



Louisiana Tech University

College of Engineering and Science

Tenure & Promotion Guidelines

July 2021

Table of Contents

1. PHILOSOPHY	2
2. IMPLEMENTATION	2
3. AREAS OF EMPHASIS	3
4. TEACHING	3
5. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES	4
6. SERVICE	5
7. TEAMWORK AND COLLEGIALLY	6
8. MOST SIGNIFICANT INTELLECTUAL PRODUCTS	7
9. EXPLANATORY NOTES TO INDICATORS OF EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS	7
10. EXTERNAL REVIEW	11
11. TENURE & PROMOTION PROCESS	12
12. TENURE OF FACULTY HIRED AT ADVANCED ACADEMIC RANK	13
13. TENURE & PROMOTION DOSSIER FORMAT	13
14. TENURE & PROMOTION CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT	15
1. Identity, Rank, and Affiliation	15
2. Education	15
3. Professional Experience	16
4. Honors/Awards	16
5. Scholarship	16
6. Professional Development	17
7. Service	17
15. MID-TERM REVIEW	18
16. SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWER	19

1. PHILOSOPHY

The purpose of the guidelines given here for tenure and/or promotion is to provide guidance to those people being considered for tenure and promotion and to those performing the evaluations. The guidelines attempt to identify those areas where major emphasis should be placed while still giving flexibility to recognize different strengths for different faculty members.

These guidelines apply to all tenure-track faculty in the College of Engineering and Science. The emphasis is on quality in teaching, research and scholarly activities, and service. Poor performance in handling teaching responsibilities will not lead to tenure and/or promotion. If a faculty member has a large number of refereed publications, but these are found to be of uniformly poor quality, then a decision may be made not to grant tenure or promotion. On the other hand, if a faculty member is low on numbers of publications, but has publications of high quality and recognition, and shows continuity in such publication activity, then a decision may be made to grant tenure or promotion on that basis. Equally, in the funded research area, no dollar amounts are set. There are clearly differences in ordinary levels of external funding in various disciplines, and funding levels depend on the type of research undertaken. However, external funding needs to be pursued vigorously, and success in obtaining funding is expected of candidates.

2. IMPLEMENTATION

It is extremely important that fair judgments be made. Therefore, it is imperative that those participating in the review process at both the program level and the college level be as careful and as thoughtful as possible in their deliberations.

Four external peer reviews will be required for all applicants for tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member will submit a list of at least four names, avoiding those with possible conflict of interest – graduate and post-doctoral advisors, former students, collaborators, co-authors, etc.. The Director will select two of these names and add two other names of his or her own choosing. The Director will then request written evaluations from these peer reviewers. These reviews will form part of the basis for final consideration of the tenure and/or promotion decision. These reviewers must be chosen in a fashion to ensure that they represent an appropriate level of expertise and independence for review of the quality of the candidate's work. Additional details are provided in Section 10.

Under ordinary circumstances, a faculty member who chooses to apply for tenure and/or promotion will be given the opportunity to withdraw his or her application at any stage of the procedure until it has been forwarded to the Provost. That is, the faculty member will be informed of the recommendation/action at both the program and college levels. The faculty member must notify, in writing, the next person scheduled to receive the dossier (Director, Dean, etc.) that the dossier has been withdrawn. For candidates who are in their final year of decision for tenure, the dossier will be forwarded through the entire process even if a negative decision or vote occurs at any intervening level. This procedure assures the fullest possible consideration of each final-year candidate.

3. AREAS OF EMPHASIS

Each faculty member is expected to demonstrate high levels of competence in the three main areas of faculty activity: (i) teaching, (ii) research & scholarly activities, and (iii) service. The relative emphasis on each of the three areas will vary from faculty member to faculty member. These emphases are initially defined in the appointment letter and refined in planning sessions and subsequent evaluations of the faculty member as determined by the Director and the Dean. The assigned duties of the faculty member must be taken into account in the tenure and/or promotion process of the candidate. A fourth area, namely teamwork & collegiality, will also be a criterion, as described in Section 7 below.

4. TEACHING

Teaching is the foundation of excellence in any university. It is important to establish a level of performance that results in a high level of learning. Excellent instruction challenges students to assimilate facts, analyze concepts, and evaluate hypotheses: it ultimately frees them to become more self-directed in their own learning. Teaching, an art and a science, takes on many forms, but good teachers consistently communicate information to their students in a planned and comprehensible manner. A teacher must also be able to stimulate the interest of students to ensure that instructional objectives are achieved.

Since teaching is fundamental to the role of the faculty, failure to place excellence in teaching at the center of the University's mission does a major disservice to those who come to study at Louisiana Tech University and those on whose support the institution depends. Consequently, effective teaching is a necessary criterion for promotion and tenure. A distinction must be made between routine classroom performance and teaching excellence that draws upon the faculty member's depth and breadth of scholarship. The review process must be diligent in safeguarding the institution's commitment to excellence in teaching.

Judgment of a faculty member's teaching ability should include consideration of the following skills:

- Ability to stimulate thought, study, and initiative among students, and to improve the quality of these activities
- Use of a variety of instructional assessment methods and response to the results
- The clarity and relevance of the course delivery
- Experience in professional practice and research accomplishments; plus the relevant application of that experience to teaching
- Availability to students
- Quality in advising and counseling students
- Ability to plan courses, to relate them to the particular academic discipline and the development of the student, and to judge student performance
- Ability to use technology appropriately in providing instruction
- Effort to improve teaching materials
- Participation in sharing the responsibility for the academic offerings of the University

The quality of teaching is factored into decisions on tenure and promotion. The weighting should be consistent with the emphasis on teaching relative to research and service as defined by agreement between the candidate and appropriate administrators during annual goal setting. The tenure decision should reflect the understanding that exceptional teaching should be rewarded by proper consideration in the overall process. Evidence of commitment to effective teaching and teaching excellence may include:

- instructional development: courses, curricula, pedagogical methods, and materials;
- teaching and learning evaluations: course assessments, exit interviews, peer evaluations, and alumni evaluations
- academic and research advising of undergraduate and graduate students; and
- other evidence of improving teaching effectiveness and student learning.

5. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

All tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to seek outside funding for research, to conduct research projects in a professional manner, and to regularly publish results of research in appropriate scholarly journals and proceedings. Research and scholarly activities include both scientific/technical research and research into more effective teaching methods and their evaluation. Faculty should not expect outstanding performance in teaching and service to compensate for substandard accomplishments in research and scholarly activities.

While both the quality and quantity of a candidate's research and scholarly achievements should be examined, quality should be the primary consideration. Quality should be defined largely in terms of the work's importance and impact in the progress or redefinition of a field or discipline, the establishment of relationships among disciplines, the improvement of practitioner performance, or in terms of the creativity of the thought and methods behind it. Original achievements in conceptual frameworks, conclusions, and methods should be regarded more highly than work making minor variations in or repeating familiar themes in the literature or the candidate's previous work. To this end, the candidate is asked to provide a list of no more than five of the most significant intellectual products that he or she has produced. The products can be refereed publications, other publications or proceedings, hardware or software, academic institution building (e.g. research center or degree program), etc. The products must be capable of being judged for their quality and impact.

The work of the faculty is considered scholarly when it satisfies most of the following five conditions:

- Exhibits a high level of discipline-related expertise
- Breaks new ground or is innovative
- Can be documented and replicated and is peer reviewed
- Is effectively communicated
- Has significance or impact

The following lists provide some typical indicators of *excellence* and *effectiveness* in scholarship related to both research and teaching:

Indicators of Excellence

- Publications in leading refereed journals
- Receiving major fellowships or research awards
- Frequent citation of publications
- Publication of scholarly book(s)
- Editor or member of editorial board of a major journal
- Member of review panel for national or international scientific agencies.
- Keynote presentations, invited presentations or invited papers at international and national meetings
- Receiving significant external peer-reviewed funding for research
- Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
- Evidence of creative professional practice in which the faculty member's particular expertise is utilized
- Licensing of technology developed by the candidate
- Start-up companies based on technology developed by the candidate that involve external investments

Indicators of Effectiveness

- Publications in refereed journals
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national or international research organizations
- Publication of a chapter in a scholarly book
- Editor of scholarly book(s)
- Presentation of papers at national or international meetings of appropriate disciplines
- Publications in non-refereed but widely recognized journals
- Publications in refereed journals resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other fields
- Published curriculum materials
- Original software development
- Externally funded research program
- Timely completion and preparation of external publications for graduate theses completed with the candidate as advisor or co-advisor
- Patents issued for innovations resulting from the candidate's work

6. SERVICE

University and public service are important components of a university's mission and responsibilities. This includes service to the institution – to students, colleagues, programs, colleges, and the University – as well as beyond the campus. Service by members of the faculty to the community, state, nation, and beyond, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities, when the work is at a sufficiently high level and of sufficiently high quality, should be recognized as supporting evidence for promotion and/or tenure. Service, especially service external to the University, has significant impact on the visibility, reputation, and well being of the University. Faculty members are expected by the University and the public to make

their professional knowledge and skills broadly available to society.

The faculty plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty governance and the formulation of program, college, and university policies, and who prove themselves to be able administrators. Service to the University and to academic professional organizations, therefore, constitutes an important faculty responsibility. It is also important to recognize that distinctions exist between an individual's service based on the performance of professional and academic responsibilities (including those within the institution), and service provided through the performance of civic responsibilities. For service provided through civic responsibilities to be considered in the tenure and promotion process, the service must be related to the faculty member's area of expertise. Even then, this form of service is not an important factor in promotion and/or tenure considerations.

Faculty service efforts should be planned and focused in areas appropriate to programs and the university mission. Program Chairs and Academic Directors may be consulted in the planning process to ensure that the faculty member's proposed service activities are consistent with program and college expectations. In documenting service activities, it is important to emphasize those service efforts that are truly innovative, creative, and supportive of the faculty member's professional stature and appropriate to the program's role and mission. These efforts shall be carefully and completely described with particular attention to the impact of these activities.

The section "Tenure & Promotion Curriculum Vitae Format" provides the categories and examples of the types of service activities that may be listed. The list of categories or examples are not intended to be exhaustive, but may include:

- i. public service, such as, seminars, programs, conferences, etc., organized or conducted; continuing education and extension activities; economic and community development activities; public policy and strategic studies; and consulting to public and private organizations.
- ii. service as an officer of an academic or professional association; other service to one's profession or field (e.g., served on committees); meetings, panels, workshops, technical conferences or sessions etc., led or organized; and manuscripts and proposals reviewed for publishers, journals, and government funding agencies. Serving on review panels for funding agencies signifies candidate's stature in his/her technical discipline and should be recognized.
- iii. Program, College, and University service (e.g., officer in Faculty Senate; Chair of major standing or ad hoc University committee(s)); service to students - involvement in co-curricular activities, advising student organizations, etc.; service to other faculty (e.g., consulting with other faculty to provide specific expertise for their research or teaching).

7. TEAMWORK AND COLLEGIALITY

Academic programs, the College, and the University function most effectively in a cooperative atmosphere. It is therefore important that candidates for tenure and/or promotion exhibit a sense of shared responsibility for the smooth functioning and

improvement of the University. Clear and honest differences of opinion about academic priorities, resource allocation, and academic standards need to be voiced without fear of repercussions. Singular research interests and research styles also need to be respected. However, unwillingness to accept reasonable program or collegiate responsibilities and a pattern of disruptive interactions with faculty, staff, and students is not acceptable.

The College of Engineering and Science encourages and promotes team research and proposal writing. In judging teamwork on projects and publications involving multiple investigators and authors, the senior principal investigator and lead author should be noted. However, the intention is to give multiple credit where it is due. For example, a co-principal investigator on a proposal or project who fully shares intellectual leadership, responsibility, and effort should receive as much credit as the senior principal investigator. To allow this assessment, as discussed in the documentation section of these guidelines, candidates must document their role in major cooperative projects and multiple-author refereed papers.

8. MOST SIGNIFICANT INTELLECTUAL PRODUCTS

The purpose of this Section is to give candidates the opportunity to highlight up to five significant intellectual products that have resulted from their careers to date. For candidates for promotion to the rank of professor, it is generally understood that the accomplishments discussed will be predominantly those that have resulted since their tenure and promotion to the associate professor rank. While a maximum page limit is imposed (see Section 13), the candidate has considerable freedom to choose the items to be listed and discussed in this section. Obviously, these items should help the applicant make the case for tenure and/or promotion. The following format is suggested for each item included:

- a) A brief but descriptive title,
- b) A reasonably complete (to the extent permitted by page limit constraints) description of the nature and significance of the accomplishment,
- c) If applicable, citations of any publications, presentations, or technical reports that describe the “product” more completely, and
- d) If applicable, links to web pages where additional details of the “product” may be found.

While the external reviewers and the Tenure & Promotion committees may examine the material mentioned in items c) and d), they are not *required* to do so.

9. EXPLANATORY NOTES TO INDICATORS OF EXCELLENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS

Scholarly reputation: This is established using the above indicators as catalogued in the candidate’s dossier and evaluated by external reviewers. For granting of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate is expected to have established a strong record of research capability and evidence of the potential for impact within the candidate’s field of expertise. For promotion to Professor, the candidate is expected to have established clear evidence of a nationally and/or internationally respected scholarly

career.

Research Funding: One measure of success is the ability of the candidate to obtain funding for his or her research and to adapt to funding realities to achieve success. In engineering and science, graduate studies are an important component of higher education, and the university needs to be successful in attracting and retaining graduate students and leading them to timely graduation. Research proposal preparation is an indication of effort. Funded research is, however, a necessity for scholarship for many areas of engineering and science. Evidence of research proposal submission to national competitive peer-reviewed programs is expected, and the peer reviews of such proposals should be retained as part of the dossier for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Although funding sources are not uniform across disciplines or sub-disciplines, candidates need to demonstrate that they can develop a research/scholarship program. No minimum standards are set for research funding. To be promoted to Associate Professor, the candidate is expected, under ordinary circumstances, to have obtained significant research funding from external sources. To be promoted to Professor, the candidate is expected to be obtaining research funding from external sources on a consistent basis sufficient to fund a sustained research program. Success in equipment grants will be viewed positively but is not considered a replacement for research funding.

Conduct of Research and Role of the Investigator(s): Successful conduct of funded research is important to the reputation of Louisiana Tech University. This includes adherence to federal, state, university, and funding agency rules governing the conduct of the research and financial and administrative reporting.

Publication Record: To be considered for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure at the Associate Professor level, a faculty member is expected to have a consistent record of scholarly, peer-reviewed publications. These publications can be of various types including refereed journal publications, refereed conference proceedings, invited conference papers, patents, research project reports, refereed abstracts, technical notes, technical discussions, and technical and non-technical articles. Each type of publication is described below. To be considered for promotion to Professor, an Associate Professor must have a more sustained record of high quality, peer-reviewed publications than that required for promotion to Associate Professor.

In both cases, the faculty member should have exhibited a continuum of publication activity rather than a spurt of publication activity just prior to tenure or promotion review.

A senior faculty member may be expected to have more administrative duties, mentoring activities, and professional leadership activities. Hence, the balance among types of publications and among research, teaching, and service activities may be different for senior faculty from that expected for junior faculty.

Refereed Journal Publications: This is the principal outlet for basic and applied research in virtually all the engineering and science fields. Not all specialized areas of engineering and science have the same number of outlets for these peer-reviewed publications, but most have several sources. It may be difficult for some candidates to use this outlet for research results in some of the emerging specialty areas. If the

candidate is in such a field, he or she should so state this in writing to the appropriate Director so that a timely review of the issue may be made early in the probationary period and alternate measures for quality and impact of the candidate's performance can be evaluated and put in place for use in evaluating the candidate's dossier.

Refereed Abstracts, Technical Notes, Technical Discussions, Technical and Non-Technical Articles, Etc.: These outlets all demonstrate that a candidate is actively involved and up-to-date in his or her specific research area. The submittal of a technical discussion of a previously published refereed journal article, for example, is evidence that the candidate is interacting with peers in his or her specialty area, and in some cases correcting or amplifying research conclusions present in current refereed journal articles.

Textbooks and Monographs: The preparation and/or revision of a book is evidence that the candidate is up-to-date in his or her specialty. Obviously, students interacting with the candidate, as well as students of other universities, are the principal beneficiaries of this effort. Books are often the result of many years of research work in a specific area and the manuscript is generally reviewed by peers selected by the publisher. If books are listed in the "most significant intellectual products" section, candidates should provide information regarding the objectives and intended audience of the book, and some measures of its success. In the curriculum vitae, authored books should be clearly distinguished from edited books.

Refereed Conference Proceedings: Many research funding sources in engineering and science have shifted from governmental agencies to private industries. This has resulted in an increase in applied research and the appearance of a large number of specialty conferences as the principal outlet for this type of research. Many of these conferences require that the submitted paper be reviewed by two or more peers with the same rigor applied to refereed journal publications. The review process for other conference proceedings may not be as stringent. The College Tenure & Promotion Committee may request written evidence of the level of peer review provided in any conference proceedings and/or the acceptance rate for papers as discussed under *Publication Record* above.

Invited Conference Papers: Researchers invited to submit a paper to a specialty conference normally receive such an invitation because of the reputation they have developed within their area of expertise. This reputation has been established with his or her peers in a specific research area as a result of publications, paper presentations, research funding awards and the general communications among researchers in a specialized area of engineering and science. Generally an invitation to submit a paper is a recognition that the invitee is on the cutting-edge of his or her field. Like refereed conference papers, the outlets in this case also vary in strength and reputation and the candidate should provide as necessary evidence of the reputation of the conference.

Patents: The filing of a patent resulting from an engineering or scientific research project is certainly evidence of a candidate's creativity. Patents are often the result of an extensive applied research effort, and in some cases, basic research. The patent is evidence that the candidate was able to successfully apply scientific and engineering principles to the solution of a problem or to satisfy a societal need. Due to proprietary and legal restrictions, the candidate is often prohibited from immediately publishing the

work which led to the development of the patent. In such cases, the patent may serve as the only evidence of the candidate's scholarly activity in this regard. The candidate should include in the dossier evidence of the scientific quality of a patent, perhaps in a letter from independent outside sources.

Research Project Reports: Funded research projects generally require the preparation of a final research report by the principal investigator. A report subjected to extensive review and published as a state or federal document would be classified as a refereed publication if the agency review process is comparable to the peer review for a refereed publication. Convincing evidence must be presented by the faculty member to have any such report considered as refereed. A report that is retained by the sponsoring agency and not disseminated normally would be not classified as a refereed publication. If funding comes from the public sector, generally the publication of scholarly papers based on the research results is permitted in due course. However, if the funding comes from private sources, candidates may be restricted in publishing the research results for as long as five years in some cases. The College Tenure & Promotion Committee may request supporting evidence if the work reported in such reports is listed among the “most significant intellectual products.”

Quality Indicators of Intellectual Contributions: To represent the quality of a publication, the candidate may provide information on the impact factor or other quality indicators of the journals, citation statistics of their work, and/or acceptance ratio of the conferences and the extent of its dissemination (regional/national/international) and inclusion of journal/conference proceedings in recognized indexes. Books and book chapters are also desirable as they present the candidate's recognition in the area.

Classified Research: Classified research should be given special consideration in evaluation for tenure and promotion. A candidate needs to demonstrate significant funding level related to conducted classified research, the frequency and continuity of the classified project funding, frequency of reporting to the funding agency, number of students graduating, etc.. Candidates need to be aware that, in spite of the classified nature of research, evidence of quality and impact of the research is necessary. External reviews may be sought from people with clearances necessary to review and comment on the candidate's body of work.

Intellectual Property and Economic Development: Intellectual property (IP) and economic development can be measured in terms of actual economic impacts as evident from private or public sector investment in the research, products, jobs, or other resources related to the work. There are several benchmarks of IP/economic development impact that can flow from academic work. These include reports of invention, filing a patent, issuing a patent, licensing the technology, starting a technology company, growing the technology company, or serving as an active board member. The T&P committee will take these accomplishments into account along with other measures of scholarly productivity and national competitiveness. Reports of invention (ROI) sometimes occur fortuitously or unexpectedly. Nevertheless, they show that a researcher is inventive and is often indicative of research at the cutting edge. If funding is associated with the ROI then the impact is considered significant. The decision by the University to pursue a patent application based on the candidate's work is taken only after significant

independent review and will be viewed as a significant intellectual accomplishment. The issue of a patent is an even more significant milestone, reflecting both excellence and effectiveness of the candidate's research and productivity, as acknowledged by the patent issuing authority.

10. EXTERNAL REVIEW

External reviews will be required for all applicants for tenure and promotion. The faculty member will submit a list of at least four names that must not include anyone who might be considered to have a conflict of interest. For example, anyone who has had a personal or professional relationship with the applicant that would preclude them from reviewing a research proposal by the applicant should not be included. In addition, any other individual who might be expected to have a conflict of interest with respect to the candidate should be eliminated. The Director will select two of these names and will add two other names of his or her own choosing. The Director will then request written evaluations from these peer reviewers. Note that when a Director is being considered, the Dean will solicit the peer reviews, following the same guidelines. In all cases, the stature of the peer reviewers will be considered in the decision process. These external reviewers will be sent the following materials:

1. A copy of these Tenure & Promotion Guidelines,
2. A cover letter from the Director requesting the review,
3. A copy of the cover letter prepared by the candidate making the case for tenure and/or promotion,
4. A copy of the applicant's vitae,
5. A copy of the "Most Significant Intellectual Products" section (see Section 13)
6. The Research section of the application (see Section 13).

The letter from the Director will include any information the Director believes is necessary, but as a minimum will include the following requests:

"If you believe you have a conflict of interest with respect to this applicant, please notify me immediately so that another reviewer can be selected. For example, anyone who has had a personal or professional relationship with the applicant that would preclude them from reviewing a research proposal by the applicant should not be included. Other reasons may also exist which create a conflict of interest."

"In your written response to me, I would appreciate wide-ranging comments on any and all aspects of the application, but please address the following specific items also. Primarily, we request from you an honest and frank review of the quality of the candidate's research program. We ask that you comment on the quality of journals or conference proceedings in which publications have appeared, the quality of the publications themselves, and contributions made by the applicant to the field. In addition, please comment on funding success, as well as quality and prestige of sources. Comments on any direct observation you may have had of the applicant's representation of Louisiana Tech at conferences, workshops, etc., will also be helpful."

11. TENURE & PROMOTION PROCESS

University Policy 2114 provides the following outline of the tenure and promotion process. The full text of the policy can be found at:

<http://www.latech.edu/administration/policies-and-procedures/2114.shtml>.

1. Timetable for Application and Consideration for Tenure and/or Promotion

Faculty members will ordinarily be considered for tenure in the final year of their probationary period in accordance with the specific schedule of dates, as provided. If the faculty member does not elect to apply in his/her final year, he/she will automatically be considered as non-renewed and so notified in writing.

In the case of an application for promotion from a tenured faculty member, the faculty member, usually in consultation with the Unit Head, can choose to apply when the faculty member feels that the necessary credentials for promotion have been achieved. The schedule for such applications is the same used for tenure decisions, as provided.

2. Schedule of Dates (Guidelines)

Second Week of the Fall Quarter	Dean ensures that the College Tenure and Promotion Committee is named
Third Week of the Fall Quarter	College Committee promulgates the specific schedule for the year.
October 1	Submission of dossiers to the Unit Head.
December 1	Deadline for final receipt of peer review letters, as applicable to college review process.
January 7	Unit Head submits materials to Departmental committee.
January 28	Department completes action and reports vote
February 1	Unit Head recommends to Dean and College Committee.
March 1	College Committee completes action and reports the vote to the Dean.
March 15	Dean recommends to Provost.
April 15	Provost forwards recommendation to President.
Prior to end of appointment period	Final decision by President; faculty notified of decisions.

12. TENURE OF FACULTY HIRED AT ADVANCED ACADEMIC RANK

On occasion faculty members are hired without tenure at levels above assistant professor. Faculty members initially employed at the rank of professor may be granted tenure upon appointment or, at the discretion of the institution, may be required to serve a probationary period not to exceed four years. Faculty members initially employed at the rank of associate professor shall serve a probationary period of at least one year, but no more than four years. Recommendations for tenure of such individuals must be accompanied by the same materials, including external reviews, as those required from individuals who achieve academic rank and tenure entirely inside the institution.

13. TENURE & PROMOTION DOSSIER FORMAT

The College administration believes that preparation of the T&P dossier should not involve an extraordinary amount of time and effort. Because our programs are relatively small, they allow for close interactions between senior and junior faculty members. In addition, by the time a faculty member comes up for tenure and/or promotion, several cycles of workload planning and performance evaluations have been completed, which includes feedback to the Director from multiple sources, such as Center Directors and Strategic Plan Team leaders. The present format allows for the submission of material that is most closely scrutinized and considered most important by the various committees in arriving at their recommendations.

The restriction of the material sent for external review (see Section 10 and below) is to encourage a thorough evaluation and prompt response by the reviewers, and appears to be very much in line with the evaluation material sent out by engineering and science departments/colleges at other institutions. External review is only one aspect of the tenure and promotion evaluation. External reviewers can knowledgeably comment only on the research and scholarly activities of the candidate. Their recommendations obviously are not the only factors that determine eligibility for tenure and promotion, although they are certainly to be given serious consideration.

The application for tenure and promotion should be presented in a binder in which the various sections are separated by tabbed dividers. To ensure uniformity, the College will provide the binder and tabs for candidates.

The copies of annual evaluations and the computerized portion of student evaluations of teaching will be inserted by the Dean's office and need not be supplied by the candidate.

Binder: A three-ring, hardback binder with 1" spine maximum. The binder cover and spine should be labeled with the name of the candidate, the purpose of the application ("for tenure & promotion to <rank>," or "promotion to <rank>"), and date.

Tabs: Sections I-V should be separated by tabs labeled by the Section number.

IMPORTANT: The binder and tabs will be provided by the Dean's office to all tenure and promotion candidates in time for their application. Assistant Professors will receive the binder in time for the mid-term review (see Section 15)."

	<p>Form A All forms may be downloaded in a single MS Word file from http://info.engr.latech.edu, "Documents & Forms," in the "Tenure & Promotion" section.</p>
	<p>Letter of application A cover letter, written by the candidate, which summarizes the case for tenure and/or promotion. This letter provides the candidate the opportunity to highlight and organize the elements of the application in an unrestricted format.</p>
	<p>Suggested External Reviewers The candidate must supply the names and contact information, including e-mail, of <u>four</u> external reviewers who are capable of objectively evaluating the application and have no conflict of interest. Former advisors (graduate and post-doc), students, post-doctoral fellows, collaborators, coauthors of papers, etc., should not be listed.</p>
I.	<p>Curriculum Vitae Detailed Vitae in the specified format (see next Section).</p>
II.	<p>Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Form II(a) (modification of University Form B). (b) Maximum of 5 pages to describe and substantiate teaching accomplishments. (c) One page to describe undergraduate advising, if applicable – number of students advised each year, and your approach to advising.
III.	<p>Most Significant Intellectual Products Describe up to five significant "products" of your career. The descriptions must contain enough detail to convey the nature and importance of the contribution, but limit each to approximately one page so as to stay within the page limit. Citations (but not copies) of published work and links to supporting material that may be available on the candidate's web pages are welcome but the T&P Committee is not required to look through those. (maximum of 5 pages)</p>
IV.	<p>Research</p> <p><i>(a) Proposals submitted and funded (required):</i> Use Form IV(a) to create a single table listing (most recent first) of all submitted proposals. <u>Brief</u> clarifications of roles and share of budget in funded group proposals should be provided as footnotes (use additional pages if necessary).</p> <p><u>Do not supply copies of proposals.</u> Up to five proposal reviews may be attached if they are necessary to prove (i) the quality of the funded proposals, or (ii) that the PI is on the verge of significant funding success.</p> <p><i>(b) Graduate student advising (required):</i></p>

	<p>Use Form IV(b) to generate a table of graduate students advised as Chair or Co-Chair only. [Service on graduate committees is to be listed either in Section I or Section V below.]</p> <p>(c) Publications: Publication list is already included in the CV. <u>Provide copies of three (and only three) papers you consider to be your most significant publications up to this point in your career. These may already be briefly described in Section III, and the overlap is entirely acceptable. Up to five</u> peer reviews of papers submitted may be included if they are necessary to show (i) the quality of the papers already published, or (ii) that the applicant has papers under review that are about to be accepted.</p>
V.	<p>Service Describe and substantiate some of the more significant contributions listed in the vitae (maximum of 5 pages).</p>

Items to be sent to external reviewers:

For external review, candidates should send the Director a single PDF file containing the following items:

- (a) Letter of Application.
- (b) Curriculum Vitae.
- (c) Section III – Most Significant Intellectual Products.
- (d) Section IV – Research (including PDF reprints of three papers).

Additional Information:

Be prepared to submit additional material if necessary if requested by external reviewers or the College Tenure & Promotion Committee. Such requests will be forwarded to the candidate through the Director.

14. TENURE & PROMOTION CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT

1. Identity, Rank, and Affiliation

The following information in a format of your choice.

Name:

Rank:

Program:

Address:

E-mail:

Web page URL:

Phone:

Fax:

2. Education

List, in reverse chronological order, degrees earned, discipline, and institution.

Example:

2002: PhD in Chemical Engineering, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ.
 1995: MS in Chemical Engineering, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ.
 1993: BS in Chemical Engineering, Georgia Tech, Atlanta, GA.

3. Professional Experience

3.(a). Academic Experience:

List, in reverse chronological order, all positions held. Example:

2004-present: Assistant Professor, Chemical Engineering, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, LA.
 2002-2004: NSF Post-doctoral Research Fellow, Chemical Engineering, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL.
 1998-2002: Research Assistant, Chemical Engineering, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ.
 1995-1996: Teaching Assistant, Chemical Engineering, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ.

3.(b). Administrative Experience (if applicable)

List, in reverse chronological order, all positions held. Same format as 3.(a).

3.(c). Industrial/Private Enterprise Experience (if applicable)

List, in reverse chronological order, all positions held. Same format as 3.(a).

4. Honors/Awards

List, in reverse chronological order, awards or honors, including memberships in honor societies.

5. Scholarship

5.(a). Articles in peer-reviewed journals:

Submit complete bibliography citations, including authors, title of article, journal name, volume number (issue number, if applicable), beginning and ending page numbers, and year of publication. *Use reverse-chronological order, starting with those recently submitted and under review, those accepted but yet to appear, and then those that have appeared in print. Do not list papers that are in manuscript stage.*

5.(b). Papers presented at conferences:

- i. Peer-reviewed conference papers. List in reverse-chronological order.
- ii. Non-reviewed conference papers. List in reverse-chronological order.

5.(c). Technical Reports:

Examples include NASA briefs; notes written for large collaborations; white papers for funding agencies; technical design reports for experiments, spacecraft, new facilities, or major research instrumentation; or reports written as part of the deliverables on industrial contracts. Provide title, agency/entity submitted to, year of preparation, and web URL's if available. List in reverse-chronological order.

5.(d). Book Chapters:

Submit complete bibliography citation, including title of chapter, publication name, (volume number and issue number, if applicable – if part of a monograph series), name(s) of the editor(s), beginning and ending page numbers, publisher, and year of publication. *Use reverse-chronological order, starting with those recently submitted, then those accepted but yet to appear, and then those that have appeared in print. Do not list chapters that are in manuscript stage.*

5.(c). Published Books:

List scholarly monographs and books; textbooks; edited and/or translated books; bibliographical books; any of the above co-authored or with multi-authors, in reverse-chronological order. Identify publisher and year of publication.

5.(f). Research grants:

List the performance period (beginning and ending month/year) of the award, title of the proposal, funding agency, and amount funded. *List only funded grants and proposals currently under evaluation.*¹

5.(g). Other scholarship:

- i. Patents and Disclosures
- ii. Reports of Invention
- iii. Start-up companies, licensure of technology, etc.
- iv. Other items – textbook reviews, consulting, etc.

6. Professional Development

List continuing education, training sessions, conferences, seminars, or workshops attended for enhancing effectiveness of teaching or research.

7. Service**7.(a). Service to Profession:**

Examples of items to be listed are:

- i. Service on editorial boards of professional journals
- ii. Service as reviewer for professional journals
- iii. Service as panel member on State/Federal/Private funding agency programs
- iv. Service as mail-reviewer for State/Federal/Private funding agency programs
- v. Service to professional organizations

7.(b). Service to Academic Program.

Examples:

- i. Student advising
- ii. Student organizations
- iii. Program teams

¹ A complete list of all proposals submitted, whether funded or unfunded, is requested in Section IV, on Form 4(a).

- iv. Other services performed

7.(c). Service to College.

Examples:

- i. College strategic plan teams
- ii. Ad-hoc College committees/teams
- iii. Graduate recruiting initiatives
- iv. Other services performed

7.(d). Service to University

Examples:

- i. University strategic plan teams
- ii. University committees
- iii. University Senate
- iv. Other services performed

7.(e). Service to Community

Some examples are:

- i. non-funded professional advisory service to community, civic, governmental, religious, or social groups (periodic consultant, speaker, workshop leader)
- ii. non-funded service to government, industry, public organizations and other off-campus groups as a valuable resource in efforts to foster economic development
- iii. testimony on professional matters to legislative bodies.

15. MID-TERM REVIEW

For those hired at the Assistant Professor rank, a mid-term review is conducted during the third year of employment. The purpose of the mid-term review is to provide an assessment and feedback of a faculty member's progress toward fulfillment of tenure and promotion expectations. It is intended to provide objective, independent comments to the candidate. This gives the faculty member time to make mid-course adjustments, if necessary. Formal feedback from the mid-term review will be handled as part of the annual evaluation process.

The following items should be a part of the review process:

- (1) The faculty member should prepare a dossier similar to the one that will be submitted for tenure review and submit the dossier to the Academic Director, by January 15 of the third year of service (after two full years of service). The binder will be provided by the Dean's office and should be retained for the tenure and promotion application.
- (2) At least three senior faculty members in the college, including two from outside the faculty member's academic program, will be asked by the Director to provide independent assessments. The mid-term dossier is not sent for external review. The reviewers' assessments will not be a part of the personnel file, and will not be submitted to administrators above the Academic Director, but will be used by the Academic Director as a basis for preparing a comprehensive assessment. This assessment will be included as part of that year's annual evaluation, which will be completed by April 15 of the mid-term year.

There will be no required mid-term review for senior tenure-track hires (at the Associate Professor or Professor rank).

16. SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Professor _____

<Address>

Dear Professor _____:

Dr. _____, Assistant Professor of _____, is applying for tenure and promotion. I believe that you may be able to provide an unbiased evaluation of her/his research accomplishments as a tenure-track faculty member. If you believe you have a conflict of interest with respect to this applicant, please notify me immediately so that another reviewer can be selected.

Since 1995, Louisiana Tech University's College of Engineering and Science has been operating under an innovative, multidisciplinary administrative structure. The traditional departmental structure was dismantled in favor of a more flexible structure. In this structure, Directors are the administrative heads of multiple academic units. We place great value on collaboration across disciplines for research and education, perhaps more so than an institution with a department-based structure.

The following items are being sent to you along with this letter: (a) the College of Engineering & Science Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, (b) the cover letter from the candidate, (c) the candidate's detailed CV, (d) the candidate's five most significant intellectual accomplishments, and (e) a tabulation of proposals submitted and funded, along with any supplementary information that may be provided by the candidate. If you wish to receive reprints of any of the candidate's publications, please let me know.

Primarily, I request from you an honest and frank review of the quality of the candidate's research program. We ask that you comment on the quality of journals or conference proceedings in which publications have appeared, the quality of the publications themselves, and contributions made by the applicant to the field. In addition, please comment on funding success, as well as quality and prestige of sources. Comments on any direct observation you may have had of the applicant's representation of Louisiana Tech at conferences, workshops, etc., will also be helpful.

I understand that you may not have enough information to make an evaluation about the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of teaching, service, and collegiality. However, I would appreciate wide-ranging comments on any and all aspects of the application based on the content of the candidate's CV.

In summary, based primarily on your evaluation of the candidate's research, I would like you to answer the question: "Would you promote this candidate using Louisiana Tech's guidelines for tenure and promotion?"

In order that the various steps in the Tenure and Promotion process can be completed in a timely manner, I request that you send me your evaluation by _____.

Sincerely,