

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



Dear Dr./Professor _____,

_____ is seeking promotion and tenure in the Department of _____ in the College of Engineering at Drexel University. Drexel is a comprehensive, global, R1-level research university that emphasizes experiential learning and cooperative education. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy describes our standards in the following way: *Tenure is granted to a faculty member who is independently expert in their field(s), has established a distinguished record of academic achievement and made significant contributions to knowledge and teaching, is judged to meet appropriate national or international standards of excellence, and is judged likely to continue that record. Each candidate should have a strong record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service and have demonstrated outstanding performance in either research or teaching. Each college (or equivalent) may further define specific criteria for a candidate's performance in these areas as appropriate to the discipline and consistent with University policy.*

With this letter, I have provided the college tenure and promotion criteria (found at <https://drexel.edu/~media/Files/engineering/resources/COE%20TP%20final.ashx?la=en>), as well as the candidate's personal statement, curriculum vitae, and key dossier material. Please provide your assessment of the candidate in light of the information provided and your knowledge of how the candidate's work fits into the discipline on a national or international basis. Please focus your review on the quality and impact of the candidate's work. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *The main issues to be addressed are 1) the impact of the candidate's work on a field or fields and 2) the promise for future significant impact on the field or fields.* We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion or tenure, nor are we asking if the candidate might receive promotion or tenure at your institution.

Drexel University requires that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *An external reviewer may not have served on the candidate's dissertation proposal committee or dissertation committee. External reviewers will not be (or have been) co-authors of the candidate or Co-PIs in the recent past (five years).* Therefore, if such a connection exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the External Referee Form and return it with your review. Also, please include a copy of your curriculum vitae and a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with a context for your comments. We would appreciate receiving your comments by _____.

We appreciate your assistance as we consider _____'s candidacy. We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you and appreciate your assistance. Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members and senior administrators serving in a promotion and tenure advisory capacity, but we will otherwise maintain confidentiality. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *Any exceptions to the requirement of confidentiality can only be authorized by the University's Office of the General Counsel.*

Thank you for your assistance in this important academic process.

Sincerely,



Dear Dr./Professor _____,

_____ is seeking promotion to Associate Professor in the Department of _____ in the College of Engineering at Drexel University. Drexel is a comprehensive, global, R1-level research university that emphasizes experiential learning and cooperative education. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy describes our standards in the following way: *Promotion is granted to a faculty member who is independently expert in their field(s), has established a distinguished record of academic achievement and made significant contributions to knowledge and teaching, is judged to meet appropriate national or international standards of excellence, and is judged likely to continue that record. Each candidate should have a strong record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service and have demonstrated outstanding performance in either research or teaching. Each college (or equivalent) may further define specific criteria for a candidate's performance in these areas as appropriate to the discipline and consistent with University policy.*

With this letter, I have provided the college tenure and promotion criteria (found at <https://drexel.edu/~media/Files/engineering/resources/COE%20TP%20final.ashx?la=en>), as well as the candidate's personal statement, curriculum vitae, and key dossier material. Please provide your assessment of the candidate in light of the information provided and your knowledge of how the candidate's work fits into the discipline on a national or international basis. Please focus your review on the quality and impact of the candidate's work. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *The main issues to be addressed are 1) the impact of the candidate's work on a field or fields and 2) the promise for future significant impact on the field or fields.* We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion, nor are we asking if the candidate might receive promotion at your institution.

Drexel University requires that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *An external reviewer may not have served on the candidate's dissertation proposal committee or dissertation committee. External reviewers will not be (or have been) co-authors of the candidate or Co-PIs in the recent past (five years).* Therefore, if such a connection exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the External Referee Form and return it with your review. Also, please include a copy of your curriculum vitae and a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with a context for your comments. We would appreciate receiving your comments by _____.

We appreciate your assistance as we consider _____'s candidacy. We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you and appreciate your assistance. Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members and senior administrators serving in a promotion and tenure advisory capacity, but we will otherwise maintain confidentiality. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *Any exceptions to the requirement of confidentiality can only be authorized by the University's Office of the General Counsel.*

Thank you for your assistance in this important academic process.

Sincerely,



Dear Dr./Professor _____,

_____ is seeking promotion to Professor in the Department of _____ in the College of Engineering at Drexel University. Drexel is a comprehensive, global, R1-level research university that emphasizes experiential learning and cooperative education. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy describes our standards in the following way: *Criteria for promotion include a distinguished and continuing record of research, teaching, and service at a high level commensurate with the respective rank at highly regarded institutions. Professors at Drexel University are expected to have achieved appropriate national/international prominence within their field or discipline, demonstrated strong mentorship of students, participated in interdisciplinary activities, where possible, and provided vigorous leadership in significant University and professional service activities. Each candidate should have a strong record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service and have demonstrated outstanding performance in either research or teaching. Each college (or equivalent) may further define specific criteria for a candidate's performance in these areas as appropriate to the discipline and consistent with University policy.*

With this letter I have provided the college tenure and promotion criteria (found at <https://drexel.edu/~media/Files/engineering/resources/COE%20TP%20final.ashx?la=en>), as well as the candidate's personal statement, curriculum vitae, and key dossier material. Please provide your assessment of the candidate in light of the information provided and your knowledge of how the candidate's work fits into the discipline on a national or international basis. Please focus your review on the quality and impact of the candidate's work. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *The main issues to be addressed are 1) the impact of the candidate's work on a field or fields and 2) the promise for future significant impact on the field or fields.* We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion, nor are we asking if the candidate might receive promotion at your institution.

Drexel University requires that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *An external reviewer may not have served on the candidate's dissertation proposal committee or dissertation committee. External reviewers will not be (or have been) co-authors of the candidate or Co-PIs in the recent past (five years).* Therefore, if such a connection exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the External Referee Form and return it with your review. Also, please include a copy of your curriculum vitae and a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with a context for your comments. We would appreciate receiving your comments by _____.

We appreciate your assistance as we consider _____'s candidacy. We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you and appreciate your assistance. Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members and senior administrators serving in a promotion and tenure advisory capacity, but we will otherwise maintain confidentiality. Drexel's Tenure and Promotion Policy states: *Any exceptions to the requirement of confidentiality can only be authorized by the University's Office of the General Counsel.*

Thank you for your assistance in this important academic process.

Sincerely,

EXTERNAL REFEREE FORM

TO:

FROM:

CANDIDATE UNDER REVIEW:

Relationship to the candidate and their work:

1. Member of the candidate's dissertation proposal committee or dissertation committee:
Yes No
2. Current collaborator: Yes No
3. Co-Author, Co-PI, or Co-Investigator in the last 5 years (with the exception of large multi-site projects where authors have a very distant relationship): Yes No
4. Other (*please specify*):

Knowledge of candidate's work based on (check all that apply):

- Candidate's personal statement, CV, and dossier materials provided herein
- Scholarly presentations (e.g., at conferences)
- Previously read candidate's work (e.g., as a reviewer or out of interest)
- Personal communications or conversations
- Media coverage of candidate's work
- Other (*please specify*):

Do you have any conflicts of interest for which you should recuse yourself as a reviewer of this candidate?

Yes No

External Reviewer (*signature*):

Date: