

Preamble

This document serves as the College of Engineering (CoE)'s tenure and promotion (T&P) policy and is a supplement to the [relevant University policies](#). In the event of a conflict between the policies, the University policy takes precedence. Individual departments may develop additional policies provided they are not in conflict with either this document or the University policy and are pre-approved by the Dean.

Definitions

Department Ad Hoc Committee (DAHC): For each candidate up for tenure and/or promotion or mid-term review, the Department Head – after consultation with the candidate, formal mentor(s) (if any), and the Dean/Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs – shall appoint a Department Ad Hoc Committee and chair, the members of whom are in fields aligned with those related to the candidate. The committee shall be formed in the summer just prior to the academic year in which the candidate is being considered. Each candidate up for tenure and/or promotion or mid-term review will have a separate committee reviewing their case. A candidate with perceived or actual conflicts with the proposed committee shall raise the issue(s) at the time of appointment for resolution by the Dean; Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs; and Department Head (please see the accompanying timeline in Appendix B). Each committee shall have a minimum of three members, a majority of whom shall be from the department, and must include at least one from outside the department (who may be outside the College, but within the University). In the event that a department does not have three tenured faculty (other than the Department Head) available, the department shall select tenured faculty from other academic departments in the College to fill the roster. The rank and tenure status of members must be at least equivalent to that sought by the tenure/promotion applicant, as stipulated in the University Tenure & Promotion Policy. In the case of candidates with split appointments between units, the DAHC shall be constituted consistent with the candidate's letter of appointment.

College of Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee (CTPC): This committee shall consist of one tenured faculty member at the rank of full professor from each department; these shall be selected by their departments, according to departmental policy, for three-year terms (which will preferably be staggered among the members). The chair of CTPC shall be appointed by the CTPC for a one-year term. The CTPC will deliberate at the College level and submit its recommendations and votes, which will be recorded, to the Dean on the tenure and promotion cases. Any conflicts of interest between a member of the CTPC and a candidate up for tenure and/or promotion will be resolved by the Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs.

Neither the Dean, Associate Dean Faculty Affairs, nor Department Heads are eligible to be a member of CTPC or a DAHC.

Process for Tenure and/or Promotion

1. Upon receiving the candidate package (see Appendix A for format) and suggested external reviewers from the candidate, the Department Head will charge the DAHC

appropriately and forward the candidate package and candidate selected, external reviewer names. An [overall timeline](#) of the process is given in Appendix B.

2. The DAHC will select external reviewers from those submitted by the candidate and will also solicit external reviewers from additional persons in the candidate's areas of expertise. The DAHC should follow the process in the University Policy for the selection of the external reviewers, which states that external reviewers must be at "arms length" from the candidates. All external reviewers must be approved by the Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs prior to being contacted. The chair of the DAHC should submit the names and biographical sketches for proposed external reviewers to the Associate Dean, taking into account the diversity of the reviewers and their institutional ranking (i.e.; reviewers should come from institutions ranked similarly to or better than Drexel). Additionally, all external reviewers should be at or above the rank of the promotion level and there should not be more than one non-academic (i.e.; employed at a national research facility) or international reviewer. Moreover, the list of external reviewers and their letters should remain confidential throughout the process and should be shared only with the appropriate committees and corresponding faculty administrators and staff. The Associate Dean will respond to the committee in a timely fashion with their approval or request for changes. A template for requests for external reviewers is in Appendix C.
3. The DAHC will collect feedback from the faculty for their assessment of the candidate. The faculty vote shall be by confidential ballot (either anonymous paper ballot or anonymous survey sent via Qualtrics) to all departmental eligible voting faculty (those at or above the level of tenure/promotion under consideration) and the ballots shall be counted by the entire DAHC. Prior to the balloting, the candidate package shall be made available to all eligible voting faculty within the department. The faculty vote should be of tenured (in the case of candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor) or of tenured full (in the case of candidates for promotion to full professor) professors.
4. The DAHC will evaluate the candidate package, the external reviews, and feedback from faculty for key strengths according to the University criteria for tenure and/or promotion¹. The DAHC will submit a package consisting of its report, the candidate package, external reviewer letters and other supplemental material, as appropriate, to the Department Head in early November, as specified by the [T&P calendar](#) delineated and announced by the Provost annually (see Appendix B). The report should be an assessment, supported by evidence, that the criteria for tenure and promotion have been met. The DAHC committee report will include specific recommendations (affirmative or negative) with respect to tenure and/or promotion.
5. The Department Head will prepare an independent assessment of the candidate based on the DAHC report and candidate package and will forward these to the candidate, with identifying information redacted, according to the University T&P calendar, for acknowledgement and comment.
6. After receiving the communication from the candidate, the Department Head will submit the collated documents to the Dean and Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs by the date delineated in the University T&P calendar.

¹ With an overall criteria of "Each candidate should have a strong record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service and have demonstrated outstanding performance in either research or teaching.", as elaborated in detail in the University Policy.

7. The Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs will transmit the entire report from the Department Head to the CTPC, which will deliberate and submit its recommendations to the Dean the first week in January.
8. The Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs will also transmit the entire report to the committee of CoE Department Heads, which will deliberate and hold an up/down vote, and subsequently submit its recommendations to the Dean the first week in January.
9. The Dean will meet with the candidate and will subsequently prepare an independent assessment of the candidate. The Dean will then communicate recommendations to the Provost, along with recommendations and reports from the department and College committees, in late January, per the University T&P calendar.

Process for Mid-Term Review

Since the mid-term review is an internal process which uses internal reviewers, upon receipt of the candidate package, the Department Head will forward it to the DAHC for evaluation and recommendation to the Department Head. The Department Head will prepare an independent assessment based on the DAHC report and transmit a recommendation to the Dean and Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs. Both the DAHC and the Department Head will assess whether the candidate's progress with respect to teaching, research, and service is satisfactory or unsatisfactory, and whether reappointment is recommended. Before transmission of the reports to the Dean and Associate Dean, the Department Head will communicate with the candidate and provide opportunity for acknowledgement, additional information, or other comments.

Upon receipt of the report, the Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs will meet with all mid-term review candidates individually. Subsequently, a report from the Dean will be generated. Once the Dean's report has been generated, the candidates will have the opportunity to comment on the Dean's report. The timeline for mid-term review can be referenced on the [Provost's website](#).

Appendix A --- Candidate Package Outline

1. Highlights (Not to exceed two pages)
2. Statement(s) on Teaching, Research, and Service Activities
3. Curriculum Vitae (formatted per next page)
4. Grants Summary Chart (indicating % attributable to candidate)
5. Teaching Portfolio
6. Other Relevant Materials
7. Sample Publications (3-5)

CV Content and Format

The curriculum vitae should include the following items:

- Personal Data - Name, university address/affiliation, and other relevant personal information.
- Education - List of degrees, showing schools attended and dates degrees were awarded.
- Professional Experience - Chronological record of professional experience beginning with the most recent activity.
- Honors and Awards - List of honors and awards, including dates.
- Publications - Publication record in reverse chronological order. Each entry should include all authors in the order shown in the publication, the title of the paper, the journal or conference in which it was published, the date, the page numbers, and the journal's impact factor. In addition, each paper should be separated into the following sections: Peer Reviewed, Conference Refereed, Conference, Book Chapter, Book, Invited, Submitted Archival, Submitted Conference, Items in Preparation, and Abstract. In addition, the five most significant publications should be identified with an "*" Publications should be separated out as pre-Drexel work and post-Drexel work, as well as publications that were prior to the previous tenure/promotion evaluation, as applicable.
- Invited Talks and other Presentations - Record of invited seminars and lectures and presentations at professional meetings. Clearly identify any items also appearing under publications.
- Entrepreneurship – List any start-up companies, patents, invention disclosures, patent applications filed, patents awarded, licensing agreements, etc.
- Sponsored Projects - In chronological order, a list of all proposals submitted which were funded or are pending, including title of proposal, agency submitted to, grant number, amount of proposal/award, date of submission, date of award, period of performance, and type of proposal (research, education, etc.). Indicate PI status - principal, co-principal, associate, etc. If a co-PI, indicate the PI and other Co-PI's, and the fractional responsibility or activity. Entries should detail relative amounts of sponsor funding, Drexel funding, and "in-kind" contributions.
- Unfunded Proposals - In chronological order, a list of all other proposals submitted but not funded, including title of proposal, agency submitted to, amount of proposal, date of submission, date of declination, and the same PI and other information as for funded proposals.
- Collaborators – List current and recent (last four years) collaborators.
- Teaching Activities – Summary of all courses and laboratories taught, courses and laboratories significantly revised/improved, and new courses and laboratories developed. Summary of faculty and course evaluations.
- Student Supervision - Summary of students supervised (post-doc, PhD, master's, and undergraduate), indicating co-advising responsibilities as appropriate. Include title of thesis project and indicate whether thesis has been completed or the work continues in progress.
- University Service Activities - Summary of service to the department, college, and university, including both committee and individual assignments.
- Professional Activities and Service - Include professional organization memberships, committee memberships, chairpersonships, and offices held (distinguish between local, state, national, and international organizations); states in which registered as a professional engineer.
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion – List any activities, service or otherwise, that promote diversity, equity, and inclusion work within the University, college, department, or field.
- Consulting Work - Listed in reverse chronological order, and including number of days per week, name of company or unit supporting the consulting, and the periods of active consulting.
- Appendices (as appropriate)
 - All teaching course evaluations must be included

Appendix B – Typical Timeline, summarized from the Provost’s website; please see [current Provost’s calendar](#) for exact dates; CoE specific dates indicated below

Late January Provost’s Office notifies Dean of candidates scheduled to be considered for tenure and promotion for upcoming AY.

Early March Deadline for faculty to declare to Dean intention to be reviewed for promotion during upcoming AY. Deadline for faculty to declare to Dean intention to be considered for early tenure review in upcoming AY (requires approval by Provost via the Office of Faculty Affairs).

Late March Dean submits final list of their tenure and promotion candidates to the Provost’s Office.

Early June (CoE) DAHC formed – The Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs and the candidate are notified.

Mid-June (CoE) The candidate can submit any concerns about the makeup of the DAHC and any conflicts of interest to the Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs.

Early July (CoE) The DAHC is finalized and a list of potential external reviewers is submitted for approval to the Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs.

Late August Candidate submits dossier to Department Head. DAHC contacts external reviewers.

Early October Deadline to receive letters from external reviewers.

Early November DAHC review completed. Candidate dossier and DAHC report forwarded to the Department Head.

Early December Department Head review completed. Departmental committee and Department Head reports forwarded to candidate.

One week later Candidate provides written acknowledgement of receipt of Departmental committee’s and Department Head’s reports. Candidate forwards any written comments addressing contents of reports to the Department Head. Candidate’s acknowledgement and written comments become part of the official dossier.

Mid-December Department Head forwards candidate’s official dossier to Dean.

First Week in January (CoE) CTPC to hold up/down vote on candidate.

First Week in January CoE review completed. Dean forwards CoE committee’s report and the Dean’s report to candidate.

Mid-January Candidate provides written acknowledgement of receipt of CoE committee’s and Dean’s reports. Candidate forwards any written comments addressing contents of

reports to the Dean. Candidate's acknowledgement and written comments become part of the official dossier.

Late January Dean forwards candidate's official dossier electronically to the Provost via SharePoint.

Late January Tenure/Promotion documents made available to University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Appendix C – Template for Letters to External Reviewers

September xxx, 20xx

<<address>><<address>>

Dear Professor <<last name>>:

The department of YYYY at Drexel University is considering the promotion of Dr. xxx to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. The University's criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure include an assessment of the extent and impact of the contributions the candidate has made and is expected to continue to make in teaching, research and service.

As a recognized leader in your field, I am requesting your candid assessment of Dr. xxx's accomplishments. Of particular importance to us is your evaluation of the quality and impact of the candidate's most important contributions and their standing in the field. It would be especially helpful if you could comment on the following specific points:

- How long, and in what capacity, have you known the candidate?
- What degree of originality and creativity has the candidate demonstrated in their research, and what is the impact of the candidate's research activities on their field?
- Which, if any, of their publications do you consider to be outstanding and of significant impact on the field?
- How would you describe the candidate's overall standing as a scholar both in their specialty research area and in the broader field?
- How would you evaluate the candidate's service contributions to the discipline such as their work on technical committees of professional societies, as a reviewer of proposals or papers, as an associate editor, or other similar activities?
- In your view, what promise does the candidate hold for future professional growth and does the candidate meet your expectations for promotion and tenure?
- Would you support this candidate for promotion and tenure at Drexel University?

To assist you in your evaluation, I am enclosing a copy of Dr. xxx's CV along with a candidate statement on teaching, research and service, and several publications selected by the candidate to represent the scope and quality of their research accomplishments. If there are any additional publications or other information that you believe will be helpful to you in your evaluation, please do not hesitate to let me know.

The University's schedule for promotion and tenure requires that we have your letter no later than October 1, year. Please let me know as soon as possible whether you are or are not able to meet this deadline. Please send an electronic copy of your letter on letterhead with a signature in PDF form to my attention at the e-mail address below by the date indicated above. You may contact me by telephone at xxx-xxx-xxxx or e-mail xxx@drexel.edu with any questions. Also, I would appreciate receiving from you a short biographical sketch that we will include in the preface to the Letters of Evaluation in the promotion dossier.

I realize that the preparation of your evaluation will require considerable time and effort. Your input is very important to us however, and we would appreciate it very much if you could provide us with this very valuable professional review that will be most helpful for us in making a well-informed decision.

Sincerely,

Dr. xxx
Professor and Chair of Department Ad Hoc Committee

Enclosures: CV, candidate statement, selected publications