P.C. Rossin College of Engineering and Applied Science
Lehigh University
Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

(Document serves as an addendum to the *University Promotion and Tenure Portfolios* and *Tenure and Promotion Checklist*)

Revised by the Rossin College Leadership Council on May 9, 2023.

Please review in conjunction with R&P Section 2.2.6, which provides details on the university policies surrounding tenure review.

1. Composition of the **external review team**
   a. The Rossin College recommends that the final external review team for promotion and/or tenure consist of at least **eight** members. These eight reviewers include the **five** members of the external review team required by R&P Section 2.2.6.2.
      i. The Department Chair, in consultation with the department faculty, will provide to the Dean a list of at least **ten** recommended reviewers.
      ii. In addition to the departmental list, the candidate, in consultation with the department chair, should recommend a list of at least two outside reviewers. These recommendations must be included with the submission of the departmental list.
         1. The candidate is encouraged to include, as one of their recommendations, an external reviewer who is intimately familiar with the candidate's research area. This reviewer may have served in the capacity of co-author, co-editor, co-principal investigator, or co-advisor of a doctoral student or post-doc. This individual may not, however, be the candidate's former graduate (masters/doctoral) or postdoctoral advisor.
      iii. The departmental and candidate's lists should include a statement of the qualifications of each reviewer and a clear and complete statement of the relationship between the candidate and the reviewer. Both lists must be submitted using the templates available on the Provost website.
   b. One candidate from the list of eight may be a close collaborator (i.e., an external reviewer intimately familiar with the candidate's research area, as described in Section 1.a.ii.1 above).
   c. At least one reviewer from the list suggested by the candidate has to be included in the final review team, but no more than two. The department chair in consultation with the department faculty will select these one or two reviewers.
   d. When a candidate has been active in **interdisciplinary research**, the group of external reviewers should be representative of the breadth of the candidate's research. Input from Lehigh department chairs in areas of a candidate's interdisciplinary research may be requested in order to develop the list of external reviewers. In any case, the breadth as well as depth of a candidate's scholarly impacts should be considered.
   e. At least 50% of the external reviewers should be tenured full professors at their institutions.

f.   The final list of external evaluators will be discussed and approved by the Dean and Provost.

2. Department representatives on the Rossin College Tenure Committee can vote in the department, but not in the Tenure Committee. They are recused from discussing and voting on the faculty member going up for tenure in their own department in the tenure committee. If the department representative has a joint appointment, they are recused from discussing and voting on candidates from both of their departments.

3. If the Rossin College Tenure Committee has questions or needs clarification about a candidate's dossier, the chair of the Tenure Committee should send those questions to the Associate Dean for Faculty Development, who will work with the department chair to provide the requested information to the committee in writing.

4. Evidence of **scholarly impact** is a primary consideration for tenure and promotion.
    a. It is important that scholarly impact is measured in a multi-faceted, multi-dimensional manner to minimize bias toward a specific discipline or research area.
    b. *Archival publications.* Archival publications provide an important indicator for the candidate's scholarly impact. Preferably, a candidate will have a demonstrated publication record in high-quality venues with their graduate students as co-authors. A citation report should be included in the dossier, along with background information on the stature of journals, book publishers, conferences, etc. See the *Rossin Addendum*: *Portfolio Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty* for preparation details.
    c. *Peer Recognition:* It should be recognized that the number of citations for a candidate's publication is highly variable, time sensitive, discipline-specific, and potentially biased toward papers focusing on reviews and surveys, and papers rich on technical data. Citation data should *not* be prioritized as a measure for tenure evaluation. Other evidence of scholarly reputation, such as invited seminar presentations at other universities; invited conference presentations; organizing professional conferences, conference sessions, workshops, and tutorial sessions; journal editorship; and professional awards and recognitions should be used to measure the candidate's recognition in his/her research community.
    d. *Research Funding:* While funded research is an important measure of the candidate's scholarly impact, it should be recognized that a high funding level does not always translate into high scholarly impact. When evaluating the candidate's funded research activities, competitive, peer-reviewed grants are particularly important. Successes in peer-reviewed research-funding proposals and in competitive industrial funding, which supports graduate research, is a relevant measure of scholarship and external recognition. Preferably, a candidate will have had a leading role in some grants (PI as opposed to Co-PI). Moreover, the *use* of research funding should be evaluated explicitly. Supporting graduate and undergraduate student research, enhancing integration between research and education, and contribution to university infrastructure through ICR, equipment, and tuition payment should be strongly encouraged.
    e. *Collaborative Research:* The role of Co-PI on research projects, as well as co-authorship on publications, should be clarified during tenure and promotion

review. Since it is difficult for an outside party to determine each collaborator's contribution to joint work, the candidate should clearly delineate his/her contributions to collaborative proposals/funded grants in the CV and describe his/her contributions to the research and/or publications in the research statement. The department summary letter may clarify the candidate's contribution to collaborative work.

f. *Graduate Student Research Supervision:* Accomplishments in graduate student research supervision should serve as a strong indicator of scholarly impact. Here, research supervision refers to the supervision of a doctoral dissertation, or master's thesis or non-thesis research, which leads to clear scholarly outcomes. The following examples may be provided as evidence of the candidate's **performance in research supervision**:

   i. advising and supporting doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers
   ii. co-advising doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers which led to, or is expected to lead to, joint publications or funded research projects
   iii. scholarly output of masters or doctoral students and postdocs (e.g., publications, conference presentations, colloquiums, awards, etc.)
   iv. doctoral students who have graduated or are making clear progress towards graduation
   v. doctoral students and/or post-docs who have achieved distinction in academe, industry, or government
   vi. other evidence (e.g., letters from former students) may be provided to testify to the quality and impact of the candidate's research supervision

g. *Other Measures:* Other evidence of scholarly impact should be provided and may include: inventions, engineering designs, products, software systems, or algorithms which resulted in patents, industrial adoptions, or other recognition by the press or the research community at large.

5. **Teaching effectiveness** should be examined in a broad context.
   a. Demonstration of commitment and growth as an educator should be considered, including activities such as: adopting inclusive practices in the classroom, developing and disseminating creative pedagogical approaches, actively participating in and implementing recommendations from teaching workshops (e.g., through CITL or professional societies), and incorporating feedback from peer and student evaluations into future course revisions.
   b. Demonstration of commitment to the educational mission of the university, through the development of new courses and active participation in curriculum development (either at the graduate or undergraduate level), should be considered.
   c. Demonstration of teaching methods that go beyond the traditional "chalk and talk" and integrate emerging educational frameworks and teaching methods that are demonstrated to have a high impact on student learning should be considered. Experimental approaches are encouraged, and continuous improvement in student outcomes may be used as a metric for teaching performance. Dissemination of pedagogical approaches, through professional conferences (such as ASEE), publications, or through professional networks is highly encouraged.
   d. Facilitation of student learning that is experiential but possibly non-curricular, including externally presented student projects, student team awards, industry

collaboration/participation in classroom settings, and published student work, is encouraged.

e. Student course evaluations should be interpreted carefully, taking into consideration implicit bias, difficulty of the material, popularity of the subject area, and whether it was a required or elective course. Peer input and student feedback (separate from the official course evaluations) may be another source of information on a candidate's teaching effectiveness.

f. Some form of peer input on teaching should be provided at the point of Tenure & Promotion review and may be included in the department summary letter. This may be given in the context of team teaching, in-class observations, or other forms of peer interaction.

g. Faculty candidates should teach a variety of courses (e.g., larger/smaller, undergraduate/graduate, core/elective courses) representative of the department by the point of Tenure & Promotion review. The typical expectation is that assistant professors will have four (no more than five) new course preps prior to turning in their tenure package.

h. Strong evidence of advising and mentorship of graduate and undergraduate students should be provided.

6. **Service** should be examined in terms of its sustained positive impact on the university community and on the profession.

a. Sustained positive impact on the university community should be evident. There should be clear evidence of substantive contributions to the university through engagement and collaboration. Significant service activities are too numerous to list, but evidence of activities that have positive impact on the university community, and that align with the university mission and strategic priorities, should be demonstrated. The impact of these activities should be assessed and evaluated.

b. Sustained positive impact on the professional community should be evident. There should be clear evidence of substantive contributions to the profession through engagement and collaboration. Examples of high-impact professional service may include: serving on national panels, service to professional societies, serving as an advocate for the field, or organizing professional conferences and workshops.

c. **Untenured faculty members should recognize that while providing service is important, it should be carefully balanced with their scholarship and teaching.**

P.C. Rossin College of Engineering and Applied Science
Lehigh University
Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor

(Document serves as an addendum to the *University Promotion and Tenure Portfolios* and *Tenure and Promotion Checklist*)

Revised by the Rossin College Leadership Council on May 9, 2023.

Please review in conjunction with R&P Section 2.2.9, which provides details on the university policies surrounding promotion of Tenured Associate Professors to the rank of Full Professor.

1. Composition of the external review team
    a. The Rossin College recommends that the final external review team for promotion to full professor consists of at least **eight** members. These **eight** reviewers include the **five** members of the external review team required by R&P Section 2.2.9.3.
        i. The Department Chair, in consultation with the department faculty, will provide to the Dean a list of at least **ten** recommended reviewers.
        ii. In addition to the departmental list, the candidate, in consultation with the department chair, should recommend a list of at least two outside reviewers. These recommendations must be included with the submission of the departmental list.
            1. The candidate is encouraged to include, as one of their recommendations, an external reviewer who is intimately familiar with the candidate's research area. This reviewer may have served in the capacity of co-author, co-editor, co-principal investigator, or co-advisor of a doctoral student or post-doc. This individual may not, however, be the candidate's former graduate (masters/doctoral) or postdoctoral advisor.
        iii. The departmental and candidate's lists should include a statement of the qualifications of each reviewer and a clear and complete statement of the relationship between the candidate and the reviewer. Both lists must be submitted using the templates available on the Provost website.
    b. One candidate from the list of eight may be a close collaborator (i.e., an external reviewer intimately familiar with the candidate's research area, as described in Section 1.a.ii.1 above).
    c. At least one reviewer from the list suggested by the candidate has to be included in the final review team, but no more than two. The department chair in consultation with the department faculty will select these one or two reviewers.
    d. When a candidate has been active in **interdisciplinary research**, the group of external reviewers should be representative of the breadth of the candidate's research. Input from Lehigh department chairs in areas of a candidate's interdisciplinary research may be requested in order to develop the list of external reviewers. In any case, the breadth as well as depth of a candidate's scholarly impacts should be considered.
    e. External reviewers from universities should be tenured full professors at their institutions.

f. No more than 50% of external reviewers from the final list should be from the list of external reviewers that provided letters for the tenure case for the same candidate. For the university-required five external reviewers, at most two can have provided tenure letters; for each external letter beyond the university-required five, the 50% rule applies (e.g., for a list of eight external reviewers, at most 3 can be from the list that provided tenure letters).

g. The final list of external evaluators will be discussed and approved by the Dean and Provost.

2. Department representatives on the Rossin College Promotion Committee can vote in the department, but not in the Promotion Committee. They are recused from discussing and voting on the faculty member going up for promotion to Full Professor in their own department in the Promotion Committee. If the department representative has a joint appointment, they are recused from discussing and voting on candidates from both of their departments.

3. If the Rossin College Promotion Committee has questions or needs clarification about a candidate's dossier, the chair of the Promotion Committee should send those questions to the Associate Dean for Faculty Development, who will work with the department chair to provide the requested information to the committee in writing.

4. Evidence of **scholarly leadership and impact** is a primary consideration for the promotion to full professor.
   a. It is important that scholarly impact is measured in a multi-faceted, multi-dimensional manner to minimize bias toward a specific discipline or research area.
   b. *Archival publications.* The caliber of the candidate's publications should provide evidence for high-impact scholarship. The candidate's publications should focus on high-quality, high-impact outlets. A citation report should be included in the dossier, along with background information on the stature of journals, book publishers, conferences, etc. See the *Rossin Addendum*: *Portfolio Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty* for preparation details.
   c. *Peer Recognition:* It should be recognized that the number of citations for a candidate's publication is highly variable, time sensitive, discipline-specific, and potentially biased toward papers focusing on reviews and surveys, and papers rich on technical data. Citation data should *not* be prioritized as a measure for promotion evaluation. Other evidence of scholarly achievement and reputation, such as best paper awards; journal editorship; invited seminar presentations at other universities; invited or keynote presentations at professional conferences and symposiums; organizing professional conferences, conference sessions, workshops, and tutorial sessions; and professional awards and recognitions should be used to measure the candidate's recognition in his/her research community.
   d. *Research Funding:* While funded research is an important measure of the candidate's scholarly impact, it should be recognized that high funding level does not always translate into high scholarly impact. When evaluating the candidate's funded research activities, competitive, peer-reviewed grants are particularly important. Successes in peer-reviewed research-funding proposals and in competitive industrial funding, which supports graduate research, is a relevant measure of scholarship and external

recognition. A candidate should have demonstrated clear leadership in proposal development and in successful extramural funding. Moreover, the *use* of research funding should be evaluated explicitly. Supporting graduate and undergraduate student research, enhancing integration between research and education, and contribution to university infrastructure through ICR, equipment, and tuition payment should be strongly encouraged.

e. *Collaborative Research:* The role of Co-PI on research projects, as well as co-authorship on publications, should be clarified during promotion review. Since it is difficult for an outside party to determine each collaborator's contribution to joint work, the candidate should clearly delineate his/her contributions to collaborative proposals/funded grants in the CV and describe his/her contributions to the research and/or publications in the research statement.

f. *Graduate Student Research Supervision:* Accomplishments in graduate student research supervision should serve as a strong indicator of scholarly impact. Here, research supervision refers to the supervision of a doctoral dissertation, or master's thesis or non-thesis research, which leads to clear scholarly outcomes. The following information may be provided as evidence of the candidate's **performance in research supervision**:
    i. advising and supporting doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers
    ii. co-advising doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers which resulted in joint publications or funded research projects
    iii. scholarly output of masters or doctoral students and postdocs (e.g., publications, conference presentations, colloquiums, awards, etc.)
    iv. doctoral students who have graduated
    v. doctoral students and/or post-docs who have achieved distinction in academe, industry, or government
    vi. other evidence (e.g., letters from former students) may be provided to testify to the quality and impact of the candidate's research supervision

g. *Other Measures:* Other evidence of scholarly impact should be provided and may include: inventions, engineering designs, products, software systems, or algorithms which resulted in patents, industrial adoptions, or other recognition by the press or the research community at large.

5. **Teaching leadership and effectiveness** should be examined in a broad context.
    a. Demonstration of commitment and continued growth as an educator should be considered, including activities such as: adopting inclusive practices in the classroom, developing and disseminating creative pedagogical approaches, actively participating in and implementing recommendations from teaching workshops (e.g., through CITL or professional societies), and incorporating feedback from peer and student evaluations into future course revisions. Evidence of educational leadership (e.g., leading or organizing teaching workshops, mentoring junior faculty in teaching, etc.) should be carefully considered as well.
    b. Demonstration of commitment to the educational mission of the university, through the development of new courses and active participation in curriculum development (either at the graduate or undergraduate level), should be considered.
    c. Demonstration of teaching methods that go beyond the traditional "chalk and talk" and integrate emerging educational frameworks and teaching methods that are demonstrated to have a high impact on student learning should be considered.

Experimental approaches are encouraged, and continuous improvement in student outcomes may be used as a metric for teaching performance. Dissemination of pedagogical approaches, through professional conferences (such as ASEE), publications, or through professional networks is highly encouraged.

d. Facilitation of student learning that is experiential but possibly non-curricular, including externally presented student projects, student team awards, industry collaboration/participation in classroom settings, and published student work, is encouraged.

e. Student course evaluations should be interpreted carefully, taking into consideration implicit bias, difficulty of the material, popularity of the subject area, and whether it was a required or elective course. Peer input and student feedback (separate from the official course evaluations) may be another source of information on a candidate's teaching effectiveness.

f. Some form of peer input on teaching should be provided at the point of Promotion review and may be included in the department summary letter. This may be given in the context of team teaching, in-class observations, or other forms of peer interaction.

g. Faculty candidates should teach a variety of courses (e.g., larger/smaller, undergraduate/graduate, core/elective courses) representative of the department by the point of Promotion review.

h. Strong evidence of advising and mentorship of graduate and undergraduate students should be provided.

6. **Service leadership** should be examined in terms of its long-term positive impact on the university community and on the profession. A strong record of service at different levels on campus and in the profession is expected.

a. Long-term positive impact on the university community should be evident. There should be clear evidence of substantive contributions to the university through engagement, collaboration, and leadership. Significant service activities are too numerous to list, but evidence of faculty service leadership that has a substantive impact on the university community, and that aligns with the university mission and strategic priorities, should be demonstrated. The impact of these activities should be assessed and evaluated.

b. Long-term positive impact on the professional community should be evident. There should be clear evidence of substantive contributions to the profession through engagement, collaboration, and leadership. Examples of high-impact professional service may include involvement on national panels, leadership positions in professional societies, chairing professional conferences and workshops, and editing journals or serving on editorial boards.