

# Appointment of associate professor to post of full professor

LEX 4.2.2

4<sup>th</sup> May 2004, status as at 13<sup>th</sup> April 2018

---

*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:*

## **Section 1 Assessment process**

### **Article 1 Launching the process**

An associate professor may request promotion<sup>1</sup> from the Dean<sup>2</sup> of the School. 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 attached annex. The teaching file is an element to be included in the portfolio.

### **Article 2 Role of the School and the Dean**

The School Committee of Academic Evaluation (hereafter: School CEA) is made up of full professors from the School who do not form part of the EPFL CEA. The School 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 attached annex) and prepares a notification for the Dean;

The Dean will prepare his/her own notification and will transmit it to the EPFL CEA along with the School notification. He/She will transmit a copy of his/her notification 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 School 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:

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'promotion' is used throughout this text to refer to the change of status from 'associate professor' to 'full professor'.

<sup>2</sup> Within the present Directive, the term 'Dean' also covers College Directors.

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

#### **Article 4 Role of the President of EPFL**

<sup>1</sup> The President decides whether or not to make a proposal to the ETH Board and informs the candidate of the situation.

<sup>2</sup> A professor who is not granted promotion may make a new request after a waiting period of three years.

### ***Section 2 Criteria for evaluation***

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.

#### **Article 5 Teaching and training**

The criteria are as follows:

1. Quality and importance of teaching activity, evaluation from students, in particular regarding the quality of communication and charisma in teaching;
2. Quality of teaching content and quality of teaching supports;
3. Creativity in terms of education and teaching methods;
4. Management of practical or semester projects, Master's degree projects and doctoral theses;
5. Participation in activities of general interest specific to the training.

#### **Article 6 Research**

The criteria are as follows:

1. Scientific (or artistic) quality and creativity, originality;
2. Technological innovations and patents;
3. Interdisciplinarity;
4. Reputation established and impact of research works at an international level. Impact of publications (bibliometric value), invited conferences;
5. Prizes received;
6. Contribution of resources (national funding, industrial funding, EU funding, Innosuisse, etc.);
7. Capacity for collaboration (internal & external).

#### **Article 7 Potential**

The criteria are as follows:

1. The scientific development of the candidate;
2. Development in training;

- 
3. Technological development;
  4. The candidate's vision.

### **Article 8 Other activities**

The criteria are as follows:

1. Participation in activities of general interest to the School, to EPFL;
2. Quality of management of human and financial capital for the Unit;
3. Participation supporting the scientific community;
4. Societal impact, including within the economic sector (example, 'Spin-Off')

### **Article 9 Weighting of evaluation criteria**

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.).

## ***Section 3 Specific provisions***

### **Article 10 Protection of information and access to the evaluation portfolio**

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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 11 Entry into force**

The present regulations entered into force on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2004, version 1.2, status as at 13<sup>th</sup> April 2018.

On behalf of the EPFL Direction:

President:  
Martin Vetterli

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:

#### I - Standard candidate portfolio:

##### *A - Information to be transmitted to the rapporteurs (in English)*

1. Curriculum Vitae.
2. 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.
3. Invited lectures at international conferences.
4. Prizes and academic honours.
5. Diploma and doctoral students.
6. Summary of teaching activities.
7. Summary of research activities and principal achievements.
8. Funding record.
9. Collaboration with other groups.
10. Innovation, technology transfer and patents.
11. Other professional activities (editorial boards, conference organisation, etc.).
12. Administrative activities.
13. Detailed academic career plan: Teaching.
14. Detailed academic career plan: Research.
15. Vision for research in the field of activity
16. Three publications with a brief description of their importance and their originality.

##### *B - Information used internally at EPFL (in French or in English)*

17. Complete teaching portfolio, including teaching evaluations and letters of reference from the Section Director and the Director of the Doctoral School (see Art. 10, LEX 2.5.1).
18. Management and organisational activities and summary of laboratory management.
19. References (usually 6 names with a brief description of their status and their relationship with the candidate).

#### II - Standard School portfolio:

1. The composition of the School 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 Dean of the School's recommendation.
4. A completed candidate portfolio (see point I above).
5. A complete list of rapporteurs (approximately 6) used by the School, indicating the reasons for their selection. Half of the rapporteurs shall be selected without the candidate's input. 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.