

## UNIVERSITY OF NEW ORLEANS

### POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION IN ACADEMIC RANK AND FOR TENURE

Promotion and tenure are separate actions and hence will be treated separately. However, they have a common basis in that each represents a judgment by those responsible that the candidate has 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.

(In some instances, promotion automatically confers tenure. This is explained below under the section on promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor).

The key administrative official in recommending promotion or tenure is the department chair. In general, the faculty of a given department will provide the most reliable professional judgment as to whether promotion or tenure is deserved. This assessment will occur after examination of all pertinent data which normally will include an external review of a candidate's scholarly work. The chair must take pains to consult thoroughly with all appropriate members of the faculty, as set forth below. It must be remembered, however, that other administrative officials are required to act upon the recommendations made by the chair, either granting or failing to grant endorsement in each instance. Candidates for promotion and tenure must therefore be careful not to assume that the chair's recommendation is final. LSU System regulations require that the dean of the college, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, 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 LSU Board of Supervisors.

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

#### I. PROMOTION

General LSU System policy regarding promotion is set forth in *PM-46 Policies Governing Appointment and Promotion of the Teaching and Research Staffs*. The specific criteria and procedures that follow are in accordance with this document.

Since these guidelines are designed to apply to the entire University (including the Library), they are stated with some generality. The faculty of each department, working with the department chair, is to establish specific criteria and procedures for that department; and the faculty of each college, working with the dean, is to establish college-wide guidelines for that

college. Both departmental and college-wide guidelines and criteria are to be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for approval. Needless to say, departmental and college guidelines must be consistent with the University guidelines set forth below.

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

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

### **Criteria for Promotion**

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

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

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

The following minimum criteria have been established for promotion to the various ranks:

1. For promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor.
  - a. the appropriate terminal degree.
  - b. a clear need in the department for a specialist in the candidate's particular field of competence.
  - c. evidence of teaching ability and of scholarly or (where applicable) creative activity.
2. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

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

3. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor<sup>1</sup>.
  - a. normally, at least five years service as Associate Professor.
  - b. effective teaching and advising, including regular graduate teaching and, normally, direction of theses for those departments with graduate programs.
  - c. outstanding and substantial scholarly work, or (where applicable) outstanding creative work of equivalent importance, on a sustained basis. For scholarly publications, only work that has been published or accepted for publication will be considered.
  - d. one of the following:
    - i. significant and sustained professional activity.
    - ii. outstanding contributions to the development and progress of the University.
  - e. evidence of substantial professional development or achievement since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.
  - f. evidence of high professional standing (e.g., as shown by letters from off-campus professors of national repute, or by grants, awards, editorships, high office in scholarly organizations).

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

In general, it should be remembered that the chair has the responsibility to make a clear and convincing case for any promotion recommended. The recommendation should not be vague and general. Specific evidence of the candidate's academic achievements and concrete detail in

---

<sup>1</sup>**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 four years at the time the promotion to Associate Professor takes effect.

support of the chair's evaluations will be required. For example, a statement that the candidate is an effective teacher would have to be documented by the results of a teacher evaluation survey, peer evaluation of departmental seminars, letters or comments from former students, etc. The presentation should be written so that the merits of the case are fully apparent to persons who are not familiar with the discipline of the individual under consideration.

### **Procedures for Promotion**

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

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

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

1. At least a month ahead of time, the chair must send written notification to each person eligible for consideration, stating that the review process is about to get underway and advising the candidate to provide any information he/she wishes to have considered by those to be consulted. It is the candidates' responsibility to provide relevant information concerning their work which they suppose may otherwise escape attention. Many departments find it convenient to accomplish this by requesting all members of the department annually to complete a form reporting their work during the preceding year. Whatever method is used, all candidates must ensure that the information made available is accurate and up-to-date.
2. The chair will assume responsibility for collecting and presenting to the faculty members concerned with each review a curriculum vitae of each candidate, as well as a synopsis of that individual's progress and achievements, including effectiveness in teaching, research and writing or (where applicable) the equivalent creative activity, and service to the University and community. These materials will include (if appropriate) the external assessments of the candidate's scholarly work. If significant for the effective discharge of the candidate's responsibilities to the University, information concerning personal qualities and ability to work harmoniously with colleagues and students may also be included. Attention should also be drawn to applicable departmental personnel policies.
3. These materials will be reviewed and discussed at a meeting, conducted by the chair, of all those taking part in the evaluation process. Such a meeting will give

all concerned the opportunity to hear any additional information or comments which members of the group may have to contribute. Written notice of the meeting should be given well in advance to all faculty members involved, with a statement of the agenda. The meeting should be conducted so as to afford a reasonable opportunity to discuss the materials presented, to put questions, and to offer further information and judgments. Confidentiality must be strictly maintained.

4. Each department will develop its own system of recording the recommendations of the appropriate faculty on whether or not to promote the candidate. Whatever method is chosen, a verifiable record of the recommendations must be kept, and the result made known to the appropriate faculty. The chair will then consult with each of those faculty members who so desire, before reaching a decision.
5. The departmental decision is ultimately the chair's, and it may disagree with the recommendation of the faculty. In any case, the chair will notify the appropriate faculty of his/her decision and the reasons for it. The chair will then forward to the dean his/her decision, together with a record of the recommendation of the faculty.
6. The chair will report to the dean his/her decision on each eligible candidate whether or not promotion is recommended. In any case in which this decision disagrees with the recommendation of the faculty, the chair will give the dean a written explanation of the disagreement.
7. A candidate whose promotion is not being recommended by the chair must be so informed within ten academic days after the decision is made. The chair should counsel verbally with the candidate concerning the candidate's areas of weakness, and should provide formal notification to the candidate in a memorandum within ten academic days. This written notification serves to formalize the chair's decision and ensures that the unsuccessful candidate is not left in a state of uncertainty. The memorandum should be brief and simple but should relate the decision to the relevant criteria. A copy of this memorandum is to be sent to the dean of the college.
8. Candidates whose promotions are recommended by the chair should be so advised in private, informally, within ten academic days. They should be reminded of the review process that still remains before the recommendations become official.
9. A candidate whose promotion is recommended by the chair but subsequently refused by another reviewing official must be so notified by the chair in a timely fashion, i.e., within a few days after the chair is told of the decision. As in #7 above, the chair should convey the information verbally, with appropriate counseling, and in a formal memorandum. A copy of this memorandum is to be sent to the dean of the college and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
10. An unsuccessful candidate for promotion has the right to receive a verbal explanation of the reasons underlying the decision from the person who has made the unfavorable determination. If the candidate so wishes, a written explanation must also be provided. Unlike the verbal explanation, however, which serves as a counseling mechanism, the written explanation will be brief, categorical, and expressed as a judgment.

## **2. Colleges**

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

The faculty of each college may recommend whether to establish a formal college-level advisory group. (If such a group already exists in a given college, this procedure need not of course be implemented).

Each dean will advise the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the decision that is made on this point, furnishing the reasons that have underlain the decision. In colleges where such an advisory group already exists, the dean is to provide the Vice Chancellor with a full explanation of the composition and charge of the advisory group. The faculty of the college has the right to reconsider this question.

## **3. Office of Academic Affairs**

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

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

## **II. TENURE**

The following excerpt from Chapter II, Section 2-7, of University Regulations as amended by the Board of Supervisors sets forth the LSU System policy regarding tenure:

Faculty members and other members of the academic staff of comparable rank, including librarians, may be appointed for a specified term ("term appointment") or indefinitely ("tenured appointment") depending on rank and experience. Appointment or tenure on one campus of the LSU System carries no implication of appointment or tenure on another campus. Academic employees are tenured only with respect to their academic ranks and not with respect to administrative titles or assignments.

Tenure is not a guarantee of lifetime employment, particularly in face of institutional change or financial exigency. It does assure that the employee will not be dismissed without adequate justification and without due process.

Term employees are appointed for specified periods of time as indicated on the appointment form.

Professors and Associate Professors are tenured and are appointed for an indefinite period of time, except that the initial appointment and subsequent reappointments through not more than four years of total service to the LSU campus involved may be made for a stipulated term. Persons promoted to the rank of Professor or Associate Professor after less than four years of service on the campus may be continued on term appointment through no more than the fourth year. Persons holding a professorial rank (Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor) while being paid from a grant or contract do not acquire tenure through the passage of time but may become tenured only by specific, individual recommendation through appropriate channels and approval by the President.

Assistant Professors are appointed for terms no longer than three years. Upon reappointment after seven years of service in rank on a particular campus, Assistant Professors receive tenure. A thorough review will be made during the sixth year of service so that notice of termination may be given if necessary no later than the end of the sixth year of service. Individual campuses have the option of conducting the thorough review prior to the sixth year, provided that appropriate written notification is given to the faculty member. The University may, at its discretion, count prior service on the same campus toward the seven-year evaluation period for an Assistant Professor to achieve indeterminate tenure. The ultimate decision shall be left with the President, to be applied in each individual case for which the respective campus recommends granting indeterminate tenure counting prior service favorably.

Those who rank as Instructor or Associate shall be on an annual appointment.

The following excerpt from the same section sets forth the policy regarding expiration of appointment:

Upon expiration of a term appointment, the employee is a free agent to whom the University System has no obligation. The University System may reappoint the employee to the same or a different position. Non-reappointment carries no implication whatsoever as to the quality of the employee's work, conduct, or professional competence.

When an employee is not to be reappointed, written notice to the employee will ordinarily be provided in accordance with the following schedule:

1. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of the year; or, if an initial one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.

2. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
3. At least 12 months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years service on that campus.

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.

## Criteria for Tenure

In the majority of cases, tenure is achieved upon promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Exceptions will normally occur only when (a) a person is promoted to, or reappointed as, Associate Professor or Professor with less than four 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 infrequently – only in those extremely rare cases where a person has not earned promotion to Associate Professor yet has been deemed so valuable to the University as to warrant tenure.

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

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

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

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

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.

## Procedures for Tenure

### 1. Department

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

It should be noted that tenure, unlike promotion, is attained upon reappointment after a stated number of years. Hence the department chair and the dean must take every precaution to ensure that all faculty members who could potentially attain tenure – i.e., all those above the rank of instructor who do not have tenure – are reviewed at the appropriate time, as indicated below.

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

Except in the year when this formal Pre-Tenure Review is occurring, each department is to conduct informal departmental reviews beginning with the third year in rank for assistant professors. This procedure, which is to be established separately by each department, will provide a mechanism for early, informal counseling by the department chair. The chair may elect to forward results of these reviews to the dean and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for their comments. However, all concerned must bear in mind that this is an informal, advisory procedure – it does not lead to a tenure decision.

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

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

To implement these policies, departments will observe the same procedures described under the section on Promotions [see above, pages 5-6, numbers (1)-(10)]. The only difference will be the obvious one, that references to "promotion" will be replaced by "tenure." As was

noted above, chairs will usually find it desirable to consult about tenure decisions at the same time as promotion decisions.

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

## **2. College**

The dean will follow the same procedures for tenure decisions as for promotion decisions. See page 7.

## **3. Office of Academic Affairs**

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will follow the same procedures for tenure decisions as for promotion decisions. See page 7.

## APPENDIX A

February 28, 1989

### GUIDELINES: EXTERNAL REVIEW OF SCHOLARLY WORK

Approved by the University Senate on March 29, 1989

#### I. PURPOSE

- A. When judging a candidate for promotion/tenure, the ultimate measure of his/her scholarly work<sup>2</sup> comes from peer review – most importantly that done by his/her department. A department will normally augment the data it uses for its decision by soliciting reviews of the candidate's work from respected members of the profession from outside the University. External review may be waived if it is agreed that it will add no data useful to the decision process. However, it will be done in any case when requested by the candidate, the department, the dean, or the provost. A department or college may adopt, or be directed to adopt, a policy requiring it for some or all decisions. External review, when done, will follow these guidelines.
- B. External review of scholarly work represents only one aspect of the entire promotion/tenure decision process. It is sought in order to provide additional data about the quality, relevance, and impact of a candidate's scholarly work. The external reviewers are only advisory to the department, the dean, and the provost. The primary responsibility for promotion/tenure decisions rests with the department which, following the criteria and procedures of the University, reviews all aspects of a candidate's career – teaching and service as well as scholarly work.

#### II. PROCEDURES

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

- A. The reviewers will not be asked whether a candidate should be tenured and/or promoted.
- B. Each department shall develop its own timetables so that the reviewers may be chosen, contacted, and the reviews received in time for them to be used in the department's decision making.
- C. Responsibility for the administration of the external review process rests with the department chair in consultation with the dean.
- D. 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:

---

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

1. The candidate and the department chair will develop a mutually acceptable list of six reviewers. This list of names shall be submitted to the dean for approval. The chair shall request reviews from all six persons on the list. A minimum of three reviews must be received. If for some reason fewer than three reviewers respond additional names shall be selected in a similar manner.
  2. In a case where the candidate and the department chair cannot agree on a mutually acceptable list of six reviewers, the candidate and the department chair shall each submit a list of six names with their academic rank and business address to the dean. The dean will provide a copy of each list to both the candidate and the chair and the dean will select at least three reviewers from each list. At least two reviews from each list must be received. If the initial reviewers from each list do not provide reviews, the dean will select additional reviewers from the appropriate lists provided, and if the required number of reviews cannot be obtained using the original lists, additional names shall be selected in the original manner from the candidate, the chair, or both.
- E. A standard letter shall be used to request reviews. (See. Appendix A.) Modification of this letter may be made by departments with the approval of the dean.
- F. 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.<sup>3</sup> In all cases a complete list of the candidate's scholarly work will accompany the items submitted to the reviewer.
- 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 department chair, when notifying the candidate of the decision, will provide her/him with a collective summary of the general contents of the reviews without reference to the individual reviewers. In particular, the candidate should be made aware of any significant negative comments made about his/her work. A copy of the chair's summary will be forwarded with the other promotion/tenure materials.
- I. 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.

---

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

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

**APPENDIX A**  
**of Guidelines: External Review of Scholarly Work**

**Sample Letter**

[Heading]

[Date]

Dear [ ]:

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

---

Chair, Department of [ ]

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT FORM

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

\_\_\_\_\_ I am willing to serve.

\_\_\_\_\_ I am unable to serve.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(date)

Please return this form by [ specify date ] to:

[ \_\_\_\_\_ ]