THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

I. Introduction

It is understood that all College and Departmental guidelines will adhere to the University’s Administrative Guidelines for AC-23 (Guidelines) Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations and to Provost’s Office directives. They will be updated accordingly. Given the diversity of departments and schools within the College, schools and departments may construct discipline-specific guidelines which, however, must be consonant with these guidelines. The dean is responsible for reviewing college and unit guidelines annually and incorporating recommendations as appropriate from college promotion and tenure committee and Provost’s Office. The dean will consult with the academic unit heads and college promotion and tenure committee on annual updates.

II. PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

A. “Promotion shall be based on recognized performance and achievement in each of the several areas, as appropriate to the particular responsibilities assigned to the faculty member. Tenure shall be based on the potential for further achievement in the several areas enumerated above as indicated by performance during the provisional appointment. The presumption is that a positive tenure decision for an assistant professor is sufficient to warrant promotion to associate professor.” (Guidelines, II.)

B. In addition to the general criteria listed in AC-23, the College of Arts and Architecture is often concerned with more specific values.

1. The College regards the quality of teaching, the quality of research or creative accomplishment, and the quality of outreach and public service all to be important.
2. The integration of these three elements is also highly valued.
3. One alternative assessment documenting teaching effectiveness should be included in dossiers for each academic year beginning with academic year 2020-2021
4. It is the unit head’s responsibility to make clear to every faculty member what is expected in each of these areas and assure that this information is present in the dossier. Each unit head should describe these responsibilities carefully in the front of the appropriate section of the dossier and note how these responsibilities may be weighted differently on an annual basis.
5. It is expected that there is correlation between the annual evaluations, goals, and assignments for the faculty member and the unit head’s expectations outlined for each section of the dossier.

C. Given the diversity of departments and schools within the College, schools and departments may construct discipline-specific guidelines which, however, must be consonant with these guidelines.

D. University promotion and tenure guidelines require consistent use of specific descriptors for the area of teaching, which the College has adopted for all categories.

EXCELLENT – The responsibilities and expectations of the position are exceeded in a sustained, outstanding manner.

VERY GOOD – The responsibilities and expectations of the position are exceeded.

SATISFACTORY – The responsibilities and expectations of the position are met at a basic level.

UNSATISFACTORY – The responsibilities of the position are not fulfilled.

E. Only one evaluative statement letter is written and should contain the committee’s overall vote for each promotion and/or tenure action. The aim should be to arrive at a unanimous decision for the overall recommendation as well as for the evaluative descriptor for each section of the dossier. If unanimity is not possible, the Committee should record the vote count and then justify the rationale for the majority and the minority opinions for each descriptor and, if necessary, for the overall recommendation. (University Guidelines, V, H)

F. The unit’s nomination to full professor guidelines must be reflected in the college guidelines.

G. For promotion to full reviews, when the peer review committee does not recommend promotion and the department head/school director agrees, after consulting with the dean of the academic unit the department head/school director should discuss with the candidate the advisability of withdrawing the dossier.

F. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

1. The College is dedicated to maintaining rigorous academic standards with an awareness of the particular needs and aims of its individual departments and schools. Thus, the faculty member is responsible for the recognition of a student’s talents and abilities and for fostering them both by means of effective teaching and by setting an example in creativity, performance, exhibition activity, or scholarship, as may be appropriate to the discipline. In addition to inculcating a mastery of subject matter, instruction is to be directed toward developing the student’s ability to communicate.

2. The College requires all sections of all courses be evaluated by the SRTE every time it is taught, except when there are fewer than five students in the class, whereby the students’ anonymity might be compromised. The results from each of these evaluations must be included in the dossier as well as inform annual and extended reviews.

3. In addition to the list of courses taught and SRTE evaluations, the unit average for SRTE’s produced by the Office of Academic Affairs should be included and noted by reviewers.

4. Student comments from SRTE’s, organized in themes and patterns of comments, should be included.

5. Any solicitation of additional student comments or interviews of groups of students should include allstudents who have been taught by the candidate or a random selection of students. Other criteria, such as a class grade or recommendations of specific students, should not be used to select students.

6. In some divisions of the College, a great deal of teaching is extended beyond the classroom. Therefore, in evaluating teaching in such areas, one may also judge the conduct of rehearsals, workshops, and critiques. Peer observations of these activities may be included as peer review.

7. Peer review often includes classroom observations as well as observation of teaching outside the classroom. It may also include observation of student success in later coursework.

8. Letters of peers regarding teaching should be based on observations of teaching situations. Additional letters not based on observation of teaching should not be included.

9. Student achievements in competitions, awards, advanced graduate study, and placement in careers provide further assessment of teaching effectiveness.

10. In areas where the normal operation of the department/school requires working closely with other faculty members and students, it is expected that the candidate will interact with those individuals in an effective and productive manner.

11. In graduate programs, teaching is considered to include the supervision of dissertations, theses, or graduate projects and the guiding of advanced students toward professional careers. Advising and mentoring are part of the teaching process.

G. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments

“It is expected that units encourage and support collaborative and interdisciplinary research [and creative accomplishments] and that units will develop methods to assess these activities.” (Guidelines, II, D)

Creative or interpretive contributions in design, visual, and performing arts are of special importance in the College of Arts and Architecture. Artistic creation and scholarly research are valued equally. Accomplishments are expected to be of high quality and of artistic, scholarly, and/or professional significance and impact. The College expects faculty members to be professional role models for students through an active commitment to research and/or creative activity.

1. Contributions may include: new works of art; design (architectural, landscape, graphic design, theatre); musical or theatrical performance; scholarly publication; preparation of and participation in exhibitions; commissioned and professional work; other comparable artistic and scholarly achievements.

2. There should be evidence of a thorough understanding of a faculty member’s particular discipline through attendance, participation, and presentation at scholarly and professional meetings.

3. There should also be evidence of a recognized reputation in the subject matter field as shown by invitations to lecture, to serve on panels, or to be a visiting artist, architect, scholar, judge, juror, or referee.

4. The development of new courses and the refinement of existing courses in the faculty members discipline can also be cited as evidence of scholarship and mastery of subject matter.

5. Any letters by internal peers should be solicited by the unit head and comply with Guidelines, III.C.9.

H. Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession

The dossier should contain evidence of the faculty member’s contributions to departmental, college, and university committees and programs, and to the public through the extension of specialized knowledge and service to local, state and national service and professional organizations. Letters of peer observation of effective participation in university service are appropriate and may be solicited by the unit head. (Guidelines, III.C.9)

III. PREPARATION OF DOSSIERS –

Please see Attachment A for deadlines that are updated annually

A. The preparation of the dossier is the responsibility of department heads/school directors, in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed.

1. Guidelines section III, D, speak to the importance of dissemination of information. The College dean works with unit heads and staff to ensure the dissemination through workshops, mentoring, and private consultation.

2. The preparation of the factual materials to be included in the dossier should be completed by the candidate no later than September 1, allowing time for review and revisions as necessary at the unit level.

B. External evaluators of the candidate’s creative accomplishment and research are approved by the dean.

1. The candidate should suggest outside evaluators to the department head/school director who will add additional names not suggested by the candidate.

2. Lists of suggestions for external names of reviewers for all promotion and tenure candidates will be submitted to the Dean's Office no later than May 1 using Attachment B: External Reviewer Form. The dean may add additional names to the list.

3. Please make notations of the nature of any personal/professional knowledge of the person. Some of our professional worlds are very small and we must work on as much objectivity in external reviewers as possible. Please include comparable institutions (e.g. CIC, AAU, or major research university; land-grant, etc.) or some explanation about why a recommendation for a smaller, regional, or private institution or university may be a better place for comparison (e.g. North Texas for music; RISD for visual arts, etc.) Though exceptions for comparable universities may be well-known among our discrete disciplines, the review letters that go forward with external review letters from smaller universities have to be explained in order to educate the university wide committee.

4. Once the list is approved, you will receive a memo from the dean indicating the next step in the process of who to ask, etc. Unit heads will contact potential external evaluators to secure their agreement to submit letters by October 1.

C. Internal unit letters, other than peer teaching observations or as specified in the University Guidelines for AC-23, III.C.9, are not part of the standard dossier for consideration at the college and university level. Letters of peer observation of effective participation in university service are appropriate and may be solicited by the unit head.

IV. REVIEW COMMITTEES

Committees shall evaluate each candidate based on established criteria in each of the three areas of consideration. The descriptor used to assess the level of contribution (Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory) shall be a consensus of the committee view, including any statement(s) of minority opinions. Only one evaluative statement letter is written and should contain the committee’s overall vote for each promotion and/or tenure action. The aim should be to arrive at a unanimous decision for the overall recommendation as well as for the evaluative descriptor for each section of the dossier. If unanimity is not possible, the Committee should record the vote count and then justify the rationale for the majority and the minority opinions for each descriptor and, if necessary, for the overall recommendation.

In regard to committee voting, members must recuse in advance of any discussion if there is a declared conflict of interest.

Faculty members on leave of absence, including sabbatical leave, are prohibited from participating on promotion and tenure committees.

A. UNIT COMMITTEES

1. No later than the annual deadline (usually the week after spring break), each academic unit in the College of Arts and Architecture will have established its own Promotion and Tenure Committee for the following year.

2. Guidelines and procedures for establishment for these committees, approved by each unit faculty, will be posted on the College website.

3. Unit guidelines will specify the composition of the committee, the term of membership, and the method of choosing a chair.

4. Academic units are charged with evaluating all candidates for promotion as well as reviewing the progress toward tenure of all tenure-track faculty during the 2nd, 4th, and 6th year of provisional service to the University.

B. COLLEGE COMMITTEE

The duties of the committee include reviewing University, College and appropriate unit recommendations for promotion and tenure in accordance with the guidelines set for in AC-23.

1. The College Committee on Promotion and Tenure will be composed of seven members selected as follows:

a. One member to be elected by the faculty of the Department of Architecture, the Department of Art History, the Department of Landscape Architecture, the School of Music, the School of Theatre and the School of Visual Arts.

b. One member appointed by the Dean.

2. The unit representative to the College P&T committee should be elected by the annual March deadline, to allow the chair and/or members of all P&T committees to attend Spring Semester promotion and tenure workshops.

a. The term of membership will be two years and will be staggered.

b. Members should be elected who will have the standard college committee meeting time available during the follow academic year.

3. The college committee will elect its own chair.

Only one evaluative statement letter is written and should contain the committee’s singular overall vote for each promotion and/or tenure action. When the committee has not reached a unanimous vote on a candidate, the evaluative statement shall include a discussion of the reasons for divergent opinions. (University Guidelines for AC-23, V.H.3)

V REVIEW PROCEDURES

The University Guidelines for AC-23 should be reviewed carefully and observed in this section. This section addresses specific A&A College procedures for requests for promotion and early tenure. Unit heads, in consultation with appropriate faculty, submit materials described below for dean’s approval before advising the candidate to proceed with preparing a dossier for promotion to full or for promotion in rank for fixed term faculty.

**A. Promotion**

1. Reviews for promotion are initiated by the unit head after consultation with a group of full professors in the units. If necessary, the consultation may be an ad hoc group of full professors that includes some from cognate disciplines, not necessarily in the same unit.

2. No later than the annual deadline (usually soon after spring break), unit heads who are recommending any faculty member for promotion to full professor for the next year will provide a summary memo to the dean that supports the candidate’s eligibility for promotion based on the strength of the record.

3. Any candidate for promotion to full should demonstrate a pattern of excellence or significance of impact in all three areas of scholarship, which should be addressed in the head’s letter.

4. Along with the head’s letter of recommendation, annual reviews from the candidate's most recent post-tenure review will be submitted to the dean.

5. If someone is due for a post-tenure review and the unit head believes he or she is ready for promotion and wishes to propose promotion rather than a post-tenure review, then the unit head will provide the summary letter to seek dean’s approval to send the faculty member up for promotion instead.

6. The request to promote instead of doing another post-tenure review should be completed before the deadline for post-tenure reviews. The faculty member should receive the standard AC-40 annual review for the current year.

**B. Early tenure**

1. Early tenure is to be considered only for “extraordinary and exceptional” cases.

2. If a department head/school director is considering recommending a faculty member for early tenure and promotion, they must consult with a group of full professors in the unit and provide a summary memo to the dean consult with the dean (see A. Promotion, #1 and #2 above) no later than March 1 to ensure that the dean has time to review all of the materials before requesting permission from the Provost's Office to submit the faculty member for early tenure.

*Approved by Faculty, Oct. 6, 2006.*

*Revisions to reflect college committee recommendations and University guidelines:*

*Spring 2012; Fall 2018; Spring, 2019, Fall 2022*

Attachment A

College of Arts and Architecture

Procedures and Spring Deadlines for

Starting Process for

Promotion and Tenure for 2023-2024

**Deadlines**

March 2 Consult with Dean regarding any recommendations for early tenure based on an extraordinary and exceptionally stellar record.

March 23 Names of candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor due to Dean’s Office.

Names of candidates for promotion to full professor, and past five years of annual reviews, recommended by department head/school director due to Dean’s Office.

Names of non-tenure line candidates for promotion review to associate teaching, clinical, or research professor due to Dean’s Office.

Names of non-tenure line candidates for promotion to full teaching, clinical, or research professor, and past five years of annual reviews, recommended by department head/school director due to Dean’s Office.

April 1 A clean copy of your (department/school) new guidelines (no highlights) will be uploaded to the College’s Promotion and Tenure page.

A copy of the guidelines with the changes highlighted in yellow to be sent to Old Main for their file.

Department/school Promotion and Tenure Committee members, their titles, and explanation of how the committee was formed to be communicated with the Dean’s office in writing.

Name of Department/school representative to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee due to the Dean’s Office

Unit non-tenure line committees elected, and committee chair appointed

Names of non-tenure line faculty eligible for College committee due to Dean’s Office.

May 3 List of external reviewers for all candidates for promotion and tenure (six recommended by candidate and six recommended by department head/school director due to Dean’s Office. (Use the form below.)

All submissions must be sent to aadean@psu.edu

**Promotion to Full Professor Recommendations**: No later than **March 23**, department heads/school directors who are recommending any faculty member for promotion to full professor for the next year will provide a summary memo to the dean in support of the candidate’s eligibility for promotion based on the strength of the record. Any candidate for promotion to full professor must demonstrate a pattern of excellence or significance of impact in all three areas of scholarship and should be addressed in the head’s letter. Along with the head’s/director’s letter of recommendation, annual reviews from the candidate's most recent post-tenure review (which should be no more than five years’ worth of annual reviews) will be submitted to the dean electronically. The Dean will determine if the candidate should be considered for promotion.

**Promotion or Post-tenure Reviews**: If a faculty member is due for a post-tenure review in the current academic year (2023-24) and the unit head/school director believes they are ready for promotion and wishes to propose promotion rather than undergo a current post-tenure review, the unit head/school director will provide the summary letter and annual reviews to seek the Dean’s approval to postpone the post-tenure review in lieu of recommending promotion in 2023-24. The request to promote instead of conducting another post-tenure review must be submitted by the March 23 deadline noted above. The faculty member should receive the standard AC-40 annual review for the current year.

**Early Tenure** **Reviews**: Early tenure is to be considered only when a faculty member has demonstrated an extraordinary, exceptional, and stellar record in two of the three areas of scholarship during the probationary period. If a unit head/school director is considering recommending a faculty member for early tenure and promotion, they must consult with the dean no later than March 2 to ensure sufficient time to review all the materials. If the Dean concurs with the recommendation for early tenure review, the Dean will then request permission from the Provost's Office to submit a candidate for early tenure review.

**External Reviewers:** Lists of suggestions for external reviewers for all promotion and tenure candidates must be submitted to the Dean's Office no later than May 3. Names must be submitted using the table format below. Submissions must include notations of the nature of any personal/professional knowledge of the candidates. Some of our professional worlds are very small and we must expect as much objectivity in external reviewers as possible. Unit heads/school directors must ensure the inclusion of comparable institutions (e.g. CIC; major research university; land-grant, etc.) or an explanation about why a recommendation of a reviewer from a smaller, regional, or private institution or university is warranted (e.g. University of North Texas for music; RISD for visual arts). All review letters included in review dossiers by reviewers from smaller universities necessitate explanation to inform the university-wide committee.

Once the list is approved by the Dean, the department head/school director will receive a memo indicating which reviewers have been approved and the next step in the process.

**Non-Tenure Line Promotion Reviews**: Unit heads/school directors who are recommending any faculty for promotion will provide a summary memo to the dean in support of the candidate’s eligibility for promotion based on the strength of record. Unit heads/school director must provide the faculty member’s current title and proposed title. For NTL candidates seeking promotion to full professor in any of the NTL tracks (teaching, clinical or research), the department head/school director/supervisor must submit a memo to the dean in support of the candidate’s eligibility for promotion based on the strength of the record in accordance with the department/school and college guidelines for promotion.

In accordance with unit and college guidelines, candidates for promotion must demonstrate a pattern of excellence or significance of impact in teaching or research, based on their appointment along with service and should be addressed in the head’s letter. Along with the head’s/director’s letter of recommendation, annual reviews from the candidate (which should be no more than five years’ worth of annual reviews) will be submitted to the dean electronically. The Dean will determine if the candidate should be considered for promotion.

Please see the due dates sheet that lists all dates for the 2023-24 P&T season.

If at any time you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Dean’s Office.

**EXTERNAL REVIEWER RECOMMENDATIONS:** Joe Smith: External Reviewer List

Department/School: Department of Horticulture

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rank | Name/order of preference | Nature of any personal/professional knowledge of the reviewer | Unit Head/Director  OR Candidate  Recommendation |
| 1. | Noah Scott  Professor of Horticulture  College of Ag  Department of Horticulture  La Salle University  Brief Bio: [50 words] | Professional contact:  The candidate knows Noah Scott in a professional context over the years as a former Board Member of Horticulture Society and International Horticultural Association. | Unit Head |
| 2. | Lance Gerber  Professor, Department of Horticulture Sciences  University of Florida  Brief Bio: [50 words] | Professional contact:  I was introduced to Lance Gerber professionally during his time teaching Horticultural Sciences at Carnegie Mellon before he joined the faculty at the University of Florida. I have not worked with him professionally in any real context but am aware of his creative work, collaborations and critical practice. | Candidate |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| List any individuals who should NOT be contacted due to close affiliation | Reason |
| Mallorie Fetzer  Professor of Horticulture  College of Ag Sciences  Department of Horticulture  Colorado University | Professional contact:  The candidate and Malorie Fetzer have co-authored a book together. |
| Shelly Kornpett  Professor, Department of Horticulture  Howard University | Professional contact:  Professor Kornpett was the candidate’s dissertation chair |

**PROMOTION AND TENURE DUE DATES**

**FOR REVIEWS IN ACADEMIC YEAR FA 2023/SP 2024**

***SPRING 2023 (for detailed information, please consult the 23.24 Procedures and Due Dates Document):***

March 2 Consult with Dean regarding any recommendations for early tenure based on an extraordinary and exceptionally stellar record.

March 23 Names of candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor due to Dean’s Office.

Names of candidates for promotion to full professor, and past five years of annual reviews, recommended by department head/school director due to Dean’s Office.

April 1 A clean copy of the new guidelines (no highlights).  This copy will also be

uploaded to the College’s Promotion and Tenure page.

A copy of the guidelines with the changes highlighted in yellow.

Department/school Promotion and Tenure Committee members, their titles, and explanation of how the committee was formed.

May 3 List of external reviewers for all candidates for promotion and tenure (six recommended by candidate and six recommended by department head/school director due to Dean’s Office. (Use the form below.)

\*(The below dates **may** be adjusted once the University Administrative Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure 2023-2024 are released in July. If dates change, a revised schedule will be sent.

**FALL 2023**

July 1 University Administrative Guidelines distributed/posted.

November 30 6th-year tenure and promotion dossiers completed at the Unit level and

forwarded to the Dean’s Office.

Dec 1-Jan 25, 2024 College P&T Committee’s review period of 6th-year tenure and

promotion dossiers.

**SPRING 2024**

January 26-Feb 23 Dean reviews 6th year and promotion dossiers.

January 26 Non-Tenure Line Promotion Dossiers due to the Dean’s Office.

January 29-Feb 29 College Non-Tenure Line Committee Reviews dossier and submits recommendations to the Dean.

February 1 All factual changes or new information must be submitted for 6th year and promotion dossiers.

2 4th -year dossiers completed at the Unit level and forwarded to the Dean’s Office.

5-23 College P&T Committee’s review period of 4th-year dossiers.

23 College P&T Committee completes reviews for 4th-year dossiers and forwards to the Dean.

28 All positive recommendations by the Dean (and all positive reviews prior to the Dean’s review for final tenure regardless of the Dean’s recommendation) forwarded to the University P&T Committee via Office of Human Resources.

March 1-Apr.19 Dean’s review period of 4th-year dossiers.

28 2nd year dossiers forwarded to the Dean’s Office

April 1-19 Dean’s review period of 2nd-year dossiers.

23 Dean completes 2nd and 4th-year reviews and notifies faculty whose appointments will not be continued, in accordance with the provisions of AC-23.

30 Dean complete Fixed-Term promotion reviews and shares results in writing with the candidate and unit head/school director.

May 3 All final decisions on promotion and tenure completed by the President based on recommendations of the Executive Vice President and Provost; all candidates notified of the results of the reviews.