

**Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts & Design, Drexel University**  
**Westphal Tenure and Promotion Policy**  
**Approved: March 1, 2012      Updated: December 10, 2021**

## Table of Contents

- I. Introduction..... 3
  - A. Tenure’s Purpose..... 3
  - B. Explanation of Tenure ..... 3
    - 1. University Policy Explanation..... 3
    - 2. The Three Performance Categories ..... 3
    - 3. A Prediction of Future Contributions ..... 3
    - 4. Outstanding Performance in Either Research or Teaching ..... 4
    - 5. The Role of the Westphal Policy in Connection to the University Policy ..... 4
    - 6. Topics Covered Solely in the University Policy ..... 4
    - 7. Provost’s Published Schedule..... 4
  
- II. The Pre-tenure Period..... 5
  - A. Information Provided at the Time of Making the Offer..... 5
  - B. Responsibility of the Tenure-track Faculty Member ..... 5
  - C. Informational Workshop with the Academic Associate Dean ..... 5
  - D. First-term Meeting..... 5
  - E. Preliminary Statement ..... 5
  - F. Subsequent Annual Performance Reviews ..... 6
  - G. Mid-term Review ..... 6
    - 1. University Policy Concerning the Mid-term Review ..... 6
    - 2. University Policy Concerning External Reviewers for the Mid-term Review ..... 6
    - 3. Mid-term Review Process Through the Level of the Mid-term Review Committee ..... 7
    - 4. The Department Head Mid-term Review ..... 8
    - 5. The Mid-term Review at the Dean’s Level ..... 9
  
- III. The Tenure Review ..... 9
  - A. Summary ..... 9
    - 1. Levels of Review ..... 9
    - 2. Confidentiality ..... 9
  - B. Criteria of Evaluation for Tenure ..... 10
    - 1. Evidence of Achievement in Teaching..... 10
    - 2. Evidence of Achievement in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work..... 11
      - a. The University Policy in Regard to Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work..... 11
      - b. The Westphal College Criteria for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work..... 11
      - c. Commissions and Client Work ..... 13
      - d. Scholarship of Teaching ..... 13
      - e. Patterns of Growth and Development ..... 13
      - f. Lengthy Projects ..... 14
    - 3. Evidence of Achievement in Service ..... 14
  
- IV. The Promotion Review ..... 14

- V. Review Committees and External Reviewers .....15
  - A. Review Committees ..... 15
  - B. External Reviewers..... 16
    - 1. Overview ..... 16
    - 2. Selection Process ..... 16
    - 3. Selection Criteria for External Reviewers..... 16
  
- VI. The Tenure Review Process within the Westphal College .....18
  - A. Constitution of the Department Tenure and Promotion Review Committee ..... 18
  - B. Review Committee: Initial Process ..... 19
  - C. Tenure/Promotion Dossier..... 19
  - D. Materials for External Review ..... 21
  - E. Review Committee: Information Gathering Phase through Completion of Report..... 22
  - F. The Department Head’s Review ..... 24
  - G. The Dean’s Review and the Advisory Committee..... 24
  - H. The Provost’s Review ..... 25
  
- VII. The Promotion Review: Rank of Professor .....25
  - A. Eligibility..... 25
  - B. Criteria..... 26
  - C. The Review Process ..... 26
    - 1. The Professor Promotion Committee and the Professor Dossier ..... 26
    - 2. Professor Promotion Committee’s Review Process ..... 27
    - 3. Dean’s Review..... 28
  
- VIII. Applicability .....29

# **I. Introduction**

## **A. Tenure's Purpose**

The institution of tenure evolved in order to offer capable educators an opportunity to pursue their academic interests with a measure of security. Tenure is a right granted by the University to a faculty member of continued employment, which safeguards academic freedom – the freedom to pursue creative, scholarly, and research ideas and interests without regard to their political or institutional acceptability. Tenure thus encourages its holder to strive for excellence and originality in a profession that typically does not offer the kind of rewards associated with the marketplace. Universities grant tenure in the belief that it helps outstanding faculty members continue to develop professionally, it increases the quality of the education they offer to their students, and it strengthens the University's contribution to society.

## **B. Explanation of Tenure**

### **1. University Policy Explanation**

Drexel University's Tenure & Promotion Policy ("the University Policy"), which was revised on May 19, 2010, with clerical revisions on June 26, 2018, states in Section I: "Tenure is a right granted by the University to a faculty member of continuing employment upon the successful completion of the pre-tenure period. Tenure is granted to a faculty member who is independently expert in [their] field(s) and is judged to meet appropriate national/international standards of excellence with the belief that tenure will further promote the professional development of the faculty member and raise the stature of the academic unit and the University."

### **2. The Three Performance Categories**

The University Policy, in Section I, describes the three categories that will be judged: "The review encompasses the candidate's research, scholarship and/or creative work (referred to collectively as "research"), teaching activities, and service to the University and to the academic field(s)." Although the majority of tenure candidates in the Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts & Design ("Westphal College") will have a body of creative work upon which they will be judged, this Westphal College Tenure & Promotion Policy ("this Policy") will also use the term "Research" to describe the general category. As a matter of clarification, the Westphal College gives no priority to any one of these subcategories: "Research," "Scholarship," or "Creative Work." A candidate will usually have work in only one of these subcategories, although sometimes in two, and only rarely in all three.

### **3. A Prediction of Future Contributions**

The University Policy states in Section III.B: "The granting of tenure represents a prediction about the future contributions of a candidate based on a compelling body of evidence. Candidates for tenure are expected to have established a distinguished record of academic

achievement that should be the foundation for an appropriate national or international reputation and be judged likely to continue that record.” Therefore, the granting of tenure is based on a judgment that the tenure candidate has both established a distinguished record of academic achievement and holds the promise to continue that level of achievement into the future.

#### **4. Outstanding Performance in Either Research or Teaching**

The University Policy states in Section III.B: “Each candidate should have a strong record of accomplishment in teaching, research, and service and have demonstrated outstanding performance in either research or teaching.”

#### **5. The Role of the Westphal Policy in Connection to the University Policy**

The University Policy states in Section III.B: “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.” Therefore, this Policy will expand upon the University Policy by establishing appropriate criteria for Westphal candidates, offering further explanations of processes, and providing more detail. The assumption is that anyone who is consulting this Policy has already read and understood the University Policy. Any questions of interpretation of this Policy should be directed to the Dean and/or the Academic Associate Dean.

#### **6. Topics Covered Solely in the University Policy**

Please note that there are certain parts of the University Policy that do not need any further discussion at the college level and therefore they will not be covered (or will not be covered in full) in the Westphal Policy. These topics include:

- Faculty members engaged in interdisciplinary work
- Tenure-track appointments
- Length of the pre-tenure period
- Hiring with tenure
- Prior years of service
- Extension of the pre-tenure period
- Withdrawal from a tenure-track appointment
- Provost Advisory Committee
- Termination of tenured faculty
- Organization of the Tenure/Promotion Dossier to be submitted to the Office of the Provost

#### **7. Provost’s Published Schedule**

Please note that the Office of the Provost will publish specific dates each year for all deadlines for the process described in this Policy. The Office of the Provost calendar can be found at this link: (LINK TO BE ADDED). Please note that these dates are subject to change each year. In viewing current dates, keep in mind that they are only approximations for what the dates will likely be in the future.

## **II. The Pre-tenure Period**

### **A. Information Provided at the Time of Making the Offer**

At the time of making an offer to a candidate in a search for a tenure-track position, the Department Head or the Dean shall provide the candidate with both the University Tenure and Promotion Policy and the Westphal Tenure and Promotion Policy.

### **B. Responsibility of the Tenure-track Faculty Member**

Although the tenure-track faculty member is responsible for building a record worthy of being judged outstanding, the Department Head is expected to help the candidate understand the requirements for tenure and to regularly monitor how well the faculty member is progressing towards the likelihood of being awarded tenure. The procedures described below are mandated for the tenure-track faculty member's pre-tenure period of six years (or less, if credit for prior service has been granted.)

### **C. Informational Workshop with the Academic Associate Dean**

Each fall term, the Academic Associate Dean will hold an informational workshop for new tenure candidates and their respective Department Heads to review the tenure process.

### **D. First-term Meeting**

In the first term of the first year of a new tenure-track faculty member's appointment, it is recommended that the Department Head, and a tenured faculty member designated by the Department Head, shall meet with the tenure-track faculty member and review their beginning record and plans for development, along with the Westphal College's and the University's standards for tenure. Please note that this is a recommendation of the Westphal College and not the University. This conversation is intended to help the candidate understand the expectations for tenure and to start an ongoing dialogue about tenure between the candidate and the Department Head.

### **E. Preliminary Statement**

In preparation for the tenure candidate's first annual performance review, the candidate shall draft a brief Preliminary Statement on their agenda for research, scholarship, and/or creative work that he or she expects to pursue during the pre-tenure period. This shall be submitted to the

candidate's Department Head, along with the faculty evaluation form (noting accomplishments of the previous year), and will form the basis of a substantive discussion at the annual performance review about the candidate's plans for establishing a record of accomplishment worthy of tenure. The Department Head will forward the candidate's Preliminary Statement, along with the completed annual performance review materials, to the Dean.

It is expected that the plan outlined in the candidate's Preliminary Statement will change over time as the candidate progresses in their work and will also evolve through discussions with the Department Head, and possibly the Dean. Please note that the Preliminary Statement is a requirement of the Westphal College and not the University.

## **F. Subsequent Annual Performance Reviews**

In each subsequent annual performance review, the Department Head shall continue to review the tenure candidate's progress towards building a record suitable for tenure review. The annual performance review forms will be kept on file in both the Department and the College. This discussion may be less detailed in the year in which the faculty member is scheduled for the Mid-term Review or its equivalent. The annual performance review shall follow guidelines issued by the University in all respects.

## **G. Mid-term Review**

### **1. University Policy Concerning the Mid-term Review**

Please consult the University Policy's section on "The Mid-term Review," Section II.F.2, for a general understanding of the Mid-term Review. The University Policy states in Section II.F.2: "The Mid-term review employs the same categories and criteria of evaluation as the tenure review and is conducted with appropriate rigor. The process is managed by the Department Head (or equivalent) in consultation with the tenure and promotion review committee of the academic unit. Specific Mid-term review procedures and calendar dates may differ from unit to unit according to the written policy of the respective academic unit but must conclude within the University timeframe designated in the Mid-term Review Calendar." Please note that the role of the "tenure and promotion review committee," mentioned above, is fulfilled by the "Mid-term Review Committee," explained further in Section II.G.3 below, which is constituted in the Westphal College for each individual candidate, solely for the purpose of that faculty member's Mid-term Review. This practice ensures that the Mid-term Review Committee will include members with sufficient knowledge of the candidate's particular discipline.

### **2. University Policy Concerning External Reviewers for the Mid-term Review**

In regard to using external reviewers for the Mid-term Review, the University Policy states the following in Section II.F.2: "The Mid-term review is typically an internal process, using internal reviewers from within the academic unit. In the event external reviewers are desired, at the discretion of the promotion and tenure committee, a maximum of two reviewers will be

consulted. The candidate will be allowed to propose no more than five (5) reviewers and at least one (1) reviewer from the candidate's list will be consulted."

### **3. Mid-term Review Process Through the Level of the Mid-term Review Committee**

Typically, the Mid-term Review occurs in the winter term of the candidate's third year. When a candidate has been granted one year of prior service, the Mid-term Review will occur in the winter term of the candidate's second year. When a candidate has been granted two or more years of prior service, there will not be a Mid-term Review because there isn't enough time to reasonably do so.

In the fall term of the designated Mid-term year, the Department Head shall meet with the candidate by the second week of the term to review the Mid-term Review process. By the eighth week of the fall term, the Department Head shall appoint three tenured faculty members to a Mid-term Review Committee to review the candidate's progress to-date. If there are faculty members under consideration for the Committee from outside the Department, they shall be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Academic Council (which consists of the Associate Deans and the Department Heads of the Westphal College). The Department Head and the Dean shall mutually approve the final composition of the Mid-term Review Committee. The Mid-term Review Committee will elect a chair. Once the Mid-term Review Committee has been formed, the members of that committee may not act as mentors to the candidate on matters relating to tenure for the duration of the Mid-term Review process, because they will have stepped into the role of evaluators of the candidate.

The candidate will submit their Mid-term Review dossier according to the Mid-term Review Calendar in the Office of the Provost. The dossier will consist of a current, academic curriculum vitae; a brief personal statement; and evidence of work accomplished in the three performance categories since coming to Drexel. In a case where a candidate has been granted credit for prior service, they may present evidence of work accomplished during the time at Drexel and during those years of credited prior service. The Mid-term Review Committee may ask for other pertinent materials in writing and the candidate may submit materials not specifically requested. If needed, the Mid-term Review Committee may also delineate matters of procedure and deadlines to the candidate in writing. There is usually no need to meet with the candidate. The only exception would be to gain pertinent and specific information that the Mid-term Review Committee believes it needs from the candidate and can obtain in no other way.

Please note that the candidate should not include Faculty Annual Reviews as part of the dossier, nor should the Mid-term Review Committee request them. Since access to Annual Reviews is appropriate to the Department Head's level and above, those are the levels where the relevancy of including specific information from Annual Reviews for the candidate's Mid-term Review will be decided.

The Mid-term Review Committee will invite all tenured faculty members in the Department to comment on their direct observation of the candidate's performance in the three categories: Research, Teaching, and Service, and to comment on the materials submitted by the candidate. The Mid-term Review Committee may also invite comments based on direct observation of the candidate's performance in the three categories from other faculty, whether tenured or tenure-

track faculty, teaching faculty, or adjunct faculty, and from professional colleagues in the University, as deemed appropriate by the Committee or suggested by the candidate.

The Mid-term Review Committee will deliver its Report to the Department Head and to the candidate by the due date according to the Mid-term Review Calendar. The candidate will acknowledge receipt of the Mid-term Review Committee Report within one week and if desired, can also include a written response to the Department Head concerning the Mid-term Review Committee's Report.

#### **4. The Department Head Mid-term Review**

The Department Head shall meet with the candidate, discuss the Mid-term Review Committee's Report and the candidate's response (if there is one), assess the candidate's progress, and offer suggestions, where appropriate, for additional effort. The Department Head will complete their review according to the Mid-term Review Calendar and will send the Report to the Dean and to the candidate. According to the University Policy in Section II.F.3, the Department Head Mid-term Review Report will indicate one of the following findings:

- “The candidate appears to be making satisfactory progress towards tenure. This finding is based on strong evidence that the candidate is likely to meet the standard of excellence demanded by a successful tenure review. In this case, the University's expectation is for continued professional development at the rate demonstrated in the first portion of the pre-tenure period and the candidate will continue with a contract through the end of the academic year of tenure review.
- The candidate appears to be progressing towards tenure and promotion with qualifications. Specific deficiencies will be elaborated for review by the candidate and Department Head (or equivalent). In such cases, it is imperative that appropriate actions by the candidate be taken to remedy deficiencies in the candidate's performance and the candidate must recognize that he/she will be evaluated on the established criteria at the time of the tenure review. The mere elimination of deficiencies, however, cannot alone assure the granting of tenure. The burden of responsibility for performance improvement rests with the candidate, though the Department Head (or equivalent) may provide reasonable assistance. The candidate will continue with a contract through the end of the academic year of tenure review.
- The candidate has not made sufficient progress towards tenure and is judged at this juncture not to be a viable candidate for tenure. In such cases, the candidate will be given a one-year terminal contract that extends through the following academic year.”

A candidate receiving either of the first two findings will be reminded that he or she must demonstrate substantial additional progress toward tenure during the remaining years of pre-tenure service. The candidate will also be reminded that the Mid-term Review is not equivalent in depth or scope to the review for tenure that will occur in the candidate's scheduled year of review for tenure.



The candidate will be asked to acknowledge receipt of the Department Head Mid-term Review Report and will be offered an opportunity to respond to it in writing, within one week of having received the Report. The Department Head will forward the Mid-term Review Committee's Report, the Department Head Report, and the candidate's acknowledgements, as well as any written responses, to the Office of the Dean.

## **5. The Mid-term Review at the Dean's Level**

The Dean shall then conduct an independent review, and render their own judgment of the candidate's progress towards tenure at this Mid-term stage. This review shall include the candidate's Mid-term Review Dossier, all other materials collected by the Mid-term Review Committee and submitted to the Department Head, the Mid-term Review Committee Report, the Department Head Mid-term Review Report and the candidate's written responses, if any, to the two Reports. The Dean will forward their Report to the candidate per the Mid-term Review Calendar. The candidate has two weeks to acknowledge receipt of the copy of the Dean's Report and state any objections in writing.

Per the Mid-term Review Calendar, the following will be submitted to the Provost's Office: the candidate's Mid-term dossier, the Committee's Report and the candidate's response; the Department Head's Report and the candidate's response; and the Dean's Report and the candidate's response.

# **III. The Tenure Review**

## **A. Summary**

### **1. Levels of Review**

The review of a candidate for tenure is a multi-level process. The Department Review Committee conducts the initial review. This is followed by the Department Head's review, the Dean's review and then review by the Provost and President. Ultimately the Board of Trustees approves or denies tenure recommendations.

### **2. Confidentiality**

All deliberations, materials, and recommendations are to be treated as confidential indefinitely except as required by the review process described in this document, other procedures outlined by the University, or by law. To maintain confidentiality, it is recommended that committee members deliberate the case in person or, if in a virtual meeting, with no recording, rather than through other means of communication. For example, email should not be used to discuss the specifics of the case; it should only be used for communications related to procedure or the mechanics of the process. Since the candidate will see the reports that the Review Committee, the Department Head, and the Dean, careful measures must be taken at each level to protect sources of information, whether the sources are external reviewers or other people who have sent letters or provided information to the Review Committee.

The University Policy states in Section IX: “In addition, candidates under review are discouraged from approaching committee members at any time concerning the disposition of their review and will understand that inquiries of this type are deemed entirely inappropriate.”

## **B. Criteria of Evaluation for Tenure**

The University Policy states in Section III.B: “The following examples provide a non-exhaustive list of sources of evidence to demonstrate a candidate’s achievements in a particular category. The particular items, listed after each category, are offered as guidelines only, and the order in which they are listed is not indicative of any type of priority ranking. No item will be counted as either necessary or sufficient for purposes of demonstrating the quality of the candidate’s work within a particular category.” This is also true for the Westphal College policy. The following examples in each category comprise a non-exhaustive list and the order is not indicative of any type of priority ranking; they are offered as guidelines only; and no one item is either necessary or sufficient for demonstrating the quality of a candidate’s work. Please note that each set of examples from the University Policy is quoted below in the appropriate section and is then followed by further clarification in regard to the expectations within the Westphal College.

Furthermore, the Westphal College recognizes that tenure cases are not uniform, in that each case presents unique aspects and varied proportions of accomplishment in the three performance categories: Teaching, Research, and Service. In some cases, there may also be some degree of overlap between or among these categories. In its assessment of tenure candidates, the Westphal College seeks to give appropriate credit to the superlative teacher or the visionary leader of a program, as well as to the successful researcher, scholar, artist, designer, performer, media producer, or entrepreneur.

### **1. Evidence of Achievement in Teaching**

According to the University Policy in Section III.B.1, examples of evidence of achievement in Teaching include:

- “Effectiveness in undergraduate and/or graduate teaching in the classroom, studio, clinical site and/or laboratory, as applicable to the discipline or interdisciplinary work based on criteria established by the academic unit(s)
- Contributions to the curriculum, such as substantial revisions of existing courses or academic programs, and development of new courses and techniques of teaching, including securing external funding for these purposes
- Publications related to teaching in the candidate’s discipline, such as most textbooks, aids, or manuals
- Effectiveness as an undergraduate and/or graduate adviser and/or mentor, including dissertation, thesis, creative projects, or independent study advising”

The Westphal College bases its judgment of teaching primarily on the courses taught by the candidate. In addition to what is mentioned above, this category can also include the candidate's contribution to the teaching of others and the mentoring of students outside of specific courses or projects. In cases where a tenure candidate created the curriculum for a new program, this achievement would constitute an overlap between the Teaching and Service categories. Further clarifications about evidence of achievement in teaching can be found in Section VI.C.

Even though the University Policy states that "most textbooks, aids or manuals" would be considered as examples of evidence of achievement in Teaching, the Westphal College views such contributions in creative fields, such as textbooks selected for publication as a result of peer review and intended for use by other institutions, as potentially belonging in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work. Papers concerning pedagogy in the candidate's discipline that are presented in peer-reviewed forums or published in scholarly journals would also have the potential of being considered as part of the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work Category. It is recommended that the tenure candidate seek clarification on which category their work would come under from their Department Head and Dean early in the tenure process.

## **2. Evidence of Achievement in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work**

### **a. The University Policy in Regard to Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work**

The University Policy states, in Section III.B.2, that evidence of achievement in Research may include:

- "As applicable to the discipline, quantity and/or quality of research, scholarship, artistic investigation and creative activity as evidenced by publications, presentations of papers (including invited presentations nationally and/or internationally), research reports, exhibitions, etc. (quantity not being a substitute for quality). Consideration will be given to papers and articles that are invited or subject to peer review. Consideration will also be given to papers and articles that are invited to the advancement of pedagogical theory and method in one's field.
- In appropriate disciplines, of the candidate's success in securing external funding
- Effectiveness in directing the research of graduate or undergraduate students
- Originating, participating in, or directing research projects
- Evaluation of scholarly or artistic accomplishment by recognized authorities outside of the University where appropriate"

### **b. The Westphal College Criteria for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work**

Within the Westphal College, there are tenure-track faculty members who come from academia, and then there are those who are independent artists or who come from industry. For scholars who come from academia, the general expectations for successful tenure through presenting at conferences, publishing in peer-reviewed journals, or authoring books are typical of achievement in academia and therefore clear. For researchers who come from academia, the

general expectations for obtaining grants and presenting their findings through conferences and articles are also typical and clear. But, for independent artists and industry professionals, who have spent their careers engaged in creative activity or managing creative enterprise, the expectations for accomplishments worthy of tenure (and which are possible while teaching full-time) are often less clear. These faculty members will need particular guidance in formulating and developing their research agendas at each stage of the tenure process.

For all tenure-track candidates in the Westphal College, the following examples are offered to provide a better understanding of the expectations for research, scholarship, and creative work worthy of tenure. As stated in III.B of this document, the following examples comprise a non-exhaustive list and the order is not indicative of any type of priority ranking; they are offered as guidelines only; and no one item is either necessary or sufficient for demonstrating the quality of a candidate's work.

Tenure-track candidates could receive recognition in the form of:

- Grants and fellowships
- Awards for excellence
- Invited speaking engagements
- Published reviews of the candidate's work
- Editorial coverage of the candidate's work

Scholars and researchers could receive recognition in the form of:

- Peer-reviewed papers accepted by and delivered at academic conferences
- Published academic conference proceedings
- Articles in peer-reviewed journals (including online peer-reviewed journals)
- Chapters for books
- Contracts for books
- Published books

Those engaged in creative work and/or creative enterprise could receive recognition in the form of:

- Solo exhibitions
- Group exhibitions
- Juried exhibitions
- Public performances
- Invited screenings
- Juried festival screenings
- Distribution of media projects
- Optioned plays or screenplays
- Creation and/or management of art/cultural community programs
- Consultancies with art/cultural organizations
- Creation of new business models for creative fields
- Commissions (gained through a competitive process)

- Professional awards
- Juried professional competitions
- Peer-reviewed professional work
- Presentations at professional organizations
- Presentations of creative work at academic conferences

#### **c. Commissions and Client Work**

Since many of the tenure candidates in the Westphal College continue to be active in their professions, the levels of review within the College must determine how to evaluate work for tenure consideration that is commissioned by and paid for by clients. Essential to this discussion is the need for client work to be judged as worthy by experts in the field before the time of tenure review. Possible avenues to establish recognition by experts can include awards won in competitions that are judged by peers in the industry, published reviews of the work, or written accolades from respected sources. It is also possible for an innovative or theoretical approach evidenced in client work to be validated by independent and objective experts in the field. There are also times when it can be demonstrated that a particular commission was obtained through a highly competitive process, which in turn demonstrates that the tenure candidate is recognized as excellent in their field.

#### **d. Scholarship of Teaching**

As noted previously in this document (Section III.B.1), the Westphal College considers the scholarship of teaching, which focuses on furthering knowledge about pedagogy in the candidate's discipline, as potentially fitting into the Research Category, rather than the Teaching Category. This includes textbooks and possibly other teaching aids that are selected for publication as a result of peer review and are intended for use by other institutions of higher learning. This could also include papers concerning pedagogy in the candidate's discipline that are presented in peer-reviewed forums or published in scholarly journals. This does not include activities that a candidate undertakes solely for their own courses (or other courses) at Drexel University, whether that involves engaging in research, authoring materials, or staying current in the discipline. These are simply considered necessary activities for excellent teaching and belong in the Teaching Category. It is recommended that the tenure candidate seek clarification on which category their work would come under from their Department Head and Dean early in the tenure process.

#### **e. Patterns of Growth and Development**

The Westphal College recognizes that tenure-track faculty may want to narrow their scope during their pre-tenure period and find ways to excel in a particular niche that lies within their broader creative, scholarly, or research field. Beginning steps in a new sub-area, involving inquiry, experimentation, and exploration, may have only modest potential for recognition in the short term, and yet, these explorations should be encouraged because they may lead to substantial achievement before the time of tenure. It should also be recognized that cutting-edge disciplines often require cutting-edge paths of inquiry, which may have few established venues for peer review. By the time of Tenure Review, however, the expectation is that the candidate

will obtain clearly demonstrable recognition for their achievements that can substantiate worthiness and contributions to the discipline.

#### **f. Lengthy Projects**

Tenure candidates who are engaged in multi-year discrete projects, such as a feature film or the design of a building, which will have little to no possibility for recognition during development, should engage in additional, substantive activities, which have the possibility of producing results and gaining recognition worthy of tenure.

### **3. Evidence of Achievement in Service**

The University Policy states in Section III.B.3 that evidence of achievement in Service may include:

- “Leadership and/or demonstrable contributions in faculty elective bodies and service on committees at program, department, college or school and University levels.
- Leadership and/or demonstrable contributions in national and/or international professional organizations.
- Service to individual students and/or student organizations.
- Promotion of the University through extramural activities, such as recruitment events, alumni affairs, etc.
- Other forms of service to the profession, external associations, etc.”

In addition, the Westphal College interprets service to include administrative appointments of all kinds, as well as assistance provided to colleagues, organization of student activities and competitions, and any special assignments or undertakings that contribute to the mission of the University, service to the profession, and community service. The Westphal College recognizes that those with the additional responsibilities of an administrative appointment, such as a Program Director, may have a different proportion of accomplishments in the three categories: Teaching, Research, and Service, and this will be taken into account in the review process.

## **IV. The Promotion Review**

University Policy states in Section IV: “Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor typically accompanies the awarding of tenure; however, in some academic units, promotion to Associate Professor may occur prior to tenure consideration.

Normally, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should have served no less than five years in rank as an Associate Professor. A tenure-track faculty member appointed as Associate Professor shall not seek promotion to the rank of Professor in the same year as consideration for tenure. Requests to be considered for early promotion or promotion to Professor as the time of tenure consideration must be approved by the Office of the Provost before the promotion process is initiated.”

In the Westphal College, a recommendation to grant tenure to a candidate who is an Assistant Professor normally implies a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Nevertheless, the Department Review Committee, the Department Head, and the Dean shall include an explicit recommendation for promotion in a recommendation to grant tenure to a candidate who is an Assistant Professor. Promotion to Full Professor in the Westphal College is covered in Section VII of this Policy.

## **V. Review Committees and External Reviewers**

### **A. Review Committees**

The University Policy states in Section V.A: “When a tenure and promotion review committee is established, formal procedures must be followed. For tenure cases, only tenured faculty may participate in votes. General orderliness of record is important regarding dates and attendance of meetings, evidence considered, votes taken, manner of voting, and outcome. Once the review process has begun, candidates are not permitted to have access to any of the materials reviewed by the tenure and promotion review committee.”

The University Policy continues in Section V.A: “New developments related to a candidate’s research, teaching, and/or service occurring after the application is submitted for the tenure/promotion review process will be considered at the time such developments occur. Reconsideration of decisions or recommendations at earlier stages of the review process is not permitted; however, such developments may impact the review going forward. Further, in the event an allegation of misconduct arises during a candidate’s review process, it is the University’s policy to refer such allegation to the appropriate University office for investigation. Depending on the severity of the alleged misconduct and the timing of the tenure review process, the Office of the Provost reserves the right to suspend the review, including the awarding of tenure, until the investigation is completed.”

Within the Westphal College, a separate Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (“Review Committee”) shall be constituted to review each candidate rather than having a single Department Committee to review all candidates for that year. This has been necessary historically because most departments contain more than one discipline, and the aim is to include as many committee members as possible that are either in the candidate’s discipline or have a working knowledge of that discipline.

## **B. External Reviewers**

### **1. Overview**

The University Policy states in Section V.B.1: “In determining a candidate’s professional standing, the University looks to nationally- and/or internationally-recognized experts external to the University. There must be at least six external reviewers associated with each tenure and/or promotion case. Following the election or appointment of a committee chair for any tenure and promotion review committee, the first order of business is to identify and secure a sufficient number of qualified external reviewers. In the best of circumstances, external reviewers provide highly informed, candid, and comprehensive evaluations of the body of work under review. In effect, the external reviewer speaks to the University, regarding the number and quality of the elements that compose the candidate’s body of work, its appropriateness within, and contribution to, the discipline or field (including interdisciplinary fields), and to the expectation that the University may reasonably hold in regard to future professional direction and probability of success. Accordingly, the selection of external reviewers is a matter to be taken most seriously.”

### **2. Selection Process**

The University Policy stipulates the selection process for the six or more external reviewers that must be chosen by the Review Committee, stating in Section V.B.2: “The majority of external reviewers will be selected by members of the initial tenure and promotion review committee from a list of potential reviewers generated exclusively by the tenure and promotion committee. Two additional external reviewers will be selected by the tenure and promotion review committee from a list of six potential reviewers generated by the candidate. In order to ensure that external reviewers may respond in a timely manner, their selection will be completed by the time of submission of the tenure dossier by the candidate. The slate of proposed external reviewers must be approved by the Dean (or equivalent) of the academic unit. Brief biographies of all external reviewers must be included in the Tenure/Promotion dossier. Reviewers may be contacted in advance to ensure their availability. Responses by all external reviewers must be included in the report. In rare instances, there may be no response from an external reviewer who has agreed to provide a review; this is to be reported but no conclusions will be drawn regarding the lack of response.” Because the Review Committee will receive the candidate’s list of six potential external reviewers before it generates its own list of potential reviewers (according to the process outlined in this Policy), the Committee will be able to ensure that there will be no overlap between the two lists.

### **3. Selection Criteria for External Reviewers**

The University Policy states in Section V.B.3: “External reviewers will be nationally and/or internationally recognized experts in their respective disciplines or interdisciplinary fields and come from academic or research institutions of high stature, typically at or above the stature of the University. In some cases, an external reviewer may be affiliated with a highly regarded program at an institution not recognized to be at or above the stature of the University. In such a case, evidence must be provided that the choice of external reviewer is appropriate, for example,



by demonstrating that the program of the institution or the work of a particular researcher is particularly important.”

The University Policy continues to state in Section V.B.3: “For tenure review, external reviewers will typically be members of the professoriate who hold tenure and, preferably, who hold the rank of ‘Professor,’ although tenured Associate Professors may also be selected on some occasions. In addition, highly recognized individuals in non-academic positions may be consulted provided they can provide a perspective on the candidate and recognize the standards and implications of the granting of tenure.” Because the majority of the disciplines in the Westphal College involve creative work that must compete in the marketplace, the reality is that many of the nationally and/or internationally recognized experts in these fields will be found outside of academia. Depending on the particular candidate in the Westphal College, up to 50% of the external reviewers may consist of these “highly recognized individuals in non-academic positions” who are photographers, filmmakers, animators, artists, designers, music producers, entrepreneurs in creative industries, etc. It is important, however, that these external reviewers understand that their reviews of the candidate’s creative work must be thorough and objective, and “recognize the standards and implications of the granting of tenure” at an academic institution.

Furthermore, external reviewers may not have a close personal or professional connection with the candidate. The University Policy states in Section V.B.3: “External reviewers must be at ‘arms length’ from the candidate. 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 (4-5 years). However, individuals co-serving with the candidate in positions such as in professional societies or editorial boards may provide reviews.” Additional examples of a potential external reviewer having a close professional connection with the candidate include having been an employer or employee at any time in the past. Although they are excluded as external reviewers, the candidate may submit their names to the Review Committee as possible sources from which the Review Committee could solicit letters. The University Policy states in Section V.B.3: “External reviewers will be asked and are expected to disclose any personal or business relationships with the candidate and state their ability to make an independent and unbiased judgment on [their] accomplishments.”

The candidate’s list of six potential external reviewers submitted to the Review Committee should include the following information about the reviewers: positions, addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, and a brief biography. The candidate should not contact anyone on the list during the tenure and promotion process. From this list, the Review Committee shall choose two and only two people. By the fourth week of the spring term, the Review Committee shall select at least four additional external reviewers. The list of at least six external reviewers (the two chosen by the candidate and the remainder chosen by the Review Committee) shall be submitted to the Dean for approval. Once the list has been approved, the Review Committee shall contact the people on the list. If there are any who do not accept the responsibility, the Review Committee will submit other names to the Dean’s Office for approval. The final outcome shall be a list of at least six external reviewers, two chosen from the candidate’s list and the remainder chosen from the Review Committee’s list, with brief biographies for each external

reviewer attached. Both the letters and the biographies from the external reviewers will need to be available in digital form.

The University Policy states in Section V.B.3: “Cover letters to reviewers should provide information on the policies of the University and academic program regarding tenure and promotion as well as indicate the criteria on which the candidate is being considered. 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.” The Review Committee’s letter to each external reviewer shall state clearly that the reviewer is being asked to evaluate only the research, scholarship and/or creative work of the candidate. The Review Committee shall also ask each external reviewer to answer the following questions in their letter:

- In what capacity, if any, do you know the candidate?
- Do you judge the quality and quantity of the elements of the candidate’s body of work to be at a high-level of achievement?
- Does the candidate’s work hold the promise for significant future achievement?

The letter to each external reviewer should also state that it is Drexel University’s policy to keep the external reviewer’s letter confidential and to share it only with committee members and administrators, who are part of the process of making recommendations on promotion and tenure.

## **VI. The Tenure Review Process within the Westphal College**

### **A. Constitution of the Department Tenure and Promotion Review Committee**

A separate Department Tenure and Promotion Review Committee (“Review Committee”) shall be constituted to review each candidate by the end of the eighth week of classes in winter term year prior to the candidate being scheduled for tenure review. In consultation with the Dean and the Academic Council, the Department Head shall appoint five tenured faculty members as members of the Review Committee, at least one of who must be in the Department and at least one of who must be outside of the Department. The aim is to include as many tenured faculty members as possible who are either in the candidate’s discipline or who have a working knowledge of the candidate’s discipline. When there is more than one Review Committee in a department, there may be an overlap of no more than three members between Committees. The Department Head and the Dean shall mutually approve the final composition of the Review Committee. Before the end of winter term, the Department Head shall meet with and charge the Review Committee, outlining procedures and expectations. Note: If the Department Head has any questions about procedures and expectations, they shall consult the Dean and/ or the Academic Associate Dean prior to charging the Review Committee. At the meeting, the members of the Review Committee shall elect a Chair and a Secretary. The Chair must have served on a Tenure Review Committee before, although they do not have to be in the same discipline as the candidate.

Once the Tenure Review Committee has been formed, the members of that committee may not act as mentors to the candidate in regard to matters of tenure for the duration of the Tenure Review process, because they will have stepped into the role of evaluators of the candidate.

## **B. Review Committee: Initial Process**

Immediately following its first meeting, the Chair of the Tenure Review Committee shall communicate in written form to the candidate the following due dates and requirements:

- The due date for a list of six potential external reviewers who meet the criteria for external reviewers, as specified by the Westphal College and Drexel University.
- The due date for the following to be delivered to the Department Head per the Tenure and Promotion calendar: the complete Tenure/Promotion Dossier in digital form; and the Materials for External Review (needed for six or more external reviewers) in digital form, unless requested in a non-digital form by external reviewers, which will contain the curriculum vitae, the personal statement, the brief explanations of teaching and service as described in Section VI.D “Materials for External Review,” and the subset of the dossier concerning research, scholarship, and creative work.

The specifics of the Tenure/Promotion Dossier, and the Materials for External Review are given in Section C below.

Once the Review Committee receives the list of six potential external reviewers from the candidate, it will then proceed to compile a list of its own potential external reviewers. There can be no overlap between the two lists. The Review Committee must obtain approval of the slate of external reviewers from the Dean before asking the external reviewers if they wish to serve. If there is an external reviewer who does not wish to serve in this role, then the Review Committee must present another potential external reviewer to the Dean for approval. To adhere to the Provost’s Policy, this vetting process must finally elicit at least six external reviewers, with two, and only two, chosen from the candidate’s list.

Throughout the process, the Review Committee may delineate matters of procedure and deadlines to the candidate in writing. There is usually no need to meet with the candidate. The only exception would be to gain pertinent and specific information that the Review Committee believes it needs from the candidate and can obtain in no other way.

## **C. Tenure/Promotion Dossier**

The University Policy refers to the candidate’s “Tenure/Promotion Dossier.” Within this Policy, the term “Dossier” will have equivalent meaning.

In the creation of the dossier, the candidate has the opportunity to explain their particular niche in the discipline, and the trajectory of their work over the pre-tenure period. The development and progress of the candidate's work should be clearly articulated so that both those who are in the field and those who are outside the field will understand and appreciate the candidate's ongoing, evolving record of achievement.

Typically, a dossier should be entirely digital in form, for both submission to the Dean's Office and the Office of the Provost. There may be instances, however, when non-digital materials are requested, such as an external reviewer requesting non-digital materials. In this case, the Review Committee will communicate any non-digital requests (of the dossier or materials) directly to the candidate to determine if the request can be accommodated. The cost of providing non-digital materials will be covered by the Department.

The dossier shall represent in a clear, accurate, and practical manner the candidate's performance since starting their tenure-track position at Drexel (or in the case of someone granted credit for prior service, since the start of the equivalent period of five years) up to August 31 of the year of review. It shall include the following:

- A curriculum vitae (please note that it is only the curriculum vitae that should detail the faculty member's entire career)
- A brief personal statement describing the candidate's development and accomplishments in Research, Teaching, and Service over the pre-tenure period
- Materials documenting the candidate's accomplishments in the three performance categories over that same period
- Appendices as necessary

Please note also that the Review Committee shall not request Annual Reviews or the Mid-term Review, nor should the candidate include them in the Dossier. Since access to Annual Reviews and the Mid-term Review is appropriate to the Department Head's level and above, those are the levels where the relevancy of including specific information from Annual Reviews or the Mid-term Review for the particular candidate's Tenure Review will be decided.

The Research, Scholarship and Creative Work Category should include an explanation of the candidate's accomplishments and a selection of supporting materials. It should be kept in mind that this is the section that will be sent to external reviewers. Accordingly, the explanation must be at a level that will make the nature and value of the work clear to a peer professional, and the supporting materials must document the work effectively.

The Teaching Category shall include a statement of teaching philosophy, an overview of all courses taught, a summary of ratings of all courses taught in the pre-tenure period and no more than six complete sets of course evaluations (or equivalent department summaries of course

evaluations) which may be placed within appendices for the Teaching Category. The overview of all courses taught shall include a comprehensive list of those courses (arranged by course number) with brief course descriptions, and a compilation of the candidate's teaching charts (the same that are used in each year's Annual Review), which include the following information for each course: course prefix, course number, section number, course title, credit hours, meeting days and times, and the number of graded students. Other materials may also be included in appendices, such as syllabi, handouts, descriptions of assignments, examples of student work produced in the candidate's courses, and any other materials that demonstrate performance in teaching. The Teaching Category may also include information on curricular or course development and information on the mentoring of students.

Because the candidate's teaching will be assessed during the tenure review process using multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness, it is suggested that a candidate offer varied material to aid the Review Committee (and the administrators at subsequent levels) in building a case for teaching that includes several different means of assessment. For example, indicators of a candidate's teaching ability may include not only course evaluations, but also student recognition or honors gained from work produced in the candidate's courses; noteworthy alumni achievements that have resulted from the candidate's teaching; recognition of the quality of the candidate's instructional methods; or acknowledgement of the originality of the courses that the candidate has created. If the candidate has received unsolicited written comments from faculty who have observed their classes, then these may also be included in the section on Teaching. The candidate may also choose to submit a list of faculty members that have observed their teaching to the Review Committee. The Review Committee may then choose to request letters from these faculty members.

The Service Category shall present an overview of the service performed during the pre-tenure period and any documentation of service that is relevant.

#### **D. Materials for External Review**

Because Westphal and University policies restrict the external review to the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work Category, only the curriculum vitae, the personal statement, the brief explanations of teaching and service, and the subset of the dossier pertaining to research, scholarship, and creative work shall be sent to the external reviewers. These Materials for External Review shall be provided digitally, unless requested in a non-digital form by external reviewers and agreed to by the candidate. The Materials for External Review shall contain the same curriculum vitae, personal statement, and section on research, scholarship, and creative work that are contained in the dossier. To provide context for the external reviewers concerning the teaching and service loads under which the candidate has produced their research, scholarship, and/or creative work, the candidate should include a comprehensive list of courses taught (arranged by course number) with brief course descriptions, and a compilation of the candidate's teaching charts (the same that are used in each year's Faculty Annual Review Form), which include the following information for each course: course prefix, course number, section number, course title, credit hours, meeting days and times, and the number of graded students. A brief explanation of the candidate's service during the pre-tenure period shall also be included.

## **E. Review Committee: Information Gathering Phase through Completion of Report**

The Review Committee will be instructed on how to create a secure digital storage site (per university requirements) which will be used for all sharing of material among Review Committee members for the duration of the process. Since the digital site will ensure confidentiality, other electronic means (including email) may not be used for sharing confidential materials by Review Committee members.

After receiving the dossier and accompanying materials, the Review Committee will upload this material to the digital site. The first step for the Review Committee will be to send the Materials for External Review to the external reviewers. As a second step, the Review Committee will enter its information gathering phase and shall invite written assessments of the candidate's performance and promise by tenured faculty in the candidate's program, department, and in the rest of the Westphal College. The Review Committee may also choose to invite the following additional documentation:

- Written assessments from alumni of the candidate's teaching
- Written assessments from other tenured, tenure-track, auxiliary, adjunct, or professional Drexel colleagues as deemed appropriate by the Review Committee or suggested by the candidate.

In requesting letters, the Review Committee shall make the following clear:

- The letter-writer shall comment only on direct observations of the candidate's performance.
- The letter-writer shall comment only on what he or she knows concerning the candidate's performance in the three categories (Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work; Teaching; and Service) and not on matters that fall outside these categories.

The Review Committee shall consider all of the requested letters and any other letters submitted to the Review Committee on behalf of the candidate. All the collected letters will be included in the Confidential Information Gathering Folder, which the Review Committee will create on the secure digital site, and which will contain other materials as outlined in the last paragraph of this section. The only exception to including a letter would be if the Review Committee receives a letter that does not reasonably adhere to the criteria and/or which alleges misconduct on the part of the candidate. In this case, the Chair of the Review Committee shall consult (without divulging the author or the specific content of the letter) with the Dean and the Academic Associate Dean on what to do with the letter. If needed, the Dean and the Academic Associate Dean may then consult with the Provost's Office on how to proceed.

In addition, the Review Committee shall create a Summary of the Internal Review Committee Process, which shall consist of orderly and succinct records regarding dates and attendance of Committee meetings, evidence considered, votes taken, manner of voting, any other appropriate actions, and their outcomes.

In its review, the Review Committee shall address all major elements of the evidence. In the assessment of Teaching, the Review Committee shall judge the candidate's teaching based on multiple indicators of teaching effectiveness that the candidate has provided. If, in the course of its review, the Review Committee should desire clarifying information from the candidate, the Review Committee shall request it in writing. The candidate is then expected to provide a prompt response. The Review Committee shall not have access to the Mid-term Review or the Annual Performance Reviews for the candidate.

The Review Committee shall have completed its review and submitted the Review Committee's Report to the Department Head per the Provost's Tenure and Promotion calendar due date. The Review Committee shall make a recommendation that states either that tenure and promotion should be granted or that tenure and promotion should be denied. The rationale for the Review Committee's recommendation shall be clearly and fully stated. The Review Committee's vote shall be noted, maintaining the confidentiality of the individual committee members. If the vote is not unanimous, dissenting views regarding the candidate's suitability for tenure and promotion shall be clearly and fully stated in the report. All members of the Review Committee shall sign the Review Committee's Report.

The Review Committee shall provide a copy of the Review Committee's Report to the candidate at the same time that it is submitted to the Department Head. The candidate shall acknowledge receipt of the Review Committee's Report to the Review Committee Chair, with a copy to the Department Head, and may include a written response by the date indicated in the Provost's Tenure and Promotion calendar.

At the conclusion of the Review Committee's process, the Confidential Information Gathering Folder on the secure digital site will contain the following:

- Summary of the Internal Review Committee Process
- List of external reviewers with biographies
- External reviewers' letters
- Letters from faculty, students, and alumni
- All other confidential documentation acquired by the Review Committee.

The Confidential Information Gathering Folder will only be shared with successive levels of approval within the tenure review process and not with the candidate. In addition, the Review Committee's secure digital storage site will include the candidate's dossier, the list of the Department Review Committee members, the Review Committee's Report, as well as the candidate's acknowledgment and possible response to this Report. The Review Committee will be instructed on how to provide this information to the Department Head.

## **F. The Department Head's Review**

The Department Head shall conduct an independent review of the candidate's case for tenure. This review will include the Tenure Dossier, all the materials available to the Review Committee, the Review Committee's Report, the candidate's written response, if any, to the Report, as well as the Department Head's knowledge of the candidate's performance during the pre-tenure period. To resolve ambiguities or disagreements, the Department Head may communicate with the Review Committee chairperson and, in some cases, with the candidate about these ambiguities or disagreements.

By the date indicated in the Provost's Tenure and Promotion calendar, the Department Head shall submit their signed Department Head's Report in digital form to the Dean. The Department Head shall simultaneously submit a copy of their Report to the candidate.

The candidate shall acknowledge receipt of the Department Head's Report to the Department Head, the Dean, and the Academic Associate Dean within one week of receiving the Department Head Report. The acknowledgement may include a written response to the Department Head's Report.

The Department Head will be instructed on how to provide the material stored on the secure digital site to the Dean, which will include the Department Head's Report, the Review Committee's Report, the candidate's acknowledgments and possible responses to these Reports, the candidate's dossier, a list of the Department Review Committee members, and the Confidential Information Gathering Folder, as outlined in Section VI.E.

## **G. The Dean's Review and the Advisory Committee**

By Nov. 1, the Dean may elect to appoint three to five tenured faculty members to form an Advisory Committee, which will not constitute another level of judgment, but will aid the Dean in their independent review. The Advisory Committee may include faculty from outside the Westphal College, but the majority must be from within the College. If the Dean chooses to appoint an Advisory Committee, it shall review the complete materials of all candidates and may ask the Chairs of the Review Committee and/or the Department Heads to discuss aspects of the cases with the Advisory Committee. These discussions must take place by finals' week of the fall term.

The advice from the Advisory Committee (if appointed) is part of the Dean's independent review of the candidate's case, which shall also include all the materials available to the Department Head. To resolve ambiguities or disagreements, the Dean may communicate with the Department Head, the Review Committee chairperson, and, in some cases, the candidate. The Dean is encouraged to clearly address any discrepancies between their view and the views expressed in the Review Committee Report or the Department Head Report regarding the significance of the candidate's achievements. If the Dean intends to render a judgment different from that of either the Review Committee or the Department Head, it is suggested that the Dean meet with the chair of the Review Committee and the Department Head together before completing their Report.



Per the date required in the Provost's Tenure and Promotion calendar the Dean shall send their signed digital Report to the candidate. Within two weeks of receiving the Dean's Report, the candidate will acknowledge receipt of the copy of the Dean's Report and state any objections in writing.

By the date specified in the Provost's Tenure and Promotion calendar, the Dean's Office will upload all required digital materials to the Provost's tenure review site including: the Dean's Report, the Department Head's Report, the Review Committee's Report, the candidate's acknowledgments and possible responses to these reports, the candidate's dossier, a list of the Department Review Committee members, and the Confidential Information Gathering Folder, as outlined in Section VI.E.

## **H. The Provost's Review**

The Provost's Review, as well as the subsequent steps of the tenure and promotion process, are governed by the University Tenure and Promotion Policy. Please consult that policy and the Office of the Provost's published schedule for further information.

# **VII. The Promotion Review: Rank of Professor**

## **A. Eligibility**

The University Policy states in Section IV: "Normally, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should have served no less than five years in rank as an Associate Professor." In addition, the University Policy states in Section IV: "A candidate considered for promotion to the rank of Professor must be reviewed only by fellow faculty at the rank of Professor."

In the Westphal College, an eligible faculty member interested in pursuing promotion to the rank of Professor shall be considered for promotion only when the Dean agrees with the Department Head (if at the rank of Professor) that a favorable outcome seems reasonably likely. If the Department Head of a potential candidate is not at the rank of Professor, or if the potential candidate is indeed a Department Head, then that eligible faculty member shall be considered for promotion only when the Dean deems that a favorable outcome seems reasonably likely.

The potential candidate shall initiate the necessary discussions outlined above in the fall term of the academic year prior to the academic year in which the review would take place. If the Dean (and the Department Head, if at the rank of Professor) have deemed that a favorable outcome is reasonably likely, then the candidate shall declare their intention to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor by writing to the Dean by the deadline stated in the Provost's Tenure and Promotion Calendar.

## **B. Criteria**

In the Westphal College, promotion to the rank of Professor requires that the candidate be judged outstanding to a degree clearly beyond that which would have been required for promotion to Associate Professor. Judgment of a candidate's case for promotion considers the candidate's achievements in all three categories of performance: Teaching, Research, and Service. The University Policy states in section IV: "Criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor include further significant contributions to knowledge and teaching, a record of continued growth in research, scholarship and creative work, and further promise of achieving appropriate high national/international prominence, strong mentorship of students, and interdisciplinary activities, where possible." Therefore, in the area of research, scholarship, and creative work, the faculty member shall demonstrate further promise (from when the candidate received promotion to Associate Professor) of achieving appropriate high national/international prominence. In the area of teaching, the faculty member shall have achieved demonstrable success, consistency, and currency. In the area of service, the faculty member shall have engaged fully in the academic life of the college and/or the university and exercised notable leadership since achieving tenure. Service to the academic discipline on a local, national, or international level shall also be taken into consideration. In addition, the candidate shall demonstrate the likelihood that their overall performance will continue at this high level of achievement.

The judgment of performance in each category is to be made with reference to prevailing standards within Drexel University, at comparable academic institutions, and in the candidate's area(s) of professional expertise. If a positive recommendation is made, there is the expectation that the candidate will continue performing at a level appropriate to the rank of Professor.

## **C. The Review Process**

### **1. The Professor Promotion Committee and the Professor Dossier**

The Professor Promotion Committee ("the Promotion Committee") shall consist of three faculty members that are tenured and have the rank of Professor, one of who may be external to the Westphal College. The Dean shall appoint faculty to the Promotion Committee by the eighth week of the winter term in the academic year prior to the academic year in which there will be candidates to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor. The Promotion Committee shall handle all cases for promotion to the rank of Professor within the Westphal College for that year. Before the end of the winter term, the Dean or the Academic Associate Dean (if at the rank of Professor) shall meet with the Promotion Committee and charge the Promotion Committee, outlining all procedures and expectations.

At the start of its work, the Promotion Committee will be instructed on how to create a secure digital storage site (per university requirements) which will be used for all sharing of material among Promotion Committee members for the duration of the process. Since the digital site will ensure confidentiality, other electronic means (including email) may not be used for sharing confidential materials by Promotion Committee members.

The Promotion Committee shall elect a Chair and a Secretary. Before the end of the winter term, the Promotion Committee shall ask, in writing, the candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor to submit their lists of six potential external reviewers by the first week of spring term. The Promotion Committee shall choose two external reviewers from the list of six potential reviewers that the candidate will provide. The Promotion Committee shall independently secure at least four more external reviewers.

The Professor Dossier, as well as Materials for External Review representing the candidate's accomplishments in the category of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work, shall be submitted per the Provost's Tenure and Promotion Calendar due date. After receiving the dossier and accompanying materials, the Promotion Committee will upload this material to the secure digital storage site. In general, the criteria for the Professor Dossier are the same as for Tenure/Promotion Dossier, as outlined in Sections VI.C and VI.D. In addition, all criteria that apply to external reviewers for tenure review shall also apply to external reviewers for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Typically, the Professor Dossier shall be entirely digital in form, for both submission to the Dean's Office and the Office of the Provost. There may be instances, however, when non-digital materials are requested, such as an external reviewer requesting non-digital materials. In this case, the Promotion Committee will communicate any non-digital requests (of the dossier or materials) directly to the candidate to determine if the request can be accommodated. The cost of providing non-digital materials will be covered by the Department.

## **2. Professor Promotion Committee's Review Process**

The Professor Promotion Committee's review begins with the dossier presented by the candidate. In addition, the Promotion Committee shall procure the following documentation:

- An evaluation of a selection of the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative work by two and only two external reviewers chosen by the candidate and four more external reviewers chosen by the Promotion Committee. The Dean shall approve the final list of six external reviewers.
- Written assessments of the candidate's achievements by their department, college, and appropriate university colleagues who are tenured

The Promotion Committee may also request written assessments from other tenured, tenure-track, auxiliary, adjunct, or professional Drexel colleagues as deemed appropriate by the Promotion Committee or suggested by the candidate. All written assessments and other submitted letters will be included in the Confidential Information Gathering Folder, which the Promotion Committee will create on the secure digital site, and which will contain other materials as outlined in the last paragraph of this section.

In addition, the Promotion Committee shall create a Summary of the Internal Review Committee Process, which shall consist of orderly and succinct records regarding dates and attendance of Committee meetings, evidence considered, votes taken, manner of voting, any other appropriate actions, and their outcomes.

Per the date required in the Provost's Tenure and Promotion Calendar, the Professor Promotion Committee shall have completed its reviews and submitted written, signed reports to the Dean and simultaneously to the candidates. The candidates shall acknowledge receipt of the Report. Within one week, the candidates may also submit to the Dean, with a copy to the Professor Promotion Committee Chairperson, a written response to the Promotion Committee's Report.

At the conclusion of the Promotion Committee's process, the Confidential Information Gathering Folder on the secure digital site will contain the following:

- Summary of the Internal Promotion Committee Process
- List of external reviewers with biographies
- External reviewers' letters
- Written assessments from tenured faculty
- All other confidential documentation acquired by the Promotion Committee.

The Confidential Information Gathering Folder will only be shared with successive levels of approval within the promotion process and not with the candidate. In addition, the Promotion Committee's secure digital storage site for each candidate will include the candidate's dossier, the list of the Promotion Committee members, the Promotion Committee's Report, as well as the candidate's acknowledgment and possible response to this Report. The Promotion Committee will be instructed on how to provide this information to the Dean.

### **3. Dean's Review**

The Dean shall conduct an independent review of the candidate's case for promotion to the rank of Professor. This review shall include all the materials available to the Promotion Committee and the Promotion Committee's Report. The review may also include an interview with the candidate.

Per the due date in the Provost's Tenure and Promotion Calendar, the Dean will submit their signed Report to each of the candidates being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor. The candidates shall acknowledge receipt of the Report. Within two weeks, the candidates may also submit to the Dean a written response to the Dean's Report.

By the date specified in the Provost's Tenure and Promotion calendar, the Dean's Office will upload all required digital materials for each candidate to the Provost's site including: the Dean's Report, the Promotion Committee's Report, the candidate's acknowledgments and possible responses to these reports, the candidate's dossier, a list of the Promotion Committee members, and the Confidential Information Gathering Folder, as outlined in Section VII.C.2.

## **VIII. Applicability**

This Westphal Tenure and Promotion Policy, including revisions after initial approval, shall become effective on the date of approval by Westphal tenured faculty (noted on the first page of this Policy). This Policy shall take precedence over all prior tenure and promotion policies in the Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts & Design. It shall apply to all faculty members whose tenure-track appointments begin after the approval date of this Policy, and to all faculty members whose tenure-track appointments began before this date, albeit with any necessary adjustments for procedures already carried out under a prior policy.

For the review of candidates whose tenure-track appointments began before the date of approval (noted on the first page of this Policy), but who will be reviewed under this Policy, any adjustments in scheduling or other aspects of the review required by University policy or procedures, or this Policy or procedures, shall be made as their necessity becomes evident and shall be communicated in a timely fashion to the candidate, the Department Head, the Dean, and (if occurring in the candidate's year of review for tenure and promotion, or promotion to the rank of Professor) the Department Tenure Review Committee or Full Professor Promotion Committee, as constituted according to this Policy.

The Westphal College reserves the right to make future revisions to this Tenure and Promotion Policy. Any such revisions will undergo the same process of examination of the existing policy and authorship of a revision by a Task Force created for that sole purpose, followed by vetting by the Dean and the Provost, and approval by Westphal tenured faculty. Tenure and promotion candidates, and all others involved in tenure and promotion in the Westphal College, are advised to stay current with updated versions of the Westphal Tenure & Promotion Policy.