us, appropriate materials will be sent to you. We would appreciate your review by [date].

Sincerely,

Dean of Library Services

ACKNOWLEDGMENT FORM

I have received your request that I act as a reviewer of [name]’s scholarly work and service activities.

_________  I am able to serve. 

If yes, I prefer to receive print materials _________

If yes, I prefer electronic material, if available________

_________  I am unable to serve.

________________________________________________________________________

Signature               Date

Please return this form immediately to:  ______________________, Associate Dean
504-280-7277 (fax) -- [email address]
Earl K. Long Library, Lakefront Campus
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA  70148

Rev. 5/2014
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LETTER TO ACCOMPANY CANDIDATE’S DOSSIER
SENT TO EXTERNAL REVIEWER

[date]

Dear ______________,

Thank you for your willingness to serve as a reviewer of _______________’s service activities and scholarly work.

We do not require reviews of each item in the packet, but of the body of [his/her] research and service. We would particularly like your assessment of the candidate’s record and of its relevance in terms of current scholarship and service in the field. An effective review need not take more than a page or two. Since this is a confidential process, copies of the review should not be sent to the candidate.

Please arrange to mail or email your comments to reach us by [approximately one month after mailing date]. If you find that you are not able to meet this deadline by mail, you may call ______________ at (504) 280-6197 to arrange a confidential fax transmission.

Sincerely,

Dean of Library Services

Enclosures
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VOTING PROCEDURE

(1) The chair of the P&T subcommittee shall be charged with supervising the voting process. To assure confidentiality and the integrity of the process, Library Administration will provide pre-folded, color-coded ballots and black pens, which will be used by all participants.

(2) Eligible faculty who are unable to attend the voting meeting may secure a pre-folded, color-coded ballot, black pen, and envelope from Library Administration. After voting, the ballot is placed in the envelope, sealed, and signed across the seal and then given to the Associate Dean. All absentee ballot envelopes will be placed in a large manila envelope.

(3) Immediately preceding the official balloting, the chair of the subcommittee will pick up the large manila envelope and the remaining ballots for distribution at the meeting. Note: There will only be enough ballots for each eligible voter. The absentee ballots and the ballots cast at the meeting will be merged prior to the tally by the chair of the subcommittee. Those in attendance will sign the official tally sheet(s) (Appendix E.4 and, if appropriate, E.5); and those voting in absentia will be required to sign the official tally sheet(s) in Library Administration as soon as possible.
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Date:

OFFICIAL BALLOT FOR PROMOTION from (rank)______________ to ________________

CANDIDATE (name): ______________________

PROMOTE ____________ DO NOT PROMOTE____________ I ABSTAIN__________
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Date:

OFFICIAL BALLOT FOR TENURE

CANDIDATE (NAME): __________________________

TENURE ___________  DO NOT TENURE ___________  I ABSTAIN ___________
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Date:

OFFICIAL TALLY SHEET regarding the vote of
PROMOTION from ___________________ TO __________________________

CANDIDATE (NAME): _____________________________

In favor of promotion  ________________

Not in favor of promotion  ________________

Abstaining  ________________

Names of those eligible to participate [supplied by Library Administration]. Names of eligible faculty who are “not in attendance” at the meeting will be indicated as NIA by the chair of the subcommittee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>SIGNATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date:

OFFICIAL TALLY SHEET regarding the vote of TENURE

CANDIDATE (NAME): _____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In favor of tenure</th>
<th>Not in favor of tenure</th>
<th>Abstaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Names of those eligible to participate [supplied by Library Administration]. Names of eligible faculty who are “not in attendance” at the meeting will be indicated as NIA by the chair of the subcommittee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>SIGNATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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University of New Orleans
RECOMMENDATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT

Name: 
Rank: 
Dept.: 

An appointment for the time period noted below has been recommended and approved. This action is not intended to reflect any salary changes which may be forthcoming, but is simply an assurance of an appointment for the designated period.

[A single box must be checked]

__ Academic. ___/___ (Mo/Yr) - ___/___ (Mo/Yr)
__ Fiscal. ___/___ (Mo/Yr) - ___/___ (Mo/Yr)
__ Final (terminal) academic. ___/___ (Mo/Yr) - ___/___ (Mo/Yr)
__ Final (terminal) fiscal. ___/___ (Mo/Yr) - ___/___ (Mo/Yr)

If this is a final renewal (terminal appointment), there should be no expectation of continued employment beyond the last day of the appointment period.

________________________________  ___________  ___________
Chair of Department                  Date

________________________________  ___________  Date
Dean of College

________________________________  ___________  Date
Vice President for Academic Affairs / Provost

________________________________  ___________  Date
President

The faculty member’s signature below represents acceptance of the appointment indicated above.

________________________________  ___________
Faculty Member                  Date
Appendix F.2

PROMOTION/TENURE APPLICATION FORM
THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA SYSTEM

Appendix G.1:  
Informal Promotion and Tenure Review for  
Untenured Assistant Professors—Notification Letter Template  

University of New Orleans  

Campus Correspondence  

To:  
Assistant Professor  

From:  
Dean of Library Services  

Date:  
September 12, 2000  

Subject:  
Informal Pre-Tenure Review  

As stated in the library’s Promotion & Tenure guidelines:  

“Beginning no later than the third year in rank and ending with the year before the formal pre-tenure review occurs, the library will conduct an informal review of each untenured assistant professor.”  

The calendar for your initial review has been established as indicated on the attached page. The members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will make themselves available to you in the preparation of your file for review, but feel free to contact them with any other questions you might have also.
Appendix G.2

Informal Promotion and Tenure Review for Untenured Assistant Professors—Calendar Template

SPRING TEMPLATE:

Mid-Mar. Library Administration will notify librarians eligible for review and appropriate senior faculty (i.e., those who perform the reviews) of the informal review calendar. Library Administration will devise and publish a calendar with explicit dates for use in the process.

2nd wk in May Reviewee’s file must be ready.

Late May Review meeting takes place

Within 5 days P&T committee’s written summary submitted to reviewee’s chair and the Dean.

Within 4 days Chair returns report with comments to P&T committee.

Next day P&T committee gives reports to the reviewee, chair, and dean and places a copy in the reviewee’s promotion and tenure file.

Within 1 wk By this date, both the chair and dean will meet with the reviewee.
Appendix G.3:
Informal Promotion and Tenure Review for Untenured Associate Professors — Notification Letter Template

University of New Orleans

To: ______________________
   Associate Professor

From: ______________________
   Dean of Library Services

Date: February 10, 2005

Subject: Informal Pre-Tenure Review

As stated in the library’s Promotion & Tenure guidelines:

“Beginning no later than the second year in rank and ending with the year before the formal pre-tenure review occurs, the library will conduct an informal review of each untenured associate professor.”

The calendar for your initial review has been established as indicated on the attached page. The members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will make themselves available to you in the preparation of your file for review, but feel free to contact them with any other questions you might have also.
Appendix G.4

Informal Promotion and Tenure Review for Untenured Associate Professors—Calendar Template

SPRING TEMPLATE:

Library Administration will notify associate professors eligible for review and appropriate senior faculty (i.e., those who perform the reviews) of the informal review calendar. Library Administration will devise and publish a calendar with explicit dates for use in the process.

Mid-Mar. Library Administration will notify associate professors eligible for review and appropriate senior faculty (i.e., those who perform the reviews) of the informal review calendar. Library Administration will devise and publish a calendar with explicit dates for use in the process.

2nd wk in May Reviewee’s file must be ready.

Late May Review meeting takes place

Within 5 days P&T committee’s written summary submitted to reviewee’s chair and the Dean.

Within 4 days Chair returns report with comments to P&T committee.

Next day P&T committee gives reports to the reviewee, chair, and dean and places a copy in the reviewee’s promotion and tenure file.

Within 1 wk By this date, both the chair and dean will meet with the reviewee.
Appendix H.1

Informal Promotion Review for Tenured Librarians—Notification Letter Template

To: ____________________
    Assistant/Associate Professor

From: _____ _____
    Dean of Library Services

Date:

Subject: Informal Promotion Review of Tenured Librarians

As stated in the library’s Promotion & Tenure guidelines, tenured associate professors and tenured assistant professors may choose to participate in an informal promotion review process in any year except one in which they have undergone a formal promotion and tenure review.

Please respond by (two weeks from date of this letter). If you do not respond, it will be assumed that you decline to participate.

I would like to be considered for informal promotion review (check one):  Yes ____  No ____

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
Date
Appendix H.2

INFORMAL PROMOTION REVIEW OF TENURED LIBRARIANS
Calendar Template

Early Feb. Library Administration will notify librarians eligible for review and appropriate senior faculty (i.e., those who will perform the review) of the informal review calendar. Library Administration will devise and publish a calendar with explicit dates for use in the process.

Early Apr. Library Administration must receive responses from the eligible librarians.

mid Apr. The reviewee’s file must be ready.

Early May Review meeting is scheduled with all eligible senior faculty and eligible Promotion & Tenure committee members.

Within 5 days A written summary of the review meeting will be given to the reviewee, the chair, and the dean, and a copy placed in the reviewee’s promotion and tenure file.

Within 1 week Dean will meet with the reviewee to discuss the summary.
Appendix H.3

Date:

INFORMAL PROMOTION REVIEW of TENURED FACULTY
from __________________ to __________________________

CANDIDATE (NAME): _____________________________

Names of faculty eligible to attend meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>SIGNATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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