College of Education Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment
Approved by Faculty, October, 2021

Preamble

The College of Education (COE) at Lehigh University is a diverse learning community committed to excellence by advancing research and practice to make a difference in the lives of individuals and to provide leadership in schools, organizations, communities, and society at the national and international levels. COE's mission is to develop reflective professionals and scholars informed by theory and research as well as the stakeholders we serve. This mission is based on strong belief in the value and critical importance of education in an open, democratic, and diverse society. COE prepares students to lead their professional disciplines in resolution of the major challenges faced by education in the United States and abroad.

Equity and Diversity Commitment

The College's current Strategic Plan is centered on the following objectives: (1) Lead with High Quality Research; (2) Expand Reach of New Knowledge; (3) Connect Research and Practice; (4) Promote Inclusion and Equity; and (5) Engage in Critical Thinking and Reflective Pedagogy. Additionally, Inclusivity, Equity, and Diversity is presented as a central value in the College of Education's mission. With respect to Diversity, the COE recognizes how people are shaped by their intersecting social identities (e.g., race, class, sex, gender identity, sexual identity, disability and religious affiliation) and how systems of power and privilege are critical in their experiences. For instance, the COE acknowledges the existence of research studies demonstrating greater service burden and lower teaching evaluations for women and people of color. Additionally, individuals may experience power and privilege based on one aspect of their social identity (e.g., race) but face stigma and oppression based on another (e.g., dis/ability status, gender and/or sexual identity). Still others may experience oppressive environments based on their race, gender, AND sexual identity. An intersectional perspective does not negate the salience of discrimination based on any one dimension of identity. Instead, it calls attention to how individuals may occupy multiple and intersecting positions of stigma and privilege.

In an effort to address how systems of power and privilege operate within its own hiring, retention, and promotion and tenure processes, the COE actively encourages, supports, and evaluates faculty in their efforts to integrate these values into their professional activities in the areas of research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service/engagement. For the purposes of Promotion and Tenure, faculty should integrate into their statement how they have evidenced and will demonstrate these values throughout their personal narrative. The evidence may include efforts in research/scholarship (e.g., using participatory methodologies, focus on groups that experience marginalization), teaching (e.g., training on critical pedagogy, efforts to decolonize syllabus or classroom practices), mentoring (e.g., providing professional development to students and peers who are members of minoritized sexual and gender identity groups, underrepresented racial minorities, international students), and service (e.g., engaged in University, College, or Lehigh community efforts to dismantle oppressive systems/practices, equitable access to education).

The COE recognizes that equity and inclusion practices within the area of research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service/engagement will vary based on discipline. Faculty should anchor/frame their work within the values, mission, strategic plan of the College of Education. The COE also recognizes that certain groups (e.g., white cisgender men) have benefited from historical advantages in the Promotion and Tenure process. Therefore, the College has taken several steps to limit such advantages and increase equity and inclusion within Promotion and Tenure. These steps include: (1) Transparency regarding the expectations for Promotion and Tenure in order to demystify the tenure process and increase access to those without institutional advantage; (2) Providing frequent and documented feedback regarding faculty's progress towards tenure and promotion which allows for increased understanding of expectations, as well as provides checks and balances against bias within the tenure process; (3) The creation of avenues for formally acknowledging and crediting equity and inclusion work within the tenure process in order to demonstrate value for critical service/engagement that has historically been unrecognized; and (4) Recognizing and appreciating methodological diversity.

Process for Meetings of Tenured and Full Professors

The Promotion and Tenure process entails multiple steps (see University R&P 2.2). Although this document is primarily focused on providing faculty with guidance on developing their dossier, an overview of the general process for annual, reappointment, as well as promotion and tenure reviews is provided below. Faculty should consult the information posted by the Provost yearly for updates on process and timeline.   Further, the Associate chair will provide faculty with current directions for creating their Lyterati portfolios as they approach the various reviews.

The University develops a timeline for reviews associated with Promotion and Tenure for all newly appointed faculty. The Department Chairperson and Associate Chairperson ensures accuracy of the Provost's timelines for each faculty member every year. Timelines include deadlines for submission of dossier, feedback and consultation by the Associate Chairperson, meetings involving the promotion and tenure committees, meetings between Candidate and Department Chair and Dean. Department promotion and tenure meetings are scheduled by the Associate Chairperson based on the timeline provided by the Office of the Provost.

The Department Chairperson leads meetings and confirms that everyone has (1) recently reviewed the University R&P, the college guidelines, and any departmental guidelines, and (2) has reviewed the portfolio prior to coming to the meeting and that they have the materials in front of them. The Chairperson begins the meeting with reminders about the importance of being mindful of biases in course evaluations, citation counts, external review letters, service/engagement, and evaluation of research (e.g., topic, methodology). The Chairperson may review the University's Guide for Chairs to Establish Norms and Promote Equitable Outcomes. Faculty are encouraged to offer reminders of bias to one another during the meeting. The Chairperson also reminds faculty that promotion and tenure evaluations are not made based on personality characteristics. Finally, there is a reminder on the importance of confidentiality.

Appropriate blocks of time are scheduled in advance to ensure that the process for each candidate is methodological, fair, and not rushed. Each voting member of the faculty speaks, in turn, on each aspect of each case after it is presented by a senior program colleague - typically a Program Director or a senior colleague of the candidate's choice. The Department Chairperson calls for each faculty member to indicate their current stance on promotion, tenure, and reappointment, and checks that everyone feels they were heard and understood. In cases of promotion, tenure, and reappointment reviews, each faculty member is instructed to submit their individual letter to the Associate Chair, Department Chair, and Department Coordinator. The letter should include a clear statement of the reviewer's stance on promotion, tenure, and reappointment. The Associate Chairperson, who takes notes throughout the meeting, constructs a draft of the Department letter. The draft is reviewed by each voting faculty member for accuracy of content and grammar. The Department Chair finalizes the letter based on faculty input and shares the signed final copy with the candidate during an individual meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to allow for supportive and constructive discussion of the contents of the letter. The candidate is required to provide a written response to the letter. The response is not an opportunity for the candidate to offer edits to the letter. Instead, the response may be a broad statement of agreement or a detailed rebuttal or correction of fact of the document.

The Department Chairperson uploads the departmental letter and the faculty response into the Lyterati portfolio prior to submitting it to the Dean. The Dean reviews materials for the annual, reappointment, and triennial reviews, and indicates his/her evaluation in an independent letter which is added to the Lyterati portfolio. All materials proceed to the Provost's office for review. For Promotion and Tenure review, the Dean receives the Lyterai portfolio from the Chair and forwards it to the COE Promotion and Tenure committee. The committee conducts their review, includes a summary letter in the Lyterati portfolio, and returns the portfolio to the Dean. At this point, the Dean conducts a review, prepares an independent summary letter, and submits to the Provost. In all reviews, the Provost office conducts the final evaluation.

<div align="center">

College of Education Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE

</div>

The College of Education's Promotion and Tenure Criteria are intended guidelines to help faculty members attain levels of performance necessary for advancement. Lehigh University's standard for tenure and promotion is excellence in all three areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. A successful faculty member will meet this standard by achieving a demonstrated balance of excellence in research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring and service.

Within research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service domains, importance rankings are delineated to reflect the varying demands of leadership, conceptualization, and scientific rigor associated with activities. These importance rankings align with the manner in which activities are weighted in faculty reviews (see footnote 1 for details). That is, faculty must ensure that their

accomplishments consist of activities listed as primary importance. At the same time, these importance rankings have been devised to guide faculty members in balancing the varying demands associated with activities and their professional goals. These importance rankings should facilitate the formation of portfolios that include various activities selected by the faculty member to express one's vision for research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service impacts. The listed categories under importance rankings are not meant to be viewed as a "check list" but rather as a menu of options to select from in order to achieve a purposefully balanced portfolio.

Importance rankings are not intended to convey that certain activities, like those listed as tertiary, are not valued during the review processes. The value of all activities is conveyed by their alignment with faculty members' vision for their accomplishments in research/scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service. Faculty members should ensure that their statements convey their purposeful balance of activities across importance rankings. For example, faculty are expected to disseminate research to academic audiences through peer-reviewed publications which are expressions of leadership and are rigorous given peer-reviewed processes (e.g. Primary Importance I). At the same time, faculty are encouraged to translate research to diverse non-academic audiences. Even when the outlets reaching these audiences do not include peer-review processes, such as media outlets or journals without referred processes (falling in Tertiary Importance), they are valuable for promoting the application of research findings to the field. Expectations for tenure are described below.

Research & Scholarship
The successful candidate for tenure will provide clear evidence that he/she has demonstrated excellence in scholarship. The fundamental expectation is that the candidate will produce a coherent program of peer-reviewed scholarship that advances knowledge and is consistent with the rigors and expectations of one's specific or interdisciplinary field. Because a tenure decision represents a long-term university investment in a faculty member, the candidate must demonstrate scholarly leadership and national / international recognition in one's field. The candidate must also demonstrate the *potential* for continued and sustained productivity across one's career.

Excellence in scholarship is judged through internal and external (i.e., outside reviewers) evaluation. Consideration is given to each of the following indicators:

•*Coherent and meaningful line of research.* Importance is given to scholarship with a cohesive and clearly identified area(s) of focus. Meaningful scholarship adds knowledge to the field and/or stimulates or encourages growth in new directions. Effective scholarship has a strong scientific foundation that extends to various audiences from various professional backgrounds (i.e., peer-reviewed empirical publications that are translated into practice- and policy-focused

audiences). For example, scientific foundation includes empirical research and conceptual articles that advance theory, uniquely synthesize research, or provide new models for the application of innovative practices. Extending this foundation to public audiences may occur through publication in peer-reviewed practitioner journals, social media posts (public scholarship), conferences, and professional development workshops.

• *Peer-reviewed scholarship.* Because peer-reviewed or refereed publications provide a means of external evaluation of one's work, strong consideration is given to peer- reviewed products in one's portfolio in relation to non-peer reviewed work. Although the candidate's portfolio may consist of multiple scholarly products including non-peer reviewed work that can have an important impact on one's field, candidates are expected to demonstrate a strong cohesive record of peer-reviewed publications.

• *Connection of Research to Practice and Policy*. Peer-reviewed practitioner-oriented outlets and public scholarship that translate or disseminate one's research or best practices for implementation for practitioners or the larger public are valued. This type of work should be viewed as a way of disseminating one's research to practitioners and the greater public.

• *Productivity.* Although quality is the primary indicator of excellence, the quantity of one's work must be sufficient to demonstrate impact, scholarly merit, and a sustained scholarly commitment to one's field. To evaluate productivity, consideration includes the number or rate of publications per year, continuous publication across years, and products that are developed and under review.

• *Quality and Impact.* The quality and impact of a candidate's work is evaluated using multiple indicators. These indicators may include: (a) first/sole authorships, (b) the rigor, sophistication, and innovation of published work, (c) the quality of publication dissemination outlets (e.g., reputable journals and book publishers in one's field, impact factors and/or national rankings of journals, presentations at national and international conferences), (d) the emerging record of citations and other evidence that one's work is influencing other scholars in the field and (e) external reviewer letters attesting to the relative contributions of one's scholarship to the field. At the time of tenure, the expectation is that the candidate's contributions are receiving national / international recognition.

• *Independent Scholarship.* Although continued collaboration with one's former graduate advisor or post-graduate mentor is helpful in the early stages of one's career, the candidate must demonstrate leadership in generating new projects that do not depend upon the former advisor's or mentor's program of research. Independence may be determined by first-authored publications and/or sufficient evidence of publications that do not involve one's former advisor. When continued collaboration with one's former advisor or mentor occurs because of the prominence

or centrality of that former advisor or mentor in the field, the candidate is expected to have a distinct research agenda over which he or she exerts leadership.

• *External Funding*. Although external funding is not required for tenure, external funding at the national or international level that supports scholarship or training efforts may provide another indicator of leadership and national or international recognition.

Teaching & Mentoring

Lehigh faculty members are expected to be highly effective teachers and mentors, who provide excellent instruction and guidance to students through courses, the supervision of student research (e.g., dissertations, master's theses) and other collaborative efforts (e.g. co-authorships in publications, novel projects, and presentations). Faculty are encouraged to demonstrate and document their efforts for equity, diversity, and inclusion in their teaching and mentoring activities. Teaching excellence is judged through multiple indicators including:

• Well-developed course syllabi, which reflect sound pedagogical and research-based practices and efforts for equity, diversity, and inclusion, in one's field and provide sufficiently rigorous and meaningful learning experiences (e.g., course content, assignments) for students.

• Evidence of innovation in course instruction (e.g., unique learning experiences for students, the development of curriculum or new learning materials, novel development and/or use of technologies).

• A consistent record of strong student end-of-course evaluations across courses.

• Reflective teaching as evidenced by self-evaluation and responsiveness to student and faculty feedback for improvement.

• Demonstrable leadership in supervising quality graduate student projects and research (e.g., doctoral qualifying projects, dissertations, master's theses) as chair or a member of a student's committee.

• Evidence of promoting students' professional development by way of co-authorship on peer-reviewed publications, projects and presentations.

Service

Because the successes of the university and individual professions require engaged commitment and leadership, service to the University, College, Department, Program, community, and one's profession are expected. Both the quality of one's service and the quantity of service activities are important considerations for tenure.

With regard to University, College, Department, and Program service, faculty are expected to show a willingness to contribute to and demonstrate leadership in the operation of the academic enterprise. Service activities to the university during the early pre-tenure years (first and second) are typically limited to participation in program activities and departmental activities to allow pre-tenured faculty to establish their research and teaching agendas. By the third or fourth year, they should demonstrate emerging leadership in service to the program, College, University, or

profession. For example, faculty may lead program responsibilities such as student admissions or co-chair a college committee. Professional leadership may be seen by taking on roles as reviewers for conferences or serving on editorial boards. Consistent with the University's Principles for an Equitable Community, the College also recognizes faculty effort and time to provide student group advisement and/or social and emotional support to students from historically under-represented backgrounds (e.g., gender-queer individuals, people of color, international students). To demonstrate the College's commitment to the Principles for an Equitable Community, the College Promotion and Tenure committee encourages these efforts and recommends that this service be documented.

Professional and community service is intertwined with scholarship as well as the candidate's and university's national visibility and recognition. Pre-tenure faculty members are expected to demonstrate increasing growth in leadership and engagement in service activities commensurate with their professional development and years in rank. Excellence in service can occur at any faculty rank. It is also understood that involvement in some activities at Primary Importance, while expected from tenured faculty, is not typical for pre-tenure faculty.

Quality indicators of professional service activities and community engagement include membership/leadership in committees of professional organizations; holding office in professional/community organizations at the national/international state, or regional level; presentations of national-level workshops, and editorial work, including appointments on journal editorial boards and ad hoc reviewing.

College of Education Promotion and Tenure Criteria
April 1995, Revised October 2002, May 2014, October 2014

A. **Research and Scholarship**

Primary Importance I
- Publication of specific research studies or theoretical expositions as a book or monograph
- Publication of research studies in peer-reviewed national or international journals[2]
- Publication of non-research articles in peer-reviewed national or international journals that generate new knowledge
- Publication of non-research articles in peer-reviewed national or international journals that translate research to practice and policy.
- Publication of articles in renowned national or international periodicals that have significant impact on one's field but are non-refereed
- Publication of textbooks. (A textbook should either extend knowledge of one's field beyond what a journal article can do, promote best practices in the field, or do both.)
- Publication of policy reports/briefs commissioned by national or international organizations that translate research to policy
- Research, training, and/or demonstration grants, contracts, or sub-contracts that are funded by an external agency using a refereed process
- Patent granted for educational product
- Technology product that is an instructional and/or a professional resource that (1) is designed and developed for use by an audience broader than simply Lehigh learners; (2) supports, demonstrates, or advances one's research agenda; (3) has been validated by being recognized by a national or international reviewing agency/organization or distributed commercially at the national or international level; and (4) is comprehensive, covering much material (breadth) and including a wide range of high quality materials and/or activities (richness).
- Publication of a psychological or educational test which has undergone a refereed process
- Editorship of a book of readings or special issue of a journal that has undergone a refereed process.
- National research award

Primary Importance II
- Chapters in edited textbooks, research volumes and books of readings.
- Publication of policy reports/briefs commissioned by state agencies or regional centers that translate research to policy
- Validated instrument for assessing or categorizing technology products
- Paper published in conference proceedings (peer reviewed only)
- Research, training, and/or demonstration grants or contracts that have been funded by an external agency using a non-refereed process

• State/local or university research award

Secondary Importance
• Peer-reviewed or invited presentations at nationally or internationally recognized professional meetings.
• Paper published in conference proceedings (except peer reviewed)
• Publication in peer-reviewed journals of non refereed articles (for example, editorials; comments; reviews of tests, books, or software)
• Peer-reviewed presentations at regional/state/local professional meetings
• Publication of research or non-research articles in peer-reviewed journals that are not nationally or internationally recognized
• Internal faculty research grants
• Technology product that is an instructional and/or a professional resource that (1) is designed for use by an audience broader than simply Lehigh learners; (2) supports, demonstrates, or advances one's research agenda; (3) has regional or state validation through multiple external citations/recommendations/linkages to the product and/or formal recognition by a regional or state agency or organization; and (4) is moderately comprehensive, covering little material (breadth) and/or using a limited range of materials and/or those materials are of medium quality (richness).
• Submission of a technical report on a funded project or an evaluation report on an externally funded project.
• Submission of grant or contract proposal to an external agency that employs a competitive review

Tertiary Importance
• Publication of supplemental teaching material or technology product that is an instructional and/or professional resource.
• Publication of research or non-research articles in journals that are edited and/or refereed by non-academic peers (This category includes articles in newsletters of national organizations, letters in newspapers or articles in popular periodicals or trade journals, and the COE Theory to Practice.).
• Non-peer reviewed presentations at regional/state/local professional meetings

B. Teaching/Advising

Primary Importance I
• Teaching performance in didactic courses, seminars, and supervision of practice. (Note: Courses which require new preparations or courses which are newly developed and implemented and which meet specifically defined department or program goals or needs as stated in the departmental plan are weighted more heavily than are routine course assignments.)

• Chair or co-chair, completed dissertation
• Chair or co-chair, dissertation in process
• National teaching or mentoring award
• Development and delivery of a new online learning course
• Implementation of innovative approaches to teaching and learning (for example, modularization of courses, appropriate use of online learning, incorporation of constructivist learner-centered activities, incorporation of unusual scheduling flexibility to address learner needs, exemplary use of newer technologies in teaching and learning), or design and development of a technology product intended primarily for use with Lehigh learners or which does not support, demonstrate or advance one's research agenda.
• Mentoring student publication or presentation at a national or international conference of work conducted at Lehigh

Primary Importance II
• Development of a summer institute or continuing education program that generates revenues
• Teaching classes markedly larger than the departmental norm during the probationary period
• Advising of a number of students that is markedly larger than departmental norm during the probationary period
• Mentoring student publication or presentation at state, regional, or local conferences of work conducted at Lehigh
• Assigned consultation to a local school district, agency, counseling center, or the like as part of regular academic duties
• Chair, completed qualifying project
• Chair, qualifying project in process
• Consultant, analysis/research design in the COE for research project, dissertation, qualifying project, or grant
• Member, dissertation committee
• State/local or university teaching or mentoring award

Secondary Importance
• Teaching of cross-program or cross-department courses that serve the college or university
• Teaching an independent study course
• Teaching apprentice teaching
• Member, qualifying project committee

C. Service

Professional Service

Primary Importance I

- Member (or chair) of national or international review panel (for example, U.S. Dept. of Education, NIMH, NSF)
- Editor, refereed journal, book series, or renowned national or international periodical that has significant impact on one's field but is not refereed.
- Associate editor, refereed journal
- Elected or appointed officer, national or international organizations
- Elected or appointed Chair, national or international committee
- Chair, national or international conference
- Advisory committee member or consultant to a major research, training, or demonstration grant outside of the university
- Advisor or consultant to a government, government-affiliated agency, or non-governmental organization
- Editorial review board member, refereed journal
- Technical, scientific advisor, statistical consultant, or similar role
- Chair, regional/state/local committee
- Chair, regional/state/local conference
- Member, national or international committee
- Serving on a dissertation committee at another university
- Editor, newsletter, communiqué, or column

Secondary Importance
- Editorial review board member, nonrefereed journal
- Member, regional/state/local committee
- Member, regional/state/local conference
- Editor, computer news group; computer bulletin board
- Site visitor or reviewer for national or state accrediting/credentialing body
- Reviewer of presentation proposals for international/national conferences

Tertiary Importance
- Ad hoc reviewer, refereed journal or book series

University and Community Service

Primary Importance
- Department Chair
- Associate Dean
- Program Director
- Associate Department Chair
- Faculty Senate
- Chair, University, College, or Department/program committee

- Chair or major leadership role in COE accreditation or external review
- Coordinator of minority recruitment
- Ongoing consultation to Schools (e.g., Centennial School, BASD)
- Technical, scientific advisor, statistical consultant, or similar role to faculty colleagues
- Program Development
- Program admissions coordinator
- Practicum coordinator
- Ongoing community service - national training or consultation
- President of School Board or Board of Trustees
- Executive Committee of Community Organization
- Formal advisor to student group on campus or at secondary school (e.g., Pride Alliance)
- Mentoring activities with students (e.g., meetings with under-represented students)

Secondary Importance
- Liaison with state or regional organization or school district
- College of Education Representative to other College Meetings
- Formal mentoring activity (University / College faculty)
- Member of Community or School Organization (e.g., school board, executive board)

Tertiary Importance
- Occasional community service - state/local consultation

Lehigh University College of Education (COE) Statement on Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor in the Lehigh University College of Education (COE) is based upon demonstrated leadership and impact upon one's field. Promotion to professor is based upon quality, level of accomplishment, commitment, and impact of teaching and mentoring, scholarship and service, beyond that demonstrated for promotion to associate professor.

Teaching must show mastery, mentoring and progress of students, leadership in instructional practice, quality and level of interaction with students and/or significant contributions to field-relevant and/or interdisciplinary pedagogy.

Scholarship for promotion to professor should reflect a specific line of continuous research that is influencing one's disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary field of study and should include "top-tier" peer-reviewed professional journals and publication outlets.

External funding is a strong indicator of impact, but is not a requirement for promotion to professor. Field differences in the value of external funding should be considered in decisions

about promotion to professor. External funding should result in dissemination of findings, generating new knowledge, innovations in education or training, and/or impact on policy or procedures. Impact or influence on the direction of one's disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary field is typically reflected in such things as positive comments by external reviewers and the frequency of citations of one's contributions by colleagues at comparable institutions, recognizing one's work as having generated new knowledge or created novel inquiry paradigms, frameworks, or technologies.

Service and engagement should reflect a balance of "distinguished" university roles (e.g., key committees) and professional service at the national or international level (e.g., office in professional organization, grant panel review membership, etc.).

There is no one combination of accomplishments or one formula that automatically results in promotion to professor. Instead, promotion to professor is a matter of judgment about the substance, quality and impact of contributions. The professors in the COE will consider each portfolio with respect to its unique strengths and its balance of high-level accomplishments. Time in rank is not a consideration in decisions about promotion to professor.

Lehigh University Best Practices for College Promotion & Tenure Committees
The following guidelines regarding procedures and practices of college promotion and tenure committees are based upon national guides such as *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators* (American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United Educators: 2000; accessible at http://www.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/index.cfm), Lehigh's *Rules and Procedure,* applicable legal requirements, and recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committee.

Clarity Consultation Consistency Confidentiality Candor Caring
• In all deliberations and recommendations, evaluators at every level (department/ program faculty, P&T committee, Dean, and Provost) must use and adhere to all applicable University policies and procedures, including *R&P* and the college guidelines on criteria for tenure and promotion. If the college guidelines contradict *R&P* in any way, the university-wide *R&P* prevails.
• When a question or a "gray area" arises regarding the criteria or procedures (and interpretation questions are not unusual in such matters), the committee chair should consult with the Deputy Provost for Faculty Affairs who will consult with others as needed.
• Committees must reach their own substantive and independent recommendation on whether or not a candidate merits tenure/ promotion.
• Committee members should check to make sure that the candidate's portfolio is complete so that the committee can evaluate the individual's candidacy with full information. The committee chair should contact the department chair or dean's office if materials are missing.
• The committee may consider new positive information that becomes available during their deliberations, such as publication of a book or article. The candidate is responsible for making the information known to the department chair, who forwards the information for addition to the candidate's portfolio.
• College P&T committees must ensure that their evaluations of candidates and their recommendations (i.e., votes) are consistent. Specifically, what they write in their letters should support what they are recommending.
• All voting members of a college P&T committee must make a clear, unambiguous recommendation. *R&P* requires that at least five members must vote without abstention. In practice this means that all committee members must vote yes or no.
• Confidentiality must be maintained throughout the process.
• Personal issues such as family, health, or other personal situations must not be considered or discussed when making decisions concerning the granting of tenure/ promotion. Committees must not request access to such information, even when the probationary period has been extended.
• The standards for tenure will remain the same for candidates who receive tenure clock extensions as for those who do not receive extensions.

• Personal characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, disability, etc. must not be considered or discussed when making decisions concerning the granting of tenure/ promotion. Discrimination is unacceptable and illegal. Committees should familiarize themselves with and adhere to the University's Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/Non-Discrimination Policy available at: http://www.lehigh.edu/~policy/university/eo.htm.

• Lack of a response from an external evaluator must not be judged as a negative evaluation.

• The committee chair must make sure that copies of appropriate documents (for example, written communications to the department regarding the committee's recommendation and any departmental response) are included in the candidate's portfolio.