College of Arts and Sciences
Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for Faculty Scholarship
Updated April 2025

The scholarship guidelines found in this document were developed by the faculty and administration of the College of Arts and Sciences to provide a basis for guiding and evaluating faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion. In recognition of the significant scholarship-related differences among the disciplines represented within the College, each academic department independently developed its own set of criteria believed to be best suited for assessing the scholarly achievements of its faculty. This document is meant to complement the information provided in the Faculty Handbook. If you have any questions, please discuss them with your department chair.

Patrick Nelson, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Department of Natural Sciences,
College of Arts and Sciences,
Lawrence Technological University

This document establishes guidelines to evaluate candidates applying for tenure and promotion in the Department of Natural Sciences. It was last revised on March 24, 2025. Three main categories of achievement—teaching, scholarship, and service—warrant careful consideration and reflection. The criteria by which these three areas will be assessed are described below.

Evaluation of Teaching

Effective teaching is fundamental to the University's mission, directly impacting student learning and development. High-quality instruction enhances the University's reputation, attracts and retains talented students, and prepares graduates to contribute meaningfully to society. Continuous improvement and growth in teaching should be consistently demonstrated throughout the tenure-track period. When evaluating teaching effectiveness, the department takes a holistic approach and considers the following factors, which are listed below in no particular order of importance:

1) **Student evaluations**

   Numerical scores and written comments from students on the University's end-of-semester evaluation surveys provide insights into a candidate's teaching effectiveness, ability to engage students, and overall impact on student learning. While these evaluations offer direct feedback from students, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement, it is important to acknowledge that bias is inherent in these assessments. Factors such as gender, race, age, and course difficulty can influence student evaluations, sometimes unfairly skewing the results. Therefore, while student evaluations are a useful tool, they should be carefully considered alongside other measures of teaching effectiveness, including those described below, to provide a more balanced and comprehensive evaluation of a candidate's performance.

2) **Peer observations**

   Peer classroom observations are another approach to evaluate a candidate's teaching practices and effectiveness, allowing experienced colleagues to assess various aspects of teaching, such as pedagogical methods, classroom management, student engagement, and the clarity and organization of the material presented. This is an opportunity for a faculty peer to simultaneously recognize teaching excellence and identify areas for professional growth. All new Department of Natural Sciences faculty

are assigned a teaching mentor, who will typically conduct peer observations unless alternative, mutually agreeable arrangements are made with the department chair. A formal classroom observation template will be shared with the peer observer and tenure-track faculty member. The completed observation document will be returned to the department chair after the candidate reflects on the peer feedback. This practice supports the development of a high-quality educational environment and fosters a culture of continuous improvement in teaching and collaboration among faculty.

3) **Curriculum development and pedagogical innovations**

A candidate's engagement in curriculum development and pedagogical innovations demonstrates their commitment to educational excellence and student success. Evidence of a candidate's engagement in high-quality curriculum development showcases their ability to design relevant, forward-thinking course content that meets the evolving needs of students and the academic discipline. A candidate's utilization of evidence-based pedagogical approaches and innovations highlights their dedication to adopting and refining teaching methods that enhance student learning, engagement, and success. Together, these efforts underscore the faculty member's role as a leader and innovator in their field of instruction.

Evaluation of Scholarship

Scholarship is a fundamental component in the pursuit of tenure and promotion, as it demonstrates a candidate's ability to contribute original knowledge to their field, enhance their academic reputation, and advance the University's mission. Engaging in scholarship showcases the candidate's expertise, intellectual curiosity, and commitment to scholarly excellence. When evaluating scholarship, the department recognizes Boyer's model of scholarship, which expands the traditional view of scholarship to include the following four categories: (1) Scholarship of Discovery, (2) Scholarship of Integration, (3) Scholarship of Application, and (4) Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. A candidate's scholarly contributions help to elevate the University's standing in the academic community and highlights the candidate's role in driving innovation and fostering a culture of inquiry on campus and within their field of expertise.

The department recognizes that the mentorship of undergraduate and/or graduate students in research plays a critical role in their development as scholars by providing them with personalized guidance, support, and opportunities for intellectual and professional growth. Publications and conference presentations that include students as co-authors and/or co-presenters are celebrated and encouraged. It is also recognized that high-quality mentoring activities are time intensive and may present productivity and scheduling challenges for research-active faculty. Scholarly efforts that directly impact the University student population will be considered part of a candidate's

scholarship activities.

Candidates should articulate the development of a cohesive research theme and body of work that highlights their scholarly independence and establishes their thought leadership. This involves demonstrating the ability to generate novel ideas, establish expertise, collaborate strategically, and publish as the lead or corresponding author of select works. Furthermore, a candidate's scholarly activities should reflect potential for sustained productivity and growth. In the review of scholarly activity, the department will solicit opinions from professional colleagues in a candidate's area of expertise external to the university. Research outputs, such as peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, and grants are tangible indicators of a candidate's productivity, scholarly progression, and impact on their discipline. These expectations are described in more detail below:

1) **Publications**

   The department places high priority on publications in peer-reviewed journals. Strategic collaborations with faculty inside and outside the LTU community, including those with former advisors and colleagues, are welcomed and encouraged. Collaborative activities enhance a candidate's scholarly productivity and positively impact the University. Reviews, editorials, conference proceedings, and book chapters are also encouraged in the promotion of scholarship development, when appropriate for the field and scope of a candidate's scholarly work.

   At the time of tenure and promotion, it is expected that the applicant has published peer-reviewed journal articles that support the case that they have developed an independent program of scholarship (i.e., "Scholarship of Discovery" as defined by Boyer). Additional publications in other areas of scholarship are supported and encouraged when appropriate for the field of expertise and interest of the candidate; however, the primary criterion for tenure and promotion is independent, programmatic scholarship of discovery work. Evidence of a candidate's continuous growth in scholarship and future plans for research projects, dissemination, and grant writing are important considerations when awarding tenure and promotion.

   The department recognizes that the number of publications appropriate during the tenure-track period will vary according to a candidate's specific field of research. During the first year of employment on the tenure track, the department chair will meet with the new faculty member to discuss publication expectations in their field and will mentor the candidate in the creation of scholarship goals to meet by their mid-tenure review. During a candidate's mid-tenure review, which occurs in the spring semester of their third year on the tenure track, the candidate will assemble publication benchmarking data for three or more associate professors in the

candidate's field at comparable institutions. Comparable faculty are those who have achieved tenure and promotion at institutions with similar departmental programs and resources. Benchmarking data will be included as an appendix attached to the candidate's mid-tenure review portfolio for review by the dean, department chair, and committee. The benchmarking data will be reviewed by all parties, with commentary provided in mid-tenure review letters and discussions with the candidate. The goal is to provide a roadmap for the second half of the candidate's tenure-track appointment as well as support for the candidate to reach their scholarship goals.

2) Conferences

The department recognizes that the presentation of scholarly work at local, regional, national, and/or international conferences is important for a candidate to disseminate their research findings and build their academic reputation. The department values the involvement of students as co-authors and/or presenters.

At the time of tenure and promotion, it is expected that the applicant has regularly disseminated their scholarly work at relevant conferences on an annual basis. While local and regional conferences are valuable experiences, a candidate should aim to present at national and/or international conferences to promote their visibility, provide new networking opportunities, and to further enhance their academic reputation as well as that of the University. The department and college will financially support such endeavors.

3) Grants

The department acknowledges that seeking external funding is an important activity for tenure-track faculty, significantly influencing their research capabilities and professional growth. Securing external funding also contributes to the broader academic and institutional environment, enhancing the quality and impact of a candidate's research endeavors. Historically, there has not been a requirement to secure external grants; therefore, the absence of funding is not construed as negative. However, a continuous, high-quality effort in grant writing is essential. The composition of internal grant applications to secure seed funding and/or support for student researchers is also celebrated and encouraged.

At the time of tenure and promotion, it is expected that the applicant has made a significant and sustained effort to apply for external funding, typically to federal agencies such as the NSF or NIH. In addition, private foundation grants and other innovative funding sources should be considered and pursued as appropriate for the candidate's field of expertise and interests.

Evaluation of Service

Service is an important component of a full-time faculty member's role, encompassing a wide range of activities that contribute to the academic community, the institution, and the profession at large. When evaluating service, the department considers evidence of meaningful activities at the department, college, and university level as well as efforts that impact the broader community that serve to improve the overall campus environment and positively represent the scientific enterprise and profession. Service activities are outside the typical day-to-day duties of teaching and scholarship and include, but are not limited to, the following examples:

1) **Service to Students:** Academic advising, mentoring, serving as a faculty advisor for a student organization, writing letters of recommendation, participating in activities that enhance student success and retention.

2) **Service to the Department, College, and University:** Participating in faculty governance through Faculty Senate, Faculty Council, or faculty search committees, committee and task force work, assessment, course coordination, course and/or program development and review work, participating in recruitment activities such as LTU Visit Days, Campus Open House events, Exploration Day, summer camp programs, and other outreach programs.

3) **Professional Service to the Community:** Participating in professional societies, serving as a grant proposal and/or manuscript reviewer, serving as a conference symposium organizer and/or presider, science-related community outreach and service, public lectures.

At the time of tenure and promotion, it is expected that the applicant has engaged in meaningful service activities at multiple levels of the University and has utilized their professional expertise to engage with the broader community. The applicant should highlight any leadership roles as well as their commitment to sustained service activities and growth beyond the tenure-track period.

Professional Development Activities
Engaging in internal and/or external professional development activities demonstrates a candidate's dedication to staying current in teaching, scholarship, and service within their field of expertise. By participating in relevant workshops, conferences, seminars, and other developmental opportunities, a candidate shows their proactive approach to professional growth, which is a key indicator of their potential for long-term success and leadership within the University.

Tenure and Promotion Requirements,
Mathematics & Computer Science Department,
Lawrence Technological University

MCS's tenure and promotion process is designed to provide a comprehensive, balanced, and discipline-specific assessment of a faculty member's accomplishments and future success in research, teaching, and service. This process recognizes that individual faculty members are experts in their disciplines and that these disciplines have different professional standards for scholarly output, student engagement in research, and pedagogical innovation. Consequently, the process is holistic in emphasis and does not rely upon metrics.

Cumulatively, these assessments should affirm that the faculty member meets the following standards for tenure and promotion as appropriate when compared with faculty in similar disciplines at institutions with similar missions, resources, and faculty responsibilities:

   a. **Research**: The faculty member has established an independent and impactful research program that produces high-quality scholarship visible to and recognized by the faculty member's broader professional community
   b. **Teaching**: The faculty member has established themselves as an outstanding teacher capable of teaching various courses and supporting departmental teaching needs at the undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate levels.
   c. **Service:** The faculty member has demonstrated the potential and desire to be a leader in the department, college, and university, as well as within their professional field.

In exceptional cases, alternative balances of research, teaching, and service may be considered in tenure and promotion decisions. For example, there may be cases where faculty are hired with a nontraditional emphasis on a given area (research, teaching, or service) and demonstrate excellence beyond what is typically expected of faculty members in that particular focus area.

Timeline

The tenure and promotion timeline in MCS is as follows (further details available on the College website):

   I. **Annually**, a Faculty member meets with the MCS Chair to discuss progress made toward tenure and promotion in research, teaching, and service. The Chair will provide necessary feedback on how the faculty member is progressing.

II. **Mid-tenure review (3rd year):** During the faculty member's 3rd year, they will submit an abbreviated mid-tenure portfolio outlining their accomplishments in research, teaching, and service. A College mid-tenure committee of 3 members and the MCS Chair will review the portfolio independently. The mid-tenure and MCS Chair reports will be submitted to the Dean who will incorporate that feedback into a report assessing the faculty member's progress toward and capacity to attain tenure and promotion. The Dean will present the results of the mid-tenure process to the faculty member. In cases where the Dean assesses that the faculty member is not on track to attain tenure and promotion, the Dean may recommend that the faculty member be put on a performance improvement plan. The expectations and timelines for this improvement plan will be set in consultation with the MCS Chair.

III. **Tenure and Promotion portfolio (6th year):** During the faculty member's 6th year, they will submit a comprehensive portfolio outlining their accomplishments in, and plans for, research, teaching, and service. The portfolio will be independently reviewed by a university tenure and promotion committee of 5 members and by the MCS Chair. The tenure and promotion committee and MCS Chair reports will be submitted to the Dean. The Dean will then incorporate the feedback into a letter, which will be forwarded to the Provost. The Provost will submit a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees. The faculty member will be notified of the Board's decision.

Research

Promotion and tenure decisions are strongly driven by the faculty member's scholarly impact. To have an academic impact, research must be of high quality and visible to the scientific community. This means peer-reviewed publications should be a priority. Faculty should also incorporate the efforts of undergraduate and graduate student trainees as much as possible. This is particularly true for graduate trainees who need to establish a publication record, in collaboration with their faculty mentor, for their career advancement. The quantity of scholarly output should be commensurate with universities with similar missions and resources to LTU. The candidate should make clear to the reviewers what this norm is for their particular area of research and demonstrate how they have either met or exceeded that standard.

There are different avenues for disseminating research and defining a standard that can be used to determine tenure and promotion. The following categories are provided as a guideline for what is expected.

1. **Publications**: Faculty members in MCS are expected to produce research that is made visible through peer-reviewed publication in high-quality media, accessible, and

recognized by their broader professional communities, such as academic journals and conference proceedings. A faculty member's publication record should demonstrate their independence and self-motivation as a researcher, and the promise of continued innovation and productivity in scholarship.

2. **Dissemination**: Faculty members in MCS will be active in disseminating their scholarship, and the scholarship of their students, locally and to their broader professional communities through, for example: oral and poster presentations at regional and national conferences, presentations given by their students, organization of sessions at conferences, organization of workshops and seminars, promotion of products of research (e.g. computer code), patent applications, etc. Success in dissemination may be measured through citations, downloads, page views, and other means, as appropriate for the professional discipline.

3. **Grants**: MCS faculty members will actively seek internal and external funding for their scholarly activities. Sought funding may support Ph.D. students, research assistants, post-docs, summer salary, travel, or equipment. Grant writing activity may focus on federal (e.g., NSF, NIH, DoD, etc.), state (e.g., MDOT, MDHHS, etc.), industrial (e.g., Ford, Google, etc.), entrepreneurial (e.g., SBIR, STTR, etc.), or philanthropic (e.g., Simons Foundation, Sloan Foundation, etc.) sources. The faculty member's grant writing experience will have demonstrated a strong possibility of obtaining grant funding and the leadership required to manage a grant successfully.

4. S**tudent Mentorship**: MCS faculty members will demonstrate excellence in student mentorship and research and supervise graduate theses and senior undergraduate projects at a level appropriate to their discipline and program (undergraduate or graduate). Faculty members supervising graduate theses will have a record of ensuring that the student research conducted under their mentorship is consistent with the expectations of their professional field.

Teaching

Promotion and tenure decisions are equally motivated by a faculty member's proficiency in teaching. Faculty members should be exceptional classroom teachers with strong course evaluations, peer evaluations, and teaching methodologies. They should be capable and willing to teach and develop a wide variety of courses consistent with current departmental needs and within their area of expertise at the undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate levels. Overall, the assessments should indicate that the faculty member has the promise of being a leader in curriculum development, pedagogical innovation, and student mentorship. Teaching assignments and accomplishments should be commensurate with those of faculty members at institutions with similar missions and resources as LTU.

As part of the tenure and promotion process, it is recommended that each faculty member receive at least one teaching evaluation from a more senior faculty member (peer evaluation) each year during their tenure-track period. These evaluations should comment on the faculty member's competency, teaching practices, and other often unseen aspects of the member's teaching, such as classroom management, student-teacher experience, and classroom tenor. Requests for a classroom visitation should be made to the MCS Chair or Associate Chair.

As with research, there are different avenues a faculty member may take, which will be factored into tenure and promotion decisions. The following categories are provided as a guideline for what is expected.

- **Classroom Evaluations**: A faculty member in MCS will have a record of excellent course evaluations, which show competency in their scientific discipline, prioritization of student learning, and consistent self-improvement and reflection on teaching practices. Peer evaluations should attest to the faculty member's innovative pedagogy and student-teacher relationship. In cases where there is disparity over time in course evaluations, recent evaluations will carry more weight in tenure and promotion decisions.

- **Research in the Classroom**: A faculty member in MCS should demonstrate commitment to incorporating their scholarship into the classroom and the student experience more broadly. This commitment may be evidenced by, for example, incorporating course-based research experiences in their classrooms, developing or updating courses in their research discipline, and providing student mentorship on course-based research projects, and informing curricular decisions to reflect the state of the art in their professional field.
- **Departmental Needs**: A faculty member in MCS will have the demonstrated capability of teaching various courses across the undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate curriculum. They should also be capable of developing courses in their scholarly expertise at either the undergraduate or graduate levels. Finally, they should clearly understand their program's curriculum and the curricular needs of the program's students for employment and/or future advanced studies.
- **Pedagogy**: A faculty member in MCS will have shown the ability to develop effective teaching pedagogy, ideally across several media of delivery. These media may include lecture-based courses, online courses, project-based courses, workshops, and flipped classrooms. Implemented pedagogy should reflect a faculty member's interest in enhancing student learning and preparing them for future academic and professional opportunities.

Service

Promotion and tenure decisions are influenced by a faculty member's service to the department, college, university, and broader professional community. Service, however, is secondary to research and teaching requirements, and service responsibilities should be limited during the tenure-track period to a level appropriate for faculty members at institutions with comparable missions and resources. The service record should demonstrate the capacity and potential to undertake departmental, college, and university leadership roles.

For tenure and promotion, service activities at the departmental level are emphasized. Service activities within the professional field should also further the faculty member's research profile and connections within their professional community. The following categories are provided as a guideline for what is expected.

1. **Departmental service**: MCS faculty members will be active attendees of and contributors to departmental meetings and assigned subcommittee meetings, as determined by the MCS Chair. These subcommittees should focus on matters of scholarly and curricular importance. Faculty members should serve on the Master's and Ph.D. Dissertation committees are appropriate for their professional field. Additional areas of Departmental service may include student academic advising, oversight of student clubs, student mentorship for competitions, high school, and community college outreach, participating in recruitment events, etc.

2. **College service**: Faculty members in MCS will have the potential to be leaders in college-level service, including membership on the Faculty Council, Faculty Research Council, program directorships / departmental administration, or college-wide outreach initiatives. College service may be considered for tenure and promotion decisions, but is not a prerequisite.

3. **University service**: Faculty members in MCS will have the potential to be leaders in university-level service, including involvement with the Faculty Senate, Research Council, or university-wide outreach initiatives. University service may be considered for tenure and promotion decisions, but it is not a prerequisite.

4. **Professional service**: Faculty members in MCS will have the potential to be leaders in their professional field through, for example, organizational responsibilities at professional conferences, organization of workshops, peer review of manuscripts, participation on federal grant review panels (e.g. NSF, NIH, DoD, etc.), membership on editorial boards, and service in executive positions for professional organizations. Professional service activities should be comparable to those of faculty members in professional fields at institutions with missions and resources comparable to LTU.

Guidelines for Tenure

Department of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Communication Lawrence Technological University
Updated May 2025

The tenure and promotion process in HSSC is designed to provide a comprehensive, balanced, and discipline-specific assessment of a faculty member's accomplishments and prospects for future success in teaching, scholarship, and service. This process recognizes that individual faculty members are experts in their own disciplines and that these disciplines have different professional standards for scholarly output, student engagement in research, and pedagogical innovation.

Candidates' tenure portfolios must demonstrate that the candidate meets the following standards for tenure and promotion as appropriate when compared with faculty in similar disciplines at institutions with similar missions, resources, and faculty responsibilities:

- **Teaching:** The faculty member has developed, designed, and taught a range of courses, supported departmental teaching at the undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate levels, and demonstrated commitment to student engagement and success.
- **Scholarship:** The faculty member has established an independent, rigorous program of research which produces high-quality scholarship that is visible to and recognized by the faculty member's broader professional community.
- **Service:** The faculty member has demonstrated the potential and desire to contribute to service initiatives across the department, college, university, and their professional field.

Teaching

Teaching is fundamental to the department's mission and culture. High-quality instruction enhances the University's reputation, attracts and retains talented students, and prepares graduates to contribute meaningfully to society. Every faculty member is responsible for creating an inclusive classroom environment and building positive, constructive relationships with students.

Continuous improvement and growth in teaching should be demonstrated throughout the tenure-track period. The department takes a holistic approach to evaluating teaching and pedagogy. Tenure candidates may demonstrate their effectiveness through:

- Student evaluations and letters of support
- Peer observation and assessment
- Curriculum development
- Pedagogical innovation
- Supervising student research
- Mentoring co-curricular organizations
- Scholarship on teaching and learning

A candidate's teaching will be rated "satisfactory" if they receive at least 3 ratings of "satisfactory" on their annual evaluations from the department chair during their tenure probationary period and evince, through their portfolio documentation, a consistent level of quality or steady improvement in their teaching activities. A candidate's teaching effectiveness will be rated "exemplary" if they receive at least 3 ratings of "exceptional" on their annual evaluations from the department chair during their tenure probationary period.

Scholarship

To be eligible for tenure, faculty in HSSC must demonstrate a sustained body of scholarly activity, which will normally include significant peer-reviewed or creative work. Research is assessed by a tenure committee reflecting the department's academic diversity. In tenure portfolios, candidates are responsible for evidencing the standards and publication forms appropriate to their field, including independent assessments from external reviewers.

Threshold satisfactory and exemplary standards are expressed in this table:

Evaluation	Total Points (at LTU)	Minimum Points Cat. A, B, C, D
Satisfactory	≥ 6	≥ 5
Exemplary	≥ 9	≥ 7

These "satisfactory" and "exemplary" point values assume standard teaching and service loads as outlined in the LTU Faculty Handbook, and may be adjusted in accordance with greater or lesser non-research obligations.

This system is designed to recognize the varieties of scholarship appropriate to diverse Humanities, Social Science, and Communication fields. These lists are not exhaustive; each candidate must demonstrate to their tenure committee how an activity fits within a point category. Given the interdisciplinary nature of the department, there is no single journal ranking system that applies across all fields. For example, if a journal is peer-reviewed but does not possess a SCOPUS ranking, the candidate may assign and justify a point category based on a different journal- or citations- ranking standard, the affirmation of external reviewers, or anecdotal evidence of the journal's significance in their field such as editorial board composition, acceptance rates, or influence on practice. Tenure-qualifying scholarship must be published while a candidate is affiliated with LTU.

Category A (5 points)

- Publication of a single-author book, published by a university, academic, or reputable trade press (e.g. Category A of the SENSE ranking). Textbooks or introductory surveys do not qualify
- Primary author publication in a peer-reviewed journal of exceptional scientific prestige (e.g. a top 100 journals in the SCIMAGO/SCOPUS ranking)
- Co-authoring as a non-primary author of a work that would otherwise qualify as Category A will be worth 2.5 points
- Principal investigator (PI) in a very competitive (success rate <15%) Research Grant from a national, highly prestigious external funding source

Category B (3 points)

- Primary author publication in a prestigious peer-reviewed journal (e.g., a journal with a Q1 SCOPUS ranking or in the top 25% of journals within the scholar's discipline[s])."
- Any work equivalent to a publication in a journal with a Q1 SCOPUS ranking, including:
    - Publication of a chapter article in a peer-reviewed edited collection published by a university, academic, or reputable trade press
- Co-authoring as a non-primary author of a work that would otherwise qualify as Category A will be worth 1.5 points

- PI in a research grant from an external funding source
- Co- PI in a very competitive (success rate <15%) Research Grant from a national, highly prestigious external funding source

Category C (2 points)

- Primary author publication in a highly reputable peer-reviewed journal (e.g., a journal with a Q2 SCOPUS ranking or in the top 50% of journals within the scholar's discipline[s]).
- Any work equivalent to a publication in a journal with a Q2 SCOPUS ranking, including:
    - Publication of an invited chapter article in a collection published by a university,
    - academic, or reputable trade press
    - Editing a collection of essays or a critical edition
    - Serving as head editor for an academic journal Publication of refereed or invited creative works
    - Author or co-authoring a textbook or introductory survey
- Co-authoring as a non-primary author of a work that would otherwise qualify as Category C will be worth 1 point

Category D (1 point)

- Primary author publication in a peer-reviewed journal (e.g., a Q3-Q4 SCOPUS ranking or recognized within the scholar's discipline[s]).
- Any work equivalent to a publication in a journal with a Q3 or Q4 SCOPUS ranking, including:
    - Publication in the proceedings of a national or international conference
- Co-authoring as a non-primary author of a work that would otherwise qualify as Category D will be worth .5 points.
- Recipient of an LTU Seed Grant award
- Lead author / PI of a major grant application (e.g. ≥$10,000, externally sourced, IRB sanctioned, collaborators from other departments or universities, and / or multiple stages of review.)

Category E (0.5 points)

- Presentations at conferences
- Lead conference organizer
- Invited presentations
- Reviews or review essays (unless it appears in a journal dedicated to reviews with a SCOPUS ranking, in which case the category will be determined by that ranking)
- Non-peer-reviewed articles
- Co-authoring as a non-primary author of a work that would otherwise qualify as Category E will be worth .25 points
- Lead author / PI of a minor grant application
- Co-PI of a major grant application
- Community-engaged scholarship activities such as:
    - Public policy documents
    - Community meetings
    - Archival projects
    - Professionally-oriented commentary via media outlets

Service

Faculty service is essential to the department's administrative functioning and institutional autonomy. Promotion and tenure decisions are influenced by a faculty member's service to the department, college, university, and broader professional community. Service, however, is secondary to the requirements of research and teaching, and should be limited during the tenure-track period to a level appropriate of faculty members at institutions with comparable missions and resources. Tenure candidates' service record should demonstrate the capacity and potential to undertake leadership roles at departmental, college, and university levels in the future. Service activities include:

- Student advising and mentoring
- Faculty meetings, in-service and commencement days
- Faculty governance bodies
- Ad hoc committees
- Recruitment events
- Professional development activities

A candidate's service will be rated "satisfactory" if they receive at least 3 ratings of "satisfactory" on their annual evaluations from the department chair during their tenure probationary period and evince, through their portfolio documentation, a consistent level of quality or steady improvement in their service activities. A candidate's service will be rated "exemplary" if they receive at least 3 ratings of exceptional on their annual evaluations from the department chair during their tenure probationary period.