



THE UNIVERSITY *of* NEW ORLEANS

Procedures and Criteria for the Recommendations on Faculty in the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Process

Due in Academic Affairs

April 9

Applications to Departments: **December 1**

Applications to Colleges: **February 9**

Applications to Deans: **March 9**

Participants in the RTP process include the Candidate, the Department, the Department Chair, Departmental RTP committee, the College RTP committee, the College Dean, the Provost, and the President.

The Department allows the students, faculty, academic administrators, and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the reappointment process. An assessment by external evaluators may also be included at any stage of the reappointment process, and may be required during the tenure and promotion process though it can always be requested by the candidate.

Recommendations to the Administration for faculty reappointments, promotions and awards of tenure are made by the Chair of the Department, the College RTP committee and College Dean, after consultation with the appropriate faculty members.

The University of New Orleans is committed to the principle of equal opportunity. It is the policy of this University not to discriminate on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, color, national origin, religion, or disability with regard to its students, employees, or applicants for admission or employment. Such discrimination is also prohibited by federal law.

This document affects the RTP process specifically, not the process for annual faculty evaluations. This document is predicated on the following governing instruments:

The University of New Orleans Academic Department Chairperson/School Director Responsibilities, Roles, and Authority, [AP-AA 23](#);

The University of New Orleans [Employee Handbook, 2015](#);

University of Louisiana System Policy [Section X \(Faculty Rank\)](#) and [Section](#)

XI (Tenure);

The University of New Orleans Tenure and Promotion Form Instructions, November, 2019;

The University of New Orleans Faculty Handbook.

A. RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS

Candidate

A candidate for RTP should make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the Department Chair, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for collecting and presenting the evidence of her/his accomplishments. The candidate's documentation must include all required information and supporting materials. All supporting materials should be referenced and clearly explained.

The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes his/her goals and accomplishments during the reappointment process, including a clear description of the quality and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: a) instruction and instructional-related activities; b) research, scholarship, and creative activity; and c) service to the university, community, or profession (please see section D for details).

The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including a summary of the courses taught, enrollment in each course, how students are evaluated in each course, student evaluations from these courses, and an index of all supplementary materials. The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and annual evaluations over the full reappointment process.

Department RTP Policy

The Department shall develop and articulate specific standards and criteria to be applied in the evaluation of candidates in all three areas of evaluation. Department standards shall not be lower than College-level standards. The Department RTP policy should adhere to the timeline presented in Table 1.

The Department RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of tenured and tenure-track Department faculty members, and approval of the College Dean. Department RTP policies shall be subject to regular review by the Department faculty.

Department RTP Committees

The Department RTP committee has the primary responsibility for evaluating the work of tenure-track faculty (Full, Associate or Assistant Professors) and Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor. The Department RTP committee makes the initial recommendation to the Department Chair and the College RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Department RTP committee members are responsible for critically analyzing the candidate's performance by applying the criteria of the Department.

The Department RTP committee shall consist of full-time, tenured faculty members elected by tenure-track and tenured faculty (or selected for service on the committee on a rotational basis). The minimum size of the committee shall be three if the Department has seven or fewer full-time faculty eligible to serve, and five if the Department has eight or more full-time faculty eligible to serve. The committee may be larger than the minimum at the discretion of the faculty and may include all tenured faculty of a Department (committee of the whole).

If too few faculty members are available to form a committee for all or some aspect of a committee's work, the committee shall consult with the College RTP committee and name faculty members from outside the Department to supplement the committee.

The committee shall be elected (unless it is the committee of the whole) by secret ballot before the end of the fall semester and election shall be by majority vote of the tenure-track and tenured faculty members of the Department. The committee's term of service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the committee's recommendations have been concluded. After the election of the committee, the Department Chair will notify the Dean of the composition of the committee.

For recommendation for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the Department's RTP committee will be made up of Full Professors only.

Department Chair

The Department Chair is responsible for communicating the Department, College, and University policies to candidates. The Chair will provide guidance to candidates over time as to whether their performance is consistent with Department expectations. The Chair, in collaboration with College or Department mentors, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career development and providing professional mentoring.

The Chair shall meet with the Department RTP committee prior to the beginning of the Department evaluation process to review the Department, College, and University processes and procedures. Department Chairs shall write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates, agreeing or disagreeing with the Department RTP committee's recommendations. In all promotion cases, the Department Chair must have a rank higher than or equal to the rank for which a candidate is being considered. In any situation where the Department Chair is not tenured and/or senior to the candidate, the Associate Dean assumes the role of Chair.

College RTP Policy

The College RTP policy shall specify in writing the standards to be applied in evaluating candidates in all three areas of evaluation, consistent with University standards and with the mission of the College. The College RTP policy shall ensure consistency of standards across the College. Colleges have the responsibility for articulating the standards appropriate to the breadth of disciplines in the College. The College RTP policy should adhere to the timeline presented in Table 1.

College RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and tenure-track

college faculty members and to the approval by the Dean and the Provost. College RTP policy shall be subject to regular review by the College faculty.

College RTP Committee

The College RTP committee reviews the materials submitted by the candidate in fulfillment for tenure and promotion to Associate or Full Professor. In so doing, the College RTP committee will review both the Department RTP and Department Chair recommendations. The College RTP committee evaluates the candidate's file in accordance with standards established in the Department, College, and University RTP policies. The College committee shall ensure that a fair and consistent evaluation occurs at the Department and College levels according to the standards set by the Department and College RTP documents. The College RTP committee shall take into account the Department's specific standards for evaluating the candidate. The College RTP committee will then prepare and forward its own independent recommendation to the College Dean.

The College RTP Committee must consist of one member from each of the Departments of the College. All Committee members must be tenured, full-time faculty. In all promotion cases, members of the College RTP committee must have a rank higher than or equal to the rank for which a candidate is being considered.

Dean of the College

The Dean has a unique role to play in providing oversight and guidance in the RTP process within the College. The Dean mentors Department Chairs regarding their role in the RTP process, encourages Departments to develop and clarify their expectations for faculty performance, provides clear guidance to the College RTP committee, and ensures that all evaluations are carried out in accordance with Department, College, and University policies. The Dean ensures that standards across the college are maintained. The Dean of the College shall provide an independent recommendation to the Provost.

Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Provost provides oversight for the university's RTP process, establishes the annual calendar of the RTP cycle, provides training for Committees, Chairs, and Deans, and distributes relevant information to prospective candidates, Chairs, Deans, and members of College and Department RTP committees. The Provost shall review the candidate's file, including all prior evaluations, and make a recommendation.

President

The President has the authority to make final decisions for the University with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This authority may be delegated to the Provost.

B. ANNUAL RTP EVALUATION

The Chair of the Department shall conduct annually a critical evaluation of the professional development in teaching, research and service (see Section D) of all tenure-track faculty members (Full, Associate or Assistant Professors) and any tenured Associate Professors seeking

promotion to Full Professor, except when a formal tenure or promotion evaluation is required (in the sixth year of pre-tenure or in the fifth year following tenure, respectively). Library faculty members will be evaluated based on performance of their assigned duties, scholarly/creative work, and service.

Assisting the Chair in the tenure and promotion evaluation process is the Departmental RTP Committee (as discussed in the Department RTP section of this document). The Chair will meet with the Departmental RTP Committee to discuss the professional development of the faculty member. Prior to the meeting, all documents described below will be submitted for consideration to the Departmental RTP committee. Only work conducted and accomplished since joining UNO as untenured faculty or since tenure (for promotion to Full Professor) will be considered. At the end of the meeting, each member of the Department RTP committee will fill out an anonymous evaluation for each candidate (see Appendix A). Each year, the Chair shall write an Annual Report to the Dean that provides a synthesis of the RTP committee's reviews for the candidate. This report will be submitted to the College Dean for his or her approval.

Annual constructive evaluation of tenure-track faculty members (Full, Associate or Assistant Professors) and Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor on their teaching, research and service (see Section D) will be made up of the following four documents:

- 1) Annual Faculty Activities Report (Faculty 180): A faculty member going through the reappointment process will submit, at the end of each Spring semester, a written report of his/her research, teaching, and other professional activities during the previous 12 months (June 1 - May 31). This report will be used to assess faculty productivity and progress towards tenure and/or promotion. Information from this report will be included in the Annual Report to the Dean.
- 2) Departmental C.V. (Faculty 180): Early in the Fall semester, a faculty member going through the reappointment process will provide an updated résumé (following the standardized University format), along with a one-page description of research and teaching goals.
- 3) Student Evaluation of Courses: Teaching evaluations for a faculty member going through the reappointment process will be provided for all his/her courses.
- 4) Candidate Self-Evaluation: A faculty member going through the reappointment process shall write a one-page self-evaluation of his/her productivity in the three areas for review, namely: a) instruction and instructional-related activities; b) research, scholarly and creative activity; and c) service to the university, community, or profession.

C. FORMAL PROMOTIONAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA AND TIMELINE

Tenure and Promotion Evaluation:

Tenure and promotion reviews must be conducted during the sixth year for all Assistant Professors, and tenure-track Associate or Full Professor may be required to serve a probationary period not to exceed four years. Tenured Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Full Professor should be reviewed no sooner than four years after promotion to Associate Professor. A faculty who applies for early tenure has an opportunity to reapply if the decision made regarding early tenure is to defer the application. In other words, application for early

tenure can be approved or deferred. A summary of the Departmental RTP Committee discussion and the evaluation form along with the Chair's report will be used by the Chair in giving verbal and written feedback to the faculty member going through the reappointment process, no later than five (5) business days after the meeting. The faculty member may, at his/her discretion, respond in writing, no later than five (5) business days after receiving the reports, to the substance of the feedback.

A copy of the Departmental RTP Committee's written report, the Chair's written report, as well as any written response from the faculty member, will be forwarded to the Dean's office and compiled for formal tenure evaluation. The Dean's office will then submit these documents to the College RTP Committee for its evaluation. The College RTP committee will write a separate, concise report on supporting or not supporting the Department's decision. Their report is forwarded to the Dean's office for review. Such written information will also be made available, during subsequent evaluations, to the respective reviewing committee. The Department RTP Committee's written report and the Dean's review will be shared with the faculty member going through the reappointment process in a timely manner in order to meet the deadlines set below. The faculty member may, at his/her discretion, respond in writing, no later than five (5) business days after receiving the reports, to the substance of the feedback.

Candidates shall submit documents to the Departmental RTP committee by December 1, so that outside letters, if needed, can be obtained. The deadlines for the Departmental evaluation to be completed and sent to the College RTP Committee is February 9. The College Committee must forward its report to the Dean no later than March 9. The College must submit the Dean's evaluation to Academic Affairs no later than April 9.

External Evaluation Procedure:

External review of scholarly work (i.e., all appropriate research, creative work, and scholarship) represents only one aspect of the entire RTP process. It is sought in order to provide additional data about the quality, relevance, and impact of a candidate's scholarly work. The external reviewers are only advisory to the department, the Dean, and the Provost. The primary responsibility for promotion/tenure decisions rests with the department which, following the RTP Guidelines of the University, reviews all aspects of a candidate's career—teaching and service, as well as scholarly work.

Where an external evaluation is required, external reviewers shall be chosen from those professionals who should be expected to be familiar with the candidate's area of work. The academic rank of these external reviewers should be senior to that of the candidate.

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

- The reviewers will not be asked whether a candidate should be tenured and/or promoted.
- Each department shall develop its own external reviewer timeline (to be aligned with the RTP timeline in Table 1) so that the reviewers may be chosen, contacted, and the reviews received in time for them to be used in the department's decision making.

- Responsibility for the administration of the external review process rests with the Chair in consultation with the Dean.
- Reviewers shall be chosen from those professionals who should be expected to be familiar with the candidate's area of work. Reviewers shall be selected in one of the following ways:
 1. The candidate and the Chair will develop a mutually acceptable list of six reviewers. This list of names shall be submitted to the Dean for approval. The Chair shall request reviews from all six persons on the list. A minimum of three reviews must be received. If for some reason fewer than three reviewers respond additional names shall be selected in a similar manner.
 2. In a case where the candidate and the Chair cannot agree on a mutually acceptable list of six reviewers, the candidate and the Chair shall each submit a list of six names with their academic rank and business address to the Dean. The Dean will provide a copy of each list to both the candidate and the Chair and the Dean will select at least three reviewers from each list. At least two reviews from each list must be received. If the initial reviewers from each list do not provide reviews, the Dean will select additional reviewers from the appropriate lists provided, and if the required number of reviews cannot be obtained using the original lists, additional names shall be selected in the original manner from the candidate, the Chair, or both.
- A standard letter and acknowledgement form shall be used to request reviews (See Appendix B). Modification of this letter may be made by departments with the approval of the Dean.
- In general, all the scholarly work submitted by the candidate will be sent out for review, unless the department and the candidate agree on a subset to be reviewed. In all cases, a complete list of the candidate's scholarly work will accompany the items submitted to the reviewer.
- 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.
- The Chair, when notifying the candidate of the decision, will provide her/him with a collective summary of the general contents of the reviews without reference to the individual reviewers. In particular, the candidate should be made aware of any significant negative comments made about his/her work. A copy of the Chair's summary will be forwarded with the other promotion/tenure materials.
- At the completion of the campus decision process, the reviews will be deposited in the Provost's office in a promotion file which is separate from and is not considered a part of the candidate's personnel file.
- If a candidate's scholarly work has already been reviewed under this procedure within the past three years, the department will include these reviews as part of the current review documentation. Full external reviews will only be repeated when the candidate, the Chair,

and the Dean feel there is a need to update the reviews based on a significant change in the candidate's record.

- When there are circumstances unique to a discipline or area of a discipline, a department may propose modifications to the procedures regarding selection of reviewers and the nature of materials to be reviewed. Any such changes must be approved by the Dean and the Provost. In particular, adaptations will be required in departments where it is impossible to send the actual work (e.g. the performing arts).

Table 1. Timeline for the Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process

From	To	Type of Document	Submit No Later Than
Candidate	Dept RTP Committee/Chair	Full RTP package	December 1
Dept Chair	Candidate	Review Letter	Six (6) business days before February 9
Candidate	Dept Chair	Rebuttal, if any	One (1) business day before February 9
Dept Chair	College RTP & Dean	Full RTP package plus all the reviews and responses	February 9
College RTP	Dean	Review Letter	March 9
Dean	Candidate	Review Letters	Six (6) business days before April 9
Candidate	Dean	Rebuttal, if any	One (1) business day before April 9
Dean	Provost	Full RTP package plus all the reviews and responses	April 9

D. TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES

(Instruction and instruction-related activities; Research, scholarly, and creative activity; and Service to the university, community, or profession)

Teaching (Instruction and instructional-related activities)

Excellence in teaching is central to the mission of the University of New Orleans. Teachers inspire and motivate their students and convey enthusiasm for their subject. They contribute to the learning and intellectual growth of students. Teachers frame the central questions of a course,

establish rules of critical thinking, illustrate connections between ideas, and compare interpretations of information. Effective teaching requires a thorough knowledge of the subject and the ability to communicate knowledge clearly through media appropriate to the discipline and to the needs of the student. Further, effective teaching includes the ability to work with, motivate, and serve as a positive role model for students. Successful teachers create a productive learning environment in the classroom, fostering student engagement in the process of learning and responding respectfully to a variety of learning styles and perspectives. They also articulate clearly their course goals, expectations, and policies, along with grading standards, assignments, and deadlines in course syllabi. They provide timely and helpful feedback on student work and make themselves available to students outside of class. Teaching responsibilities also include mentoring graduate students in thesis or dissertation preparation as well as working with undergraduate students in directed independent study and research, internships, community-based service learning, or other formats appropriate to the discipline.

It is the responsibility of each Department to evaluate the teaching of its faculty members. Evaluation of teaching must take into consideration a Department's instructional mission; a faculty member's assignment of duties within the unit; class size, scope, and sequence within the curriculum; as well as format of delivery and the types of instructional media utilized. The evaluation of teaching should be adaptable to differences among disciplines. Since such evaluation is a qualitative process, multiple sources of evidence should be employed. Assessments of teaching must be based upon student course evaluations and descriptions of courses taught and developed by the faculty member. Departments may also wish to include written reports of peer observations and evaluations of teaching. Such assessments can include review of course syllabi, texts, assignments, examinations, and class materials. Where possible, evaluation is enhanced by evidence of student learning. In addition to course syllabi and student evaluations, the candidate may present the following kinds of documentation of teaching effectiveness: instructional materials, assessment activities and products, and other materials used in connection with courses. In addition, the candidate may present evidence of new course development, course redesign, and adaptation to new formats and media through incorporation of emerging technologies. Finally, the candidate may also present documentation of professional development activities and efforts at improvement, student performance on pre- and post-instruction measures, students' self-assessment of learning gains, exemplary student work and outcomes, records of advising and mentoring, supervision of teaching and research assistants, theses/dissertations direction, and teaching awards. The responsibilities for Library faculty members (academic non-instructional faculty with fiscal year appointments) are defined by their position descriptions and generally do not include a teaching requirement.

Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Research is vital to the mission of the University of New Orleans. Hence, the University of New Orleans fosters the achievement of excellence among its faculty assigned to conduct research, be involved in scholarly work, or be actively engaged in other creative activity appropriate to their fields. The form of this activity will vary considerably across disciplines. In most disciplines, it includes the development of scholarly or creative work appropriate to the field, and the review of that work by peers. Discipline-specific accomplishments may include, but are not limited to, articles in refereed journals, books, textbooks, book chapters, monographs, scholarly reviews, juried artistic accomplishment (such as musical composition, painting, sculpture, poetry, fiction, creative nonfiction, theatrical plays, or dance), patents, inventions, product development, scholarly articles in non-refereed journals, articles in popular media, papers, invited presentations or exhibitions, commissioned or contracted work, grant submissions, presentation of scholarly work to professional societies, receipt of professional honors and awards, or other evidence of significant professional accomplishment. Within each Department, the assessment of this work will be conducted by faculty members higher in rank than the candidate. The Department will determine the criteria for both the quantity and the quality of the candidate's work. Written evaluations by external reviewers of the candidate's scholarly or creative work may also be required. What is critical is the demonstration that the candidate is an active and creative participant in the development of his or her field. In evaluating the candidate's contributions, the objectives are to establish that the work is of high quality, that it is a scholarly or creative contribution to the candidate's professional discipline, and that it shows the candidate's potential to make continuing contributions in his or her field.

Service

Service to the university, the professional field or discipline, and to the broader community is a key element of the faculty mission. Candidates for tenure must have made substantive contributions in one or more of these areas. Evaluation of administrative and other professional services to students, Departments, Colleges, and the University of New Orleans, should include more than a simple listing of events; it should include an assessment of the extent and quality of the services rendered. Public service may include work for professional organizations and local, state, federal or international agencies and institutions. It must relate to the basic mission of the University of New Orleans and capitalize on the faculty member's special professional expertise; the normal service activities associated with good citizenship are not usually evaluated as part of the tenure and promotion process. Because of the diverse missions of different units and variations in the extent and character of their interaction with external groups, general standards of public, professional service, and service learning will vary across units. Community engagement that is undertaken by faculty to enhance curriculum, teaching and learning and prepare educated, engaged citizens may be included and evaluated as part of service.

E. PROMOTION OF FACULTY OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

Faculty with the title of “Professional Practice” may seek promotions in rank but are not eligible for tenure. Promotions are based upon merit and outstanding achievement.

Due to the varying roles held by Faculty of Professional Practice across the University, departments shall establish guidelines that include clearly stated criteria for promotion that are specific to their discipline. The guidelines shall be approved by the College RTP committee, dean and Provost. Evaluation of the candidate shall take into account the nature of the duties and responsibilities set out when the candidate was appointed.

The guidelines should state that very few persons who do not hold the doctorate will be promoted to the rank of full professor. (See Chapter III of the UL System Bylaws (Section X. Faculty Rank.)

The promotion review process shall follow that of tenure-track faculty.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE RTP EVALUATION FORM

***NOTE: Departments may modify this form to align with their specific RTP guidelines.**

Faculty evaluation of the professional development of: Dr. or Pr. _____

Using a scale of 5 (as the highest evaluation) to 1 (as the lowest evaluation), read each item below and rate the faculty member's level of effort and/or accomplishments relative to that issue. If you do not have sufficient information to form an opinion concerning a particular item, or feel that the item does not apply in a particular case, then choose N/A.

Evaluation Scale: 5 (highly acceptable)
4 (more than acceptable)
3 (acceptable)
2 (unacceptable)
1 (definitely unacceptable)
N/A (not applicable/no opinion)

A. Research, Scholarly and/or Creative Activities

1. Active involvement in research and/or other scholarly or creative activities
2. Continuing publication of research results and/or display/presentation of other creative activities
3. General publication record over entire career (including new articles, reports, books, reviews and other creative works etc.)
4. Regular presentation of research at state/regional/national/international meetings
5. Continuing effort to obtain funding
6. Ability to conduct productive research with available resources
7. If this person has had graduate students in his/her supervision, your opinion of the effectiveness in supervision of graduate research
8. If this person has had undergraduate students in his/her supervision, your opinion of the effectiveness in supervision of undergraduate research.
9. If this person is being considered formally for tenure or promotion this year, your opinion of the scholarly reputation and growth potential, as assessed from solicited external letters of reference.

B. Instructional Ability, Including Instruction-Related Activities

(For Library faculty, whose position descriptions do not include formal teaching, performance of the librarian's duties will substitute for Instructional Ability.)

10. Student opinions of teaching performance (as documented by official Departmental evaluations)
11. Attitude toward students and teaching
12. If this person has supervised a course program, your opinion of the effectiveness as a coordinator

C. Service to the University, Community and Profession

13. General participation in Departmental affairs (e.g., faculty meetings, seminar programs)
14. If asked to serve, effectiveness on Department committees
15. If asked to serve, effectiveness of service in College, University and Community functions
16. If asked to serve, effectiveness of service to the profession

APPENDIX B

Sample Letter to Solicit External Reviewer Participation

[Heading]

[Date]

Dear [External Reviewer Name]:

[Candidate's Name] is being considered for promotion to the rank of [] {and/or for tenure} in the Department of [] at the University of New Orleans. Because you are knowledgeable in [his/her] area of specialization, you have been selected as an appropriate reviewer of ['s] scholarly work.

While we are not asking your advice on the more general question of should we promote and/or tenure, your comments will be important to us in judging the scholarly contribution of ['s] works.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Chair, Department of []

Sample Form: External Reviewer Acknowledgement

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

_____ I am willing to serve.

_____ I am unable to serve.

(signature) (date)

Please return this form by [specify date] to:

[Department Chair or Designated Recipient]