

2006 Chairperson's Manual

Table of Contents

Annual or Triennial Review, Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment

- Portfolio Guidelines.....3
- Curriculum Vitae.....3
- Statement on Research, Teaching, and Service.....5
- Guidelines for the Department Chair and Faculty Evaluators.....6
- Annual Review for Pre-Tenure Faculty Checklist.....10
- Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Checklist.....11
- Tenure and/or Promotion Checklist.....12
- Tenured Associate Professor Triennial Review Checklist.....14

Schedules

- Tenure and Promotion Schedule for 2006-2007.....15
- Spring Cycle Tenure and Promotion Schedule Revised for 2006-2007.....17
- First Reappointment Review 2006-2007 for Faculty Appointed in Spring 2005.....19
- First Reappointment Review for 2006-2007 for Faculty Appointed Fall 2005.....20
- Second Reappointment Review for 2006-2007 for Faculty Appointed Fall 2003.....21
- Second Reappointment Review for 2006-2007 for Faculty Appointed Spring 2004.....22

Forms

- Reappointment Form.....23
- Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor/Full Professor Form.....24
- Promotion to Full Professor Form.....25

Hiring

- Faculty Recruitment and Initial Appointment Checklist.....26
- Recommendation for Appointment Form.....28
- Affirmative Action Compliance Form.....29
- Permission to Advertise Form.....34

- Faculty Employment Request Form.....36
- AA/EEO Cards: call Provost's Office

Academic Research Leave

- Leave of Absence Checklist.....38

Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

- ADA Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities.....39
- ADA Keys to Compliance.....40
- ADA Responsibility of Disability Support Services.....42

Lehigh University Provost's Office Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

Faculty quality is the principal factor determining the quality of a university. In accordance with the mission of Lehigh University to deliver undergraduate and graduate education of the highest quality and to advance knowledge through scholarship and research of distinction, Lehigh University intends to maintain standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion that are comparable to those employed by leading universities of similar size and mission in the country.

Lehigh faculty should be outstanding educators, fine scholars, and dedicated members of the university community. Therefore, the university's reappointment, tenure, and promotion standards are intended to identify candidates whose excellence is well documented and who show clear promise of continuing superior performance and productivity. As stated in the *Rules and Procedures of the Faculty of Lehigh University* (R&P), section 2.2.1.5, "Excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and service to the university are the criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure." Achievement in each of these areas is considered separately. Each of the four colleges has more specific guidelines on standards of quality and productivity that candidates should consult. In addition, the specific means of judging a candidate's quality and commitment to the life of scholarship and instruction may differ from one discipline to another.

It is the responsibility of the academic units to maintain a system of evaluation and review and to make information available to the faculty regarding the procedures and standards by which they will be judged. It is also the responsibility of individual faculty members to consult with their chairs and deans to ensure that they understand fully the reappointment, tenure, and promotion procedures and standards of the university.

Annual or Triennial Review, Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Portfolios

Integral to the review process is the responsibility of candidates and academic units to assemble, review, and submit portfolios for candidates being reviewed. Tenure-track faculty should begin to create their portfolios in their first year, as they provide materials to faculty evaluators for annual review. These portfolios can then be revised and supplemented for subsequent reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews. Because these portfolios are the foundation on which candidates are evaluated according to the university-wide criteria, their content must be standard for the entire university.

These guidelines should be used by tenure-track faculty and faculty evaluators for: annual review of untenured faculty; reappointment; tenure and promotion; triennial review of tenured faculty; and promotion to full professor. Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean's office regarding any additional requirements.

Please see the Reappointment, Tenure and/or Promotion, Annual Review, and Triennial Review checklists appended to this document for the required contents and organization of portfolios. Sections I-III below provide additional information about the CV, the statement on research, teaching, and service, and other elements of the portfolio.

I. Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae should follow the following format:

A. Biographical information including the following:

- Name
- Home and business street and e-mail addresses, including phone and fax numbers.

- Complete educational history beyond high school, including dates.
- Full employment history/professional experience including dates (including military service, if any).

B. Publications and Creative Activities

In each category, list published works first, followed by works not yet published but accepted for publication. Co-authors should be identified. The candidate should distinguish between authored and edited works and refereed and non-refereed publications, and clarify the status of unpublished works. Comparative distinctions (e.g. major v. minor works, juried v. non-juried) should be used for performing and creative arts faculty.

Publications (in the following order): For collaborative publications, the nature of the faculty member's contribution should be specified in the Statement on Research and Scholarship.

- Books
 - Books authored. Original or revised edition should be specified.
 - Monographs.
 - Books edited.
 - Chapters in books.
- Articles in refereed journals. Provide full citation, including pagination. Review articles and invited articles should be identified.
- Published reports and conference proceedings (indicate those that are refereed).
- Edited publications and other articles (including those invited and non-refereed).
- Reviews (book, film, software, exhibit, performance, etc.) and notes.

Creative Activities (in the following order):

- Films, tapes, photographs, etc. (the nature of the faculty member's contribution should be specified).
- Exhibits, performances, demonstrations, and other creative activities (the nature of the faculty member's contribution should be specified).
- Original designs, plan, inventions, and patents.
- Other (specify type).

C. Honors and awards (dates, awarding institutions) such as:

- Recognition by professional and academic societies.
- Distinguished lectureships.
- Appointment to fellow or comparable grade in important professional organizations.
- Honorary degrees.
- Award(s) for best paper, book, etc.
- Teaching awards and other special recognitions.
- Service awards and honors.

D. Research funding and training grants broken down into the categories below. List amounts awarded and role (e.g. principal investigator).

- Competitively awarded research grants (including any collaborators).
- Non-competitive research grants (including any collaborators).
- Competitively awarded training grants (including any collaborators).
- Non-competitive training grants (including any collaborators).
- Institutional/equipment grants (including any collaborators).
- Contract/consulting work (including any collaborators).

E. Editor/editorial review board membership for scholarly publications.

F. Scholarly presentations broken down into the following categories: For multi-authored presentations, identify the presenter with an asterisk or by underlining the name.

- Invited presentations/lectures/colloquia/workshops/performances/conferences.
- Refereed presentations/lectures/exhibits/performances/conferences.
- Organized or chaired sessions/colloquia/exhibits/performances/conferences.
- Other.

G. Teaching and Research Advising

- Courses taught
- Advising – research direction. The name of student and academic year(s) involved should be indicated, as well as placement of the student(s). List completed work first and then in-progress work.
 - Undergraduate
 - Master's
 - Doctoral

H. Service (include dates and indication of leadership roles)

- University
 - Service to university.
 - Service to college.
 - Service to interdisciplinary programs.
 - Service to department.
- Professional
 - Office and committee memberships held in professional organizations.
 - Other non-university committees, commissions, panels, etc.
 - International activities not listed above.
 - Other.

II. Statement on Research, Teaching, and Service

The candidate for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must provide a statement that assists the faculty evaluators in determining whether he or she has met the criteria in research, teaching, and service. Because many faculty collaborate with others, the statement should indicate the significance and impact of the candidate's own contributions in these areas.

Normally the candidate will divide the statement into three parts that address research, teaching, and service separately. The candidate may also describe how her or his achievements in these areas are integrated or overlap.

In the statement on research and scholarship, the candidate shall supply a general narrative of his or her scholarly interests, achievements, goals, and methodologies. While this statement can take various forms, the purpose is to provide a clear indication of the substance of the candidate's current and future scholarship and its contribution to her or his academic discipline. The narrative should be written in a way that permits educated laypersons to understand the significance of the candidate's work.

For tenure and/or promotion, candidates must provide evidence that their research and scholarship have already had a significant and positive impact in their field and that their professional work has enhanced the reputation of Lehigh University. Positive action on tenure or promotion must be based on demonstrated accomplishment and not simply on potential. For promotion to full professor it is expected that the faculty member will build upon his or her established performance and demonstrate leadership in scholarship and/or teaching.

In the statement on teaching, candidates shall discuss their achievements, goals, and methodologies in teaching. This should include the candidate's teaching philosophy and explanations of why she or he teaches various courses in a particular way. Candidates should also discuss their contributions in course and curriculum development, and emphasize the ways in which their courses contribute to the mission of their department and the university as a whole.

Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion must provide materials sufficient to demonstrate that they are effective teachers and mentors, who ensure that their courses meet contemporary standards of relevance and quality, and who develop their students' analytical and expressive abilities. Faculty should provide excellent instruction at multiple levels of the curriculum, from lower-division undergraduate courses to the graduate level (where applicable).

In the statement on service, candidates shall discuss their achievements and goals in service, including advising. Although service is not a sufficient element for tenure or promotion, it is a necessary component. As with teaching and scholarship, the university expects that a candidate's level of service will increase over time. Service to the department, interdepartmental programs, college, and university is fundamental to the successful operation of the institution. The university also expects faculty to participate in an increasing level of professional service, which benefits both the reputation of the individual faculty member and the university.

III. The portfolio should also include the following materials: Please see the appropriate checklist for organization.

Teaching and advising

- A chronological listing of undergraduate and graduate (if applicable) courses taught and the number of grades assigned in each course.
- A discussion of advising, including number of students advised, the dates of service, and the advisory format (frequency of contact, individual or group meetings).
- List of means for the two global questions on student course evaluations (those rating the instructor's teaching effectiveness and the quality of the course overall) from a minimum of the last three years. Candidates are encouraged to provide copies of the Course Evaluation Summary Reports supplied by the Office of Institutional Research.
- Representative syllabi, examinations, and assignments, including innovative methods.

Research

- Background information on the stature of journals, book publishers, conferences, performance/exhibit venues, etc. In fields where data are available, provide the impact factor or ranking of journals (out of the total in the category), and the acceptance rate or other quality indicator of conferences. Information on citation data for the candidate's published works may be included as appropriate to the field. Although these citation data must be used with great care and are inherently more valid for promotion to full professor than for tenure and promotion to associate professor, in certain fields they may provide an indication of the disciplinary impact of the candidate's scholarship. In particular, citation data should be calibrated against the external evaluators' assessment of the importance of the candidate's scholarship. Data reported in the portfolio should include the number of citations by others (i.e. no self-citations) for each of the candidate's publications.

Guidelines for the Department Chair and Faculty Evaluators

Please note that the review process depends upon confidentiality among participants, including the opinions expressed by all external and internal reviewers.

Tenure-track faculty should begin to create their portfolios in their first year, as they provide materials to faculty evaluators for annual review. These portfolios can then be revised and supplemented for subsequent reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews.

1. Annual Review of Pre-Tenure Faculty

- a. In years when reappointment or tenure is not considered, an annual review process is conducted for pre-tenure faculty, including pre-tenure assistant and associate professors. Please see *R&P 2.2.4.1* for additional details regarding the annual review process, which may be coordinated with salary review.
- b. The pre-tenure faculty member and department chairperson compile materials to be considered by the tenured voting members of the department. (See 2.2.3.1 for faculty joint appointments.) The department chairperson meets with the tenured voting faculty to discuss the performance and status of the pre-tenure faculty member then summarizes in writing the department's evaluation. The chairperson then meets individually with each pre-tenure faculty member, discusses the faculty's review of his/her performance, and shares a copy of the written summary with him/her. The pre-tenure faculty member is notified that he/she has the right to respond in writing to the tenured faculty's evaluation.
- c. Copies of the departmental evaluation and any written response by the pre-tenure faculty member are placed in the pre-tenure faculty member's file in the department, with copies sent to the dean, who reviews the substance and process of the evaluation process for consistency with the criteria, stated in section 2.2.1.5. Beginning January 1, 2007, copies of these letters will also be sent to the Provost's office.
- d. The Annual Review department summary letter for pre-tenure faculty must have a high level of clarity and specificity which will ensure that the pre-tenure faculty member has a clear understanding of the department's expectations in each of the three areas. The letter will include specific guidance on what constitutes acceptable, high-quality venues for dissemination of scholarly/creative works in the faculty member's field. These annual written review letters will be included in each subsequent reappointment/ tenure portfolio of the pre-tenure faculty member.

2. Department-level reappointment, tenure, and promotion evaluators:

- a. For candidates with joint appointments, see *R&P 2.2.3.1*.
- b. When a candidate is being considered for reappointment or tenure, voting members of the department include all tenured faculty of the department. In a department with fewer than three tenured faculty, see *R&P 2.2.2.2.1, 2.2.2.2.2*.
- c. When a candidate is being considered for promotion to full professor, voting members of the department include tenured full professors of the department. In a department with fewer than three tenured full professors, see *R&P 2.2.2.2.3*.

3. External evaluators (for tenure and promotion)

- a. The first step after initiation of the tenure and promotion process is identification of external evaluators. The department chairperson, in consultation with the tenured members of the department, the dean, and the candidate, has initial responsibility for preparing a list of external evaluators. See *R&P 2.2.6.2* or *2.2.9.3* for further information on the selection process. Please note that it is recommended to construct a list of 8-10 prospective external evaluators for approval by the dean and provost because some of the scholars may decline to serve.
- b. The portfolio shall contain five or more external letters. Please consult college guidelines for additional requirements. At least one and no more than two of the external evaluators will be the candidate's nominees. Each evaluator should be a person of considerable distinction in the candidate's field or related field. The dean and provost approve the list of external evaluators that has been selected by the department in consultation with the candidate. The evaluators should be selected and letters requested without any prior solicitation by the candidate, faculty, or administration. This ban on prior solicitation refers to contact specifically regarding the external evaluation.

- c. The following information about the evaluators shall be compiled by the department chair and included in the candidate's portfolio sent to the dean:
 - A short written statement of how well and in what capacity each evaluator may know the candidate. The core group of five (5) evaluators must be individuals who have no vested interest in a candidate's success or failure; that is, co-authors, co-researchers, co-editors, former professors and advisors are usually not acceptable reviewers. However, a department chair may discuss with the dean an exception. Only the dean and provost may approve an exception to the requirement.
 - Summary of each external evaluator's stature in field or curriculum vitae.
 - A copy of the letter sent to external evaluators. The letter must be phrased impartially and request an assessment of the candidate's overall professional standing and promise relative to other individuals in the field. (See below for a sample letter requesting an external evaluation).

4. Faculty letters and department summary (reappointment, tenure, and promotion)

- a. Following the department meeting, each department-level evaluator (including the chairperson) will submit a detailed written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications in research and scholarship, teaching, and service, applying the criteria stated in R&P 2.2.1.5. In writing their letters, faculty will employ the candidate's portfolio, the letters of external evaluators (for tenure and promotion), and additional materials such as the candidate's publications, course materials, etc. The letters will employ evidence to explain fully the faculty evaluator's recommendation.
- b. In assessing teaching, faculty evaluators may include peer observations of the candidate in a classroom context and/or evaluate the candidate's instructional effectiveness in the context of professional presentations, seminars, or colloquia. Exit interviews with graduating majors may provide evidence concerning the candidate's instruction. Colleagues will also evaluate the role the candidate's courses play within the department and university curricula. For example, does the candidate share in the teaching of required courses or teach electives only? Is the candidate capable of teaching the "difficult" courses and does he/she take turns doing so? Does the candidate willingly offer new courses that enrich the curriculum, or is he/she reluctant to do so?
- c. Faculty letters should also include an evaluation of the candidate's major, non-major, and graduate advising. Evaluation may include sources such as senior and graduate student exit interviews conducted by the department; surveys of all graduating seniors/graduate students; number and placement of doctoral and master's students.
- d. After receiving the faculty letters, the chairperson writes the department's recommendation.

For reappointment candidates, see R&P 2.2.7.1 and 2.2.7.2 for information on the departmental recommendation, pre-submission consultation with the candidate, and submission to the dean.

For tenure candidates, see R&P 2.2.6.5, 2.2.6.6, and 2.2.6.7.

For candidates for promotion to full professor, see R&P 2.2.9.5, 2.2.9.6, and 2.2.9.7.

Sample Letters to External Evaluators

A sample letter requesting the participation of external evaluators in the tenure and promotion review follows, as does a sample thank you letter for their agreement to serve. While you are welcome to draft your own letters, please make certain that you request of the evaluators and subsequently receive the information specified in paragraph four of the evaluator request letter.

Sample letter requesting service as an evaluator:

Dear (Name):

Lehigh University is in the process of considering (name of faculty member) for (tenure and/or promotion). The university is committed to tenuring and promoting only those candidates whose excellence in their performance as teachers and scholars is well documented and who show clear promise of continued contributions of the highest quality and productivity. A key indicator of excellence in research and scholarship is testimony of outstanding members of the discipline. As such, I am writing to ask whether you would be willing to serve as an evaluator of the scholarly achievements of (name of faculty member).

(Paragraph including background information and accomplishments of candidate) For your convenience, a copy of (name's) CV is enclosed.

Please let us know by (date) if you will be able to provide us with your professional opinion of the scholarship of (name of faculty member). We will then mail you (his/her) recent scholarly materials; if there are publications listed on the CV that you are particularly interested in receiving, please let me know. We would need to receive your evaluation by (date).

If you agree to provide an evaluation, we would be seeking an assessment of (name's) overall professional standing and promise relative to other individuals in the field. We request your evaluation of the impact and significance of (his or her) scholarship to date, as well as an assessment of (his or her) promise of continued contributions of the highest quality and productivity.

This evaluation will be shared with the members of the department, the college tenure and promotion committee, the dean, and provost as part of the normal tenure and/or promotion review process. It is Lehigh University's general policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations of tenure and promotion candidates, except of course when disclosure is mandated by applicable legal requirements.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the phone number or e-mail address above. I am enclosing a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. We very much appreciate your assistance.

Sample thank you letter for agreeing to serve as an evaluator:

Dear (Name):

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an evaluator of (name of faculty member's) scholarly achievements. This evaluation is considered part of the normal tenure and promotion review process and as such will be shared with the members of the department, the college tenure and promotion committee, the dean, and provost. It is Lehigh University's general policy to maintain the confidentiality of evaluations of tenure and promotion candidates, except of course when disclosure is mandated by applicable legal requirements.

For your convenience, I have enclosed (name's) recent scholarly materials as well as a copy of (his/her) CV. In your evaluation, we ask that you provide an assessment of (name's) overall professional standing and promise relative to other individuals in the field. We request your evaluation of the impact and significance of (his or her) scholarship to date, as well as an assessment of (his or her) promise of continued contributions of the highest quality and productivity. Please send your evaluation to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by (date).

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the phone number or e-mail address above. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Revised May 16, 2006

**Lehigh University Provost's Office
Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment
Checklist**

Materials to be included in faculty portfolio: Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean's office regarding any additional requirements. Please arrange materials forwarded to the Provost's Office in the following order, in a three-ring binder, with clearly marked divisions between Parts I, II, and III.

Department chairs, faculty evaluators, and candidates should consult the *Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty* for more information on preparing the portfolio.

A= Candidate

B= Department chair, faculty

C= College dean

Part I Recommendations: The originals must be sent to the Provost's Office.

Date Supplied by:

- | | | |
|-------|------|--|
| _____ | B, C | 1. Recommendation for Reappointment form with signatures |
| _____ | C | 2. Dean's letter |
| _____ | B | 3. Department summary letter |
| _____ | A | 4. Candidate's response to department summary (if any) |
| _____ | B | 5. Individual signed letters of department/program faculty evaluators including department chair |

Part II Candidate's portfolio: Please consult the *Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty* for more information.

- | | | |
|-------|------|--|
| _____ | A | 6. Curriculum vitae |
| _____ | A | 7. Candidate's statement on research, teaching, and service, including the significance and impact of the candidate's <u>own</u> contributions in each of these areas (see <i>Guidelines</i>) |
| _____ | A, B | 8. Student course evaluations: list of means for the two global questions (or course evaluation summary sheets) for all courses taught at Lehigh |

Part III Supplementary documents (No more than 30 pages)

- | | | |
|-------|---|---|
| _____ | A | 9. Sample syllabi, tests, assignments |
| _____ | A | 10. Additional supporting materials such as commendations, student letters, etc. (optional) |

**Lehigh University Provost's Office
Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion
Checklist**

Materials to be included in faculty portfolio: Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean's office regarding any additional requirements. Please arrange materials forwarded to the Provost's Office in the following order, in a three-ring binder, with clearly marked divisions between Parts I, II, III, and IV.

Department chairs, faculty evaluators, and candidates should consult the *Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty* for more information on preparing the portfolio.

A= Candidate

B= Department chair, faculty

C= College dean, promotion and tenure committee

Part I Recommendations: The originals must be sent to the Provost's Office.

Date Supplied by:

- | | | |
|-------|------|---|
| _____ | B, C | 1. Recommendation form for Tenure/Promotion with signatures |
| _____ | C | 2. Dean's letter |
| _____ | C | 3. Letter of college promotion and tenure committee with signature of each committee member |
| _____ | B | 4. Department summary letter |
| _____ | A | 5. Candidate's response to department summary (if any) |
| _____ | B | 6. Individual signed letters of department/program faculty evaluators, including department chair |
| _____ | B/C | 7. College and department (if any) guidelines |

Part II Candidate's portfolio: Please consult the *Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty* for more information.

- | | | |
|-------|------|--|
| _____ | A | 8. Curriculum vitae |
| _____ | A | 9. Candidate's statement on research, teaching, and service, including the significance and impact of the candidate's <u>own</u> contributions in each of these areas (see <i>Guidelines</i>) |
| _____ | A | 10. Chronological list of courses taught and the number of grades assigned in each course |
| _____ | A | 11. Advising, including non-majors: indicate number of students advised, the dates of service, and the advisory format (frequency of contact, individual or group meetings) |
| _____ | A, B | 12. Student course evaluations: list of means for the two global questions (or course evaluation summary sheets) for a minimum of the last three years |
| _____ | B | 13. Reports of peer observations of the candidate in a classroom context may be included and can be required by a college |

Part III Research and Scholarship: Please consult the Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty for more information.

- _____ B 14. Original letters of external evaluators: minimum 5, please consult college guidelines for additional requirements.
- _____ A,B 15. Short written statement of how well and in what capacity each evaluator may know candidate
- _____ B 16. Summary of each external evaluator's stature in field or curriculum vitae
- _____ B 17. Copy of letter sent to external evaluators
- _____ B 18. Background information on stature of journals, book publishers, conferences, performance/exhibit venues, etc.
- _____ A,B 19. Citation data for the candidate's published works (if appropriate for the field)

Part IV Supplementary documents (No more than 30 pages)

- _____ A 20. Sample syllabi, tests, assignments
- _____ A 21. Additional supporting materials such as commendations, student letters, etc. (optional)
- _____ A 22. College may require copies of journal articles, book chapters, or books.

Lehigh University – Provost’s Office

Alumni Memorial Building

DATE: 4 April 2006
TO: Deans
FROM: Mohamed S. El-Aasser

REVISED

TENURE AND PROMOTION SCHEDULE FOR 2006-2007

This schedule should be used for tenure candidates whose probationary period ends in August 2007 and candidates for promotion to full professor.

Please address questions or concerns to Jean Soderlund at 85891 or jrsa@lehigh.edu.

See R&P 2.2.6 or 2.2.9,* the Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty and the Tenure and/or Promotion Checklist for additional information about the tenure and promotion process. Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean’s office regarding any additional requirements. *For joint appointments see R&P 2.2.3.1.

By 16 January 2006 – The Provost’s office sends a list of tenure and promotion candidates to the Dean’s offices.

By 1 March 2006, Preliminary Deadline - The Dean’s office and departments check these lists. Departments decide which additional candidates to put forward for tenure and promotion review and inform the Dean’s office. Chairpersons then hold necessary discussions with candidates and department/faculty evaluators to draft a list of potential external reviewers; this list, with information about each reviewer’s stature and relationship with candidate, is sent to the Dean, who forwards the list with any comments to the Provost by 15 May 2006.

By 1 June 2006, Final Deadline - Dean’s office will provide a complete list of candidates for tenure and/or promotion to the Provost’s office. The list of external reviewers is approved by the Provost by 15 June 2006.

By 4 August 2006 – Candidate’s CV, statement on research and scholarship, and scholarly materials sent to external evaluators.

By 29 September 2006 – In each department, candidate’s portfolio, scholarly materials, supplementary documents, and letters from external reviewers are available to the appropriate faculty evaluators for review (see Guidelines and Checklist). The Chairperson convenes a meeting of department/faculty evaluators and solicits individual written letters. The Chairperson also writes an individual letter.

By 20 October 2006 - Chairperson writes and circulates department summary among department/faculty evaluators, provides copy to candidate without disclosing the statements or opinions of individual evaluators, and forwards to the Dean the candidate’s portfolio and supplementary materials, department summary, the candidate’s response (if any), and individual faculty letters. See tenure and promotion checklist for contents and organization of the portfolio.

By 1 November 2006 - Dean forwards copies of portfolios to the college promotion and tenure committee.

By 8 December 2006 – College promotion and tenure committee makes recommendations to Dean. If necessary, the Dean holds meetings with the department and college committee as specified in *R&P* 2.2.6.10 or 2.2.9.10. The Dean holds a pre-submission meeting with the candidate as required in *R&P* 2.2.6.11 or 2.2.9.11.

By 24 January 2007 – Dean makes recommendations to the Provost. Official portfolios, including all original letters, are sent to the Provost's office.

During February and March 2007 – Provost meets with college committees and departments on split decision cases and those in which he disagrees with a faculty recommendation. These meetings will have priority throughout February and March. As required by *R&P*, unresolved cases with a faculty recommendation will be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees prior to the May Board meeting.

By 6 April 2007 – Preliminary letters sent to tenure and promotion candidates.

By 6 April 2007 - All recommendations for tenure and promotion submitted to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees for inclusion in the May board meeting.

18 May 2007 - Board of Trustees meeting is held. Official letters for tenure and promotion decisions are prepared as soon as possible during the following week and are hand delivered on campus.

Lehigh University – Provost’s Office

Alumni Memorial Building

DATE: 16 January 2006
TO: Deans
FROM: Mohamed S. El-Aasser

SPRING CYCLE TENURE AND PROMOTION SCHEDULE FOR 2006-2007

This schedule is to be used ONLY for tenure candidates who began their appointments at the beginning of the spring semester in January or whose reappointment and review schedule was adjusted because their tenure clocks were reset.

(This schedule is NOT for promotion to Full Professor without tenure reviews. Such reviews must be conducted according to the regular schedule. However, in cases of initial appointments recommended and approved for tenure consideration, you may initiate the review procedure with the department and college-wide review committees as soon as appropriate.)

Please address questions or concerns to Jean Soderlund at 85891 or jrsa@lehigh.edu.

See *R&P 2.2.6*,* the Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty and the Tenure and/or Promotion Checklist for additional information about the tenure and promotion process. Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean’s office regarding any additional requirements. *For joint appointments see *R&P 2.2.3.1*.

By 16 January 2006 – The Provost’s office sends a list of tenure and promotion candidates to the Dean’s offices.

By 1 March 2006, Preliminary Deadline - The Dean’s office and departments check these lists and return any corrections to the Provost’s office.

By 1 June 2006, Final Deadline – Dean’s office will confirm final list of candidates for tenure with the Provost’s office.

By 2 October 2006 - Chairpersons hold necessary discussions with candidates and department/faculty evaluators to draft a list of potential external reviewers; this list, with information about each reviewer’s stature and relationship with candidate, is sent to the Dean, who forwards the list with any comments to the Provost by 16 October 2006.

By 1 November 2006 - List of external reviewers is approved by the Provost.

By 8 January 2007 – Candidate’s CV, statement on research and scholarship, and scholarly materials sent to external evaluators.

By 19 February 2007 – In each department, candidate’s portfolio, scholarly materials, supplementary documents, and letters from external reviewers are available to the appropriate faculty evaluators for review (see Guidelines and Checklist). The Chairperson convenes a meeting of department/faculty evaluators and solicits individual written letters. The Chairperson also writes an individual letter.

By 1 March 2007- Chairperson writes and circulates department summary among department/faculty evaluators, provides copy to candidate without disclosing the statements or opinions of individual evaluators, and forwards to the Dean the candidate's portfolio and supplementary materials, department summary, the candidate's response (if any), and individual faculty letters. See tenure and promotion checklist for contents and organization of the portfolio.

By 12 March 2007 - Dean forwards copies of portfolios to the college promotion and tenure committee.

By 26 March 2007 – College promotion and tenure committee makes recommendations to Dean. If necessary, the Dean holds meetings with the department and college committee as specified in *R&P* 2.2.6.10. The Dean holds a pre-submission meeting with the tenure candidate as required in *R&P* 2.2.6.11.

By 10 April 2007– Dean makes recommendations to the Provost. Official portfolios, including all original letters, are sent to the Provost's office.

During 16 April to 9 May 2007 – Provost meets with college committees and departments on split decision cases and those in which he disagrees with a faculty recommendation. These meetings will have priority during this time. As required by *R&P*, unresolved cases with a faculty recommendation will be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees prior to the October Board meeting.

By 4 September 2007– Preliminary letters sent to tenure and promotion candidates.

By 12 September 2007- All recommendations for tenure and promotion submitted to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees for inclusion in the October Board meeting.

19 October 2007- Board of Trustees meeting is held. Official letters for tenure and promotion decisions are prepared as soon as possible during the following week and are hand delivered on campus.

Lehigh University – Provost’s Office

Alumni Memorial Building

DATE: 16 January 2006
TO: Deans
FROM: Mohamed S. El-Aasser

SCHEDULE FOR FIRST REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW FOR 2006-2007 FOR FACULTY APPOINTED IN SPRING 2005

See R&P 2.2.7,* the Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty and the Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Checklist for additional information about the reappointment process. Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean’s office regarding any additional requirements. *For joint appointments see R&P 2.2.3.1.

Please address questions or concerns to Jean Soderlund at 85891 or jrsa@lehigh.edu.

By 16 January 2006 – The Provost’s office will send a list of first reappointment candidates to the Dean’s offices.

By 1 March 2006, Preliminary Deadline - The Dean’s office and departments should check these lists and return any corrections to the Provost’s office.

By 1 June 2006, Final Deadline - Dean’s office will confirm final list of candidates for reappointment with the Provost’s office.

By 29 September 2006 – First reappointment candidates compile their portfolio and supplementary materials (see Guidelines and Checklist) and make them available to department/program faculty evaluators. The Chairperson convenes a meeting of department/faculty evaluators and solicits individual written letters. The Chairperson also writes an individual letter.

By 9 October 2006 - Chairperson writes and circulates department summary among department/program faculty evaluators, provides copy to candidate without disclosing the statements or opinions of individual evaluators, and forwards to the Dean the candidate’s portfolio and supplementary materials, department summary, the candidate’s response (if any), and individual faculty letters.

By 1 November 2006 - Dean makes recommendation to the Provost. Official portfolios, including all original letters, are sent to the Provost’s office. See checklist for contents and organization of reappointment portfolio.

By 15 December 2006 – Provost reviews reappointment and, if all parties are in agreement that the candidate should be reappointed, issues a reappointment letter. If either the Dean or Provost is in disagreement with the department recommendation, they will follow the steps indicated in R&P 2.2.7.4.

Lehigh University – Provost’s Office

Alumni Memorial Building

DATE: 4 April 2006
TO: Deans
FROM: Mohamed S. El-Aasser

REVISED
SCHEDULE FOR FIRST REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW FOR 2006-2007
FOR FACULTY APPOINTED FALL 2005

See R&P 2.2.7,* the Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty and the Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Checklist for additional information about the reappointment process. Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean’s office regarding any additional requirements. *For joint appointments see R&P 2.2.3.1.

Please address questions or concerns to Jean Soderlund at 85891 or jrsa@lehigh.edu.

By 16 January 2006 – The Provost’s office will send a list of first reappointment candidates to the Dean’s offices.

By 1 March 2006, Preliminary Deadline - The Dean’s office and departments should check these lists and return any corrections to the Provost’s office.

By 1 June 2006, Final Deadline - The Dean’s office will confirm final list of candidates for reappointment with the Provost’s office.

By 31 January 2007 – First reappointment candidates compile their portfolio and supplementary materials (see Guidelines and Checklist) and make them available to department/program faculty evaluators. After student course evaluations for fall 2006 are available, the Chairperson convenes a meeting of department/faculty evaluators and solicits individual written letters. The Chairperson also writes an individual letter.

By 23 February 2007 - Chairperson writes and circulates department summary among department/program faculty evaluators, provides copy to candidate without disclosing the statements or opinions of individual evaluators, and forwards to the Dean the candidate’s portfolio and supplementary documents, department summary, the candidate’s response (if any), and individual faculty letters.

By 21 March 2007 - Dean makes recommendation to the Provost. Official portfolios, including all original letters, are sent to the Provost’s office. See checklist for contents and organization of reappointment portfolio.

By 1 May 2007– Provost reviews reappointment and, if all parties are in agreement that the candidate should be reappointed, issues a reappointment letter. If either the Dean or Provost is in disagreement with the department recommendation, they will follow the steps indicated in R&P 2.2.7.4.

Lehigh University – Provost’s Office

Alumni Memorial Building

DATE: 16 January 2006
TO: Deans
FROM: Mohamed S. El-Aasser

SCHEDULE FOR SECOND REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW FOR 2006-2007 FOR FACULTY APPOINTED FALL 2003

See R&P 2.2.7,* the Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty and the Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Checklist for additional information about the reappointment process. Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean’s office regarding any additional requirements. *For joint appointments see R&P 2.2.3.1.

Please address questions or concerns to Jean Soderlund at 85891 or jrsa@lehigh.edu.

By 16 January 2006 –The Provost’s Office will send a list of second reappointment candidates to the Dean’s offices.

By 1 March 2006, Preliminary Deadline - The Dean’s office and departments should check these lists and return any corrections to the Provost’s office.

By 1 June 2006, Final Deadline - Dean’s office will confirm final list of candidates for reappointment with the Provost’s office.

By 13 October 2006 – Second reappointment candidates compile their portfolio and supplementary materials (see Guidelines and Checklist) and make them available to department/program faculty evaluators. The Chairperson convenes a meeting of department/faculty evaluators and solicits individual written letters. The Chairperson also writes an individual letter.

By 1 November 2006 - Chairperson writes and circulates department summary among department/program faculty evaluators, provides copy to candidate without disclosing the statements or opinions of individual evaluators, and forwards to the Dean the candidate’s portfolio and supplementary materials, department summary, the candidate’s response (if any), and individual faculty letters.

By 31 January 2007 - Dean makes recommendation to the Provost. Official portfolios, including all original letters, are sent to the Provost’s office. See checklist for contents and organization of reappointment portfolio.

By 1 May 2007– Provost reviews reappointment and, if all parties are in agreement that the candidate should be reappointed, issues a reappointment letter. If either the Dean or Provost is in disagreement with the department recommendation, they will follow the steps indicated in R&P 2.2.7.4.

Lehigh University – Provost's Office

Alumni Memorial Building

DATE: 16 January 2006
TO: Deans
FROM: Mohamed S. El-Aasser

SCHEDULE FOR SECOND REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW FOR 2006-2007 FOR FACULTY APPOINTED SPRING 2004

See R&P 2.2.7,* the Guidelines for Review of Tenure-Track Faculty and the Tenure-Track Faculty Reappointment Checklist for additional information about the reappointment process. Each college may require additional materials; thus department chairs should consult with the Dean's office regarding any additional requirements. *For joint appointments see R&P 2.2.3.1.

Please address questions or concerns to Jean Soderlund at 85891 or jrsa@lehigh.edu.

By 16 January 2006 – The Provost's office will send a list of second reappointment candidates to the Dean's offices.

By 1 March 2006, Preliminary Deadline - The Dean's office and departments should check these lists and return any corrections to the Provost's office.

By 1 June 2006, Final Deadline - Dean's office will confirm final list of candidates for reappointment with the Provost's office.

By 12 February 2007 – Second reappointment candidates compile their portfolio and supplementary materials (see Guidelines and Checklist) and make them available to department/program faculty evaluators. The Chairperson convenes a meeting of department/faculty evaluators and solicits individual written letters. The Chairperson also writes an individual letter.

By 1 March 2007 - Chairperson writes and circulates department summary among department/program faculty evaluators, provides copy to candidate without disclosing the statements or opinions of individual evaluators, and forwards to the Dean the candidate's portfolio and supplementary materials, department summary, the candidate's response (if any), and individual faculty letters.

By 2 April 2007 - Dean makes recommendation to the Provost. Official portfolios, including all original letters, are sent to the Provost's office. See checklist for contents and organization of reappointment portfolio.

April/May 2007 – Provost reviews reappointment and, if all parties are in agreement that the candidate should be reappointed, issues a reappointment letter. If either the Dean or Provost is in disagreement with the department recommendation, they will follow the steps indicated in R&P 2.2.7.4.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR
REAPPOINTMENT**

<i>I. (To be completed by Department Chair and Dean)</i>	
Name: _____	Time in Rank (include current year): _____
Department: _____	Date of Initial Appointment: _____
Proposed Action: _____	
Department Faculty or Ad Hoc Committee Vote: YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____	
Department Faculty or Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation: _____	

Chairperson's Recommendation: _____	
Chairperson's Signature: _____	_____
signature	date

Dean's Recommendation: _____	
Dean's Signature: _____	_____
signature	date
Comments: _____ _____	
II.	
Provost's Recommendation: _____	
Provost's Signature: _____	_____
signature	date

**RECOMMENDATION FOR
TENURE AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR/FULL PROFESSOR**

I. (TO BE COMPLETED BY DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND DEAN)	
Name:	Time in Rank (include current year):
Department:	Date of Initial Appointment:
Proposed Action:	
Department Faculty or Ad Hoc Committee Vote: YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____	
Department Faculty or Ad Hoc Committee's Recommendation: _____	
Chairperson's Recommendation: _____	
Chairperson's Signature: _____	
signature	
date *****	
Promotion and Tenure Committee Vote: YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____	
Promotion and Tenure Committee's Recommendation: _____	
Promotion and Tenure Committee Chairperson's Signature: _____	
signature	
date *****	
Dean's Recommendation: _____	
Dean's Signature: _____	
signature	
date	
Comments:	
II.	
Provost's Recommendation: _____	
Provost's Signature: _____	
signature	date

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

I. (TO BE COMPLETED BY DEPARTMENT CHAIR AND DEAN)	
Name:	Time in Rank (include current year):
Department:	Date of Initial Appointment:
Proposed Action:	
Department Faculty or Ad Hoc Committee Vote: YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____	
Department Faculty or Ad Hoc Committee's Recommendation: _____	
Chairperson's Recommendation: _____	
Chairperson's Signature: _____	
date *****	signature
Promotion and Tenure Committee Vote: YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____	
Promotion and Tenure Committee's Recommendation: _____	
Promotion and Tenure Committee Chairperson's Signature: _____	
date *****	signature
Dean's Recommendation: _____	
Dean's Signature: _____	
date	signature
Comments:	
II.	
Provost's Recommendation: _____	
Provost's Signature: _____	date
signature	

**Lehigh University Provost's Office
Faculty Recruitment and Initial Appointment
Checklist**

A= Candidate
B= Department chair
C= College dean
D= Provost's Office

Materials to be included in portfolio

Part I Recruitment Plan

Date Supplied by:

- _____ B, C 1. Faculty Employment Request form with signatures
- _____ B, C 2. Recruitment Plan Packet: This packet must be approved by the Department Chairperson, Dean, and Provost **prior to an advertisement being submitted.** Please do not wait until the last minute to get approval.
- a. Permission to Advertise Request form with signatures.
 - b. A draft of the advertisement.
 - c. A list of the publications/journals where you plan to advertise and the length of each advertisement.
 - d. A list of 20 or more universities, schools, and departments you plan to contact.
 - e. A list of the women and minority scholars whose help you plan to solicit in filling this position. You should identify at least five women and five minority scholars outside of Lehigh.
 - f. A description of department plans to increase the diversity of the candidate pool.
 - g. A list of search committee members following guidelines established by your college. Each search committee must include at least one member from outside the department. See R&P 2.2.3.1. for guidelines on joint searches.
 - h. Forward the Recruitment Plan Packet to the Dean's office for approval.
 - i. The Dean's office will forward an approved packet to the Provost's office.

Part II Search Process

- _____ B, D 3. Once the request to hire is approved, the Provost's office will notify by e-mail the Dean and the Chairperson. The Provost's office can post the faculty position advertisement on the web at HigherEdJobs.com at no cost upon receipt of the advertisement via e-mail to meb5@lehigh.edu in a word document format.
- _____ B 4. All applications that are received need to be acknowledged and a Lehigh University Affirmative Action Card must be mailed to the applicant. It is important to include the name of your department on the card as well as the title of the position in order for the cards to be returned to the appropriate department.

It is the department's responsibility to track these cards and include the necessary Affirmative Action information when the final candidate has been selected.

- _____ A, B 5. Each candidate selected for an on-campus interview is expected to make a formal presentation to the department about his/her current research activities, future research plans, and potential funding opportunities.
- _____ A, B 6. Each candidate will teach a class or conduct a seminar with undergraduates. Students and faculty members in the audience will rate his/her teaching.
- _____ B, D 7. If the candidate is applying for a senior appointment (associate or full professor) the candidate must meet with the Provost.

It is important to note the department or Dean's office funds search expenses. This includes all costs associated with advertising, travel, meals, etc.

Part III Hiring

- _____ B, C 8. Before any commitments (formal or informal) are made to the candidate of choice, the department prepares the following packet for the Dean's and Provost's approval:
1. Recommendation for Appointment
 2. Lehigh University Affirmative Action Compliance Statement
 3. Reference letters for candidate of choice
 4. CV's of at least the 3 top candidate's (including candidate of choice)
 5. Letter of recommendation from Chair and Dean
- _____ B, C 9. The startup package and any other approved conditions of employment will be sent to the Provost's office to be used in the offer letter. Once approval has been given to make an offer, the Provost's office has the sole responsibility of issuing the "official" appointment letter for the university that will contain all conditions of employment and the salary and other compensation arrangements. The Provost has communicated that Chairs and the Dean will not make any other commitments (verbal or written) that are in addition to the official appointment letter. Any such additions will lead to the closing of the search without an appointment.

RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT
 (Used for Faculty and Administrative Officers)

- Ms.
- Dr.
- Mr.
- Mrs.

Starting Date

Appointment Last Name First Name Middle Initial (Month/Day/Year) Term of

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Address Line 3

Term of Initial Contract	
From	To
(Month/Year)	(Month/Year)

	Position
Position (Title)	
Department	
Budget Account Number(s)	
Position Number(s)	
% Effort on Budget Accounts	
Salary	
	Account Executive Signature Date
	Counter Signature Date

REMARKS

APPROVED BY: _____ VICE PRESIDENT/PROVOST DATE	<table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">BUDGET APPROVAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">INITIAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">DATE</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">CONTRACT MAILED</td> <td style="text-align: center;">_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">INITIAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">DATE</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">SIGNED CONTRACT RECEIVED</td> <td style="text-align: center;">_____</td> <td style="text-align: center;">INITIAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">DATE</td> </tr> </table>	BUDGET APPROVAL	_____	INITIAL	DATE	CONTRACT MAILED	_____	INITIAL	DATE	SIGNED CONTRACT RECEIVED	_____	INITIAL	DATE
BUDGET APPROVAL	_____	INITIAL	DATE										
CONTRACT MAILED	_____	INITIAL	DATE										
SIGNED CONTRACT RECEIVED	_____	INITIAL	DATE										

**LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMPLIANCE STATEMENT**

TO: Provost DATE: _____

RE: New Appointment (Initial Offer) _____ Tenured _____ Untenured

Department: _____

Name of Candidate: _____

Present Rank: _____

Proposed: _____

Position Number: _____

This recommendation is made in accordance with the following statement.

Before any new or vacant faculty position may be filled, a full search must be made to generate the broadest and strongest possible candidate pool. The search must be conducted in such a manner as to be reasonably likely to bring the vacancy to the attention of qualified minority and female candidates, and to ensure the inclusion of such candidates in the candidate pool.

In all appointment actions, the best candidate will be recommended. The same scholarly and professional standards are applicable to all candidates. When it is not possible to make a clear choice among candidates on the basis of qualifications, special consideration will be given, at this juncture, in favor of women and minority groups.

Both the University's affirmative action plan and federal equal opportunity legislation require that the search process be carefully documented, and that the candidate pool generated be analyzed. The information requested on this form is needed to satisfy these requirements for documentation and analysis and also provide a useful guide to departments for the conduct of a search.

NOTE:

The concept of race as used by the Equal Opportunity Commission does not denote clear-cut scientific definitions of anthropological origins. A candidate may be included in the group to which he or she appears to belong, identifies with, or is regarded in the community as belonging. The five race/ethnic categories are defined as follows:

1. White (not of Hispanic origin): All persons having origins in any of the original people of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.
2. Black (not of Hispanic origin): All persons having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.
3. Hispanic: All persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

4. Asian or Pacific Islanders: All persons having origins in any of the original peoples of Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example. China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands and Samoa.
5. American Indian or Alaskan Native: All persons having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintain cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE ABSENCE OF A SEARCH

Only in rare and exceptional instances is it possible to make an appointment without a search. This exception is possible when a person of overwhelming preeminence becomes available suddenly and when a special opportunity for exercising affirmative action arises. The decision to circumvent the search procedures and the responsibility for this action reside solely with the provost. In such cases a full statement indicating why the provost should give special consideration to the appointment is required. Please state below the reasons why this recommendation warrants special consideration.

SUMMARY OF DEPARTMENTAL ACTION FOR NEW APPOINTMENTS IN COMPLIANCE WITH AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

A. THE CANDIDATE POOL

1. Describe in detail the position expected to be filled by this particular search.

2. Percentage of women _____ and members of minority groups _____ in the national candidate pool for this position. (Can be obtained from AA/EO Advisor to the Provost.)

2. Indicate names and rank of all new appointments made during the past three years.

NEW APPOINTMENTS	
NAMES	RANK

3. Please furnish names and rank of minority and/or women over the past three years who were:

(a) Appointed by the department.

(b) Declined an offer extended by the department

C. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

1. Department Chairperson

In your judgement, does the recommendation appear to be in compliance with the university's Affirmative Action Program, with respect to the following:

(a) Was the search sufficiently broad and well calculated to produce the names of serious female and minority applicants or prospects?

Yes No If no, explain _____

(b) Was the evaluation process sufficiently broad and intensive so that a sufficient number of prospects, including female and minority candidates, were given serious consideration?

Yes No If no, explain _____

To the extent you can judge (including by reference to the dossiers submitted in response to questions A 1-6) were the standards for choosing among the applicants properly applied?

Yes No If no, explain _____

(Signed) Chairperson

Date

2. University Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Officer

(a) Please set forth here any comments on questions in section C: _____

(b) Recommendation (check one)

(i) Recommend for approval

(ii) Recommend for approval with reservations

(iii) Do not recommend for approval

(c) If (ii) or (iii) is checked, please give reasons: _____

(Signed) AA/EO Advisor to the Provost

Date

**LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE REQUEST**

TO: Provost

DATE: _____

RE: Permission to Advertise

Department: _____

Position Number: ____ _

A. POSITION DESCRIPTION

1. Describe the position expected to be filled by this particular search.

B. SEARCH TO BE CONDUCTED

Please submit the following attachments:

1. A draft of the advertisement(s).
2. A list of the publications/journals where you plan to advertise and the length of each advertisement.
3. A list of 20 or more universities, schools and departments you plan to contact.
4. A list of the women and minority scholars whose help you plan to solicit in filling this position. You should identify at least two women and two minority scholars outside of Lehigh.

C. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

1. Chairperson, Search Committee

In your judgement, is the proposed search sufficiently broad and well calculated to produce the names of serious female and minority applicants or prospects?

Yes No If no, explain _____

(Signed) Chairperson, Search Committee

Date

2. Dean

In your judgment, is the proposed search sufficiently broad and well calculated to produce the names of serious female and minority applicants or prospects?

Yes No If no, explain _____

(Signed) Dean

Date

3. AA/EO Advisor to the Provost

Recommendation (check one)

- (iv) Recommend for approval
- (v) Recommend for approval with reservations
- (vi) Do not recommend for approval

If (ii) or (iii) is checked, please give reasons: _____

(Signed) AA/EO Advisor to the Provost

Date

FACULTY EMPLOYMENT REQUEST FORM

Requestor	Department
-----------	------------

SECTION A – POSITION INFORMATION

Complete for all faculty positions. Include position rank and hiring range for all faculty positions. If this is a new position or an existing position for which you plan to change duties and responsibilities, contact the Provost's Office.

Position title	Initial appointment level <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer <input type="checkbox"/> Associate <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Professor <input type="checkbox"/> Prof. of Practice	Hiring range to
----------------	--	------------------------

Field of concentration	Tenure Track Position <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Initial appointment <input type="checkbox"/> Without Tenure <input type="checkbox"/> With Tenure
------------------------	---	--

Date position available	<input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary (through)	Approved in university budget <input type="checkbox"/> New position <input type="checkbox"/> Existing position Not approved in university budget <input type="checkbox"/> New position <input type="checkbox"/> Change in full-time equivalent (from to effort) <input type="checkbox"/> Change in position level
-------------------------	---	--

SERVICE MONTHS

If other than a typical nine-month appointment in an academic department, please specify .

Position number	Account number	Account name	Duration of support	Total Budget available
			On-going	
			On-going	
			On-going	

INCUMBENT DATA

Name Date of change

Reason for termination/transfer

If transferred, to what Lehigh department

POSITION DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

POSITION REQUIREMENTS

Education:

Relevant teaching and research experience:

Other qualifications:

SECTION B – POSITION APPROVAL

The Provost Office will review requests for all positions to confirm budget availability. All positions funded by research accounts (429000-643999) also require approval from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

The Provost Office will notify the requesting department of approval by returning the original form. The faculty search process may begin upon receipt of the required approvals.

ROUTING	DECISION	INITIALS	DATE
Department Chairperson	_____ Approved _____ Not approved		
Academic Dean	_____ Approved _____ Not approved		
Office of Research & Sponsored Programs (if applicable)	_____ Approved _____ Not approved		
Provost*	_____ Approved _____ Not approved		

****Copy to Resource Management upon approval.***

Remarks

**Lehigh University Provost Office
Faculty Leave of Absence
Checklist**

A= Candidate
B= Department chair
C= College dean
D= Provost's Office

Materials to be included

<u>Date</u>	<u>Supplied By</u>
_____	A 1. Faculty requests leave of absence in writing to department chair. A faculty member provides up-to-date CV, which indicated research activity and teaching since his/her last leave of absence.
_____	B. 2. Chairperson forwards faculty member's request, CV, and renders recommendation in writing to dean – it must include: a. date of last leave b. nature and purpose of leave c. value of leave to the department d. plans for coverage of the faculty members' duties and responsibilities e. source of financial support f. requested salary and benefits during absence
_____	C. 3. Dean forwards faculty request, CV, and department chair's recommendation with Dean's own written recommendation to the Provost's office for approval.
_____	D. 4. The Provost, if in agreement, issues official leave letter to faculty member.

To: Faculty
From: Cheryl A. Ashcroft
Assistant Dean of Students

RE: Academic Accommodations for
Students with Disabilities

In an effort to increase awareness of the special needs of students with disabilities and to improve the communication between faculty, students with disabilities and the Office of Academic Support Services, the Advisory Board on Disabilities and ADA committee offers the following recommendation to be considered by the faculty.

It is recommended that all faculty members include in their syllabi a statement to notify students with disabilities of their right to academic accommodations and to resources available through the Dean of Students/Office of Academic Support Services.

This statement will notify students of the proper channels and will ensure that the appropriate documentation is on file in the Dean of Students Office. It will also create an environment which will encourage students with disabilities to request accommodations at the beginning of the semester. A sample statement is provided below.

Sample of Disability Statement for Your Syllabus

If you have a disability for which you are or may be requesting accommodations, please contact both your instructor and the Office of Academic Support Services, Room 212, University Center or call (610-758-4152) as early as possible in the semester.

KEYS TO COMPLIANCE

1. You must provide notice.

Brochures, student handbook, pamphlets, everything you do must have notice of accessibility or where to go for accessible services. Grievance procedures must be clearly stated and provided. Faculty should refer students if request for accommodations come to them first. (Syllabus statement)

2. Policies and Procedures must be in place to provide access.

Most problems occur because policies and procedures are not clear or not followed. (Ex. Faculty is responsible for referring students to the appropriate university office when a student makes a request for accommodations.)

Faculty cannot arbitrarily make up the rules as they go. (Extended time accommodation)

3. Must take action and make decision in a “timely manner” and a “responsible fashion.”

The university is at fault if you ignore the request or if substantial time goes by without a decision or an accommodation. Must provide a decision to allow the student to take the next step. Document the file with the approved accommodations and/or the denial, and state the reason for the denial.

4. Failure to involve “expert” consultation.

Make sure that experts are involved in the decision-making process. Those people who are appointed by the university are the academic experts (faculty).

Disability expert and ADA Officer can only speak to their area of expertise.

Consultation with all areas is essential.

5. Practice and Procedures must be non-discriminatory.

Being aware of confidentiality in the classroom is essential. (Avoid what might be considered a “hostile environment”)

6. Individualized Assessment.

You do not need to fundamentally alter your program. The same disability does not necessarily mean the same accommodation for each student in each course.

Need to consider:

- A. Nature and severity of the disability
- B. History, Skills and Ability level
- C. Nature of the program/essential functions

7. Understanding the “reasonable accommodations” standards.

Concept of reasonable has been around since 1970.

Case by case assessment is needed. Reasonable means nothing in a vacuum.

Balancing act—the right of the individual with the disability and the right of the integrity of the university program and the services.

8. Our decisions/actions must reflect fairness on the basis of their disability.

9. Our decisions/actions must reflect that you participated in a deliberative process. The university has an obligation to seek alternative means or accommodations and that it was done in a rational and logical manner.

It is not the correctness of the decision but the process that is used to arrive at the decision that is critical. A rational process using expert consultation and individual assessment is the key to the

decision-making process. There should be no evidence that the decision was made in a discriminatory, arbitrary, and capricious manner.

10. Anytime you make a decision that has an adverse impact; be prepared to support that decision!

Key defense: Make sure that a deliberative process has occurred.

- A. Individual does not have a disabling condition. (Disability/impairment must substantially limit a major life activity).
- B. Individual does not qualify. Individual cannot perform the essential function of the job or does not meet the academic standards.
- C. Decision is not based on the individual's disability but on conduct or performance.
- D. Individual was not actually denied the services, opportunities or benefits based on the disability. Both student and university have a shared responsibility. (Reasonable reciprocal effort)

Courtesy of Salome Heyward & Associates

RESPONSIBILITIES
OF
DISABILITY SUPPORT SERVICES, THE STUDENT, THE FACULTY

Responsibilities of Disability Support Services/Academic Support:

- To review student documentation to determine appropriate accommodations.
- To work with faculty regarding the provision of accommodations to students.
- To provide individual assistance to students, and/or refer students to other appropriate services.
- To work with faculty and staff to ensure “meaningful access” for students with disabilities.

Responsibilities of the Student:

- To provide the Office of Academic Support Services with comprehensive documentation of a diagnosed disability. The student must follow the criteria for documentation as outlined in our brochure. The materials must be submitted in a timely manner in order for the Director to review the materials and coordinate appropriate accommodations.
- To sign the faculty notification release form each and every semester an accommodation is being requested.
- To provide faculty with at least seven (7) day notification prior to the need for accommodations.

Responsibilities of the Faculty:

- To work with the Director of Academic Support Services to ensure that students are receiving the appropriate accommodations.
- To provide information to students regarding procedure for accommodations or other special needs.