The Direction of the Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne, based on articles 7 and 11 of the Ordonnance sur le corps professoral des EPF (RS 172.220.113.40) hereby adopts the following:

**Article 1 Launching the process**

An associate professor may request promotion\(^1\) from the Dean of the Faculty. The request is formulated in accordance with the regulations laid down by the EPFL Committee of Academic Evaluation (hereafter: EPFL CEA) and as defined in the annex regarding the portfolio. The teaching file is an element to be included in the portfolio.

**Article 2 Role of the Faculty and the Dean**

The Faculty Committee of Academic Evaluation (hereafter: Faculty CEA) is made up of full professors from the Faculty who do not form part of the EPFL CEA. The Faculty CEA:

1. Examines the application in detail;
2. Establishes a comparison of performances at an international level, including bibliometric performance, comparing the candidate’s performance with that of other professors working in the same or a similar field;
3. Calls for recommendation letters (approximately six) from persons independent of the candidate with an internationally recognised reputation;
4. Prepares a list of additional rapporteurs (approximately six) for the EPFL CEA, each of a prominent level and independent of the candidate;
5. Consults in particular with the Director of the institute;
6. Puts together a portfolio (see annex concerning the portfolio) and prepares a notification for the Dean;
7. The Dean will prepare his/her own notification and will transmit it to the EPFL CEA along with the Faculty notification. He/She will transmit a copy to the President of EPFL and will ensure that the candidature portfolio is complete. At the same time, the Dean will provide the candidate with a brief oral summary of the content of the Faculty CEA’s notification.

**Article 3 Role of the EPFL CEA**

The EPFL CEA guarantees the respect of standards of excellence at an international level and coherence within EPFL:

1. It examines the Faculty proposal, reviews the portfolio and requests information considered appropriate. If necessary, it may request that the Faculty complete the portfolio;
2. It may hear the candidate;
3. It formulates a notification for the President of EPFL.

\(^1\) The term ‘promotion’ is used throughout this text to refer to the change of status from ‘associate professor’ to ‘full professor’.
Article 4  Role of the President of EPFL

1. The President decides whether or not to make a proposal to the ETH Board and informs the candidate of the situation.
2. A professor who is not granted promotion may make a new request after a waiting period of three years.

Article 5  Criteria for evaluation

1. To become a full professor, an associate professor must excel in the majority of the following criteria and in particular must be notably outstanding in some of them.
2. The criteria are as follows:

1. Teaching and training:
   a. Quality and importance of teaching activity, evaluation from students, in particular regarding the quality of communication and charisma in teaching;
   b. Quality of teaching content and quality of teaching supports;
   c. Creativity in terms of education and teaching methods;
   d. Management of semester projects, degree projects and doctoral theses;
   e. Participation in activities of general interest specific to the training.

2. Research:
   a. Scientific (or artistic) quality and creativity, originality;
   b. Technological innovations and patents;
   c. Interdisciplinarity;
   d. Reputation established at an international level. Impact of publications (bibliometric value), invited conferences;
   e. Prizes received;
   f. Contribution of resources (national funding, industrial funding, EU funding, CTI, etc.);
   g. Capacity for collaboration (internal & external).

3. Potential:
   a. Potential for the scientific development of the candidate;
   b. Potential for development in training;
   c. Potential for technological development;
   d. Vision.

4. Other activities:
   a. Participation in activities of general interest to the Faculty, to EPFL;
   b. Quality of management of human and financial capital for the Unit;
   c. Participation supporting the scientific community;
   d. Spin-off.

3. The weighting of evaluation criteria may vary from one field to another. Aspects such as creativity, originality and artistic expression carry a particular importance in certain subject areas (architecture, human sciences, etc.).
Article 6 Protection of information and access to the evaluation portfolio

1 The candidate’s evaluation portfolio is accessible only to those persons fulfilling the position of experts in the evaluation process. The candidate or his/her representative do not have access to the evaluation portfolio.

2 Documents containing evaluation or assessment elements concerning the candidate and his/her services, as well as any opinions provided orally are strictly confidential. All persons who participate in the evaluation are bound to strict confidentiality.

3 These measures are intended to protect the candidate as well as the quality and veracity of the opinions provided by the experts and the persons supplying evaluations regarding the candidate.

Article 7 Entry into force

The present regulations enter into force on 4th May 2004, version 1.1, status as at 1st January 2017.

On behalf of the EPFL Direction:

President: Patrick Aebischer
General Counsel: Susan Killias

Annex: Note concerning the portfolio
Annex: Note concerning the portfolio

A completed dossier will enable a more rapid and efficient evaluation. Documents must be communicated electronically, in ‘doc’ or ‘pdf’ format. The following elements are to be included in the portfolio:

**Standard candidate portfolio:**

1. Information to be transmitted to the rapporteurs (in English):
   a) Curriculum Vitae
   b) Publication list (i) Articles in peer reviewed journals, (ii) Reviews, (iii) Books and book chapters, (iv) Other publications such as reports or contributions to proceedings
   c) Invited lectures at international conferences
   d) Prizes and academic honours
   e) Diploma and doctoral students
   f) Teaching activities
   g) Funding record
   h) Collaboration with other groups
   i) Innovation, technology transfer, patents
   j) Other professional activities (editorial boards, conference organisation, etc.)
   k) Administrative activities
   l) Detailed academic career plan: Teaching
   m) Detailed academic career plan: Research
   n) Vision about research in the field of activity

2. Information used internally at EPFL (in French or in English):
   a) Teaching portfolio, including teaching evaluations
   b) Three publications with a brief description of their importance and their originality
   c) Management and organisational activities and summary of laboratory management
   d) References (usually 6 names with a brief description of their status and their relationship with the candidate)

**Standard Faculty portfolio:**

1. The composition of the Faculty evaluation committee
2. A description of the ‘standards’ used by the evaluation committee to evaluate the candidate
3. A detailed line of argument justifying the Faculty recommendation
4. A completed candidate portfolio (see point 1 above under “Standard candidate portfolio”).
5. A complete list of rapporteurs (approximately 6) used by the Faculty, indicating the reasons for their selection. Amongst the recommendation letters, 4 to 5 should be written by leaders in the field who remain independent of the candidate. If a rapporteur is not considered to be of a high enough level or does not belong to a reputed institution, the reason for which this person has been suggested must be indicated
6. A copy of the letters sent to the rapporteurs
7. The reports from the rapporteurs. As far as possible, if a rapporteur fails to respond, the reason for this must be indicated
8. A list of additional rapporteurs (usually 6) with a brief profile summary
9. Documents summarising the yearly interviews with the Dean of the Faculty (for ‘Tenure Track’ assistant professors)