



PennState

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES FOR AC23

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

AND REGULATIONS

2023-2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Purpose.....	1
B.	Applicability of Policy and Guidelines.....	1
C.	Exceptions to the Guidelines	1
D.	Terminology.....	2
E.	Confidentiality in the Promotion and Tenure Process	2
II.	CRITERIA STATEMENTS	3
A.	Role of the Academic Unit in Elaborating General Criteria.....	3
B.	Role of the Academic Unit in Specifying Evaluative Methods for the Three Criteria	4
C.	Special Guidelines for the Criterion of The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning	4
D.	Assessing the Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments.....	7
E.	Role of the Executive Vice President and Provost	7
F.	Dissemination of Criteria Statements	7
III.	THE DOSSIER	7
A.	Forms for the Dossier.....	8
B.	Responsibility for Preparation of the Dossier	8
C.	Content and Organization of Information in the Dossier.....	8
D.	Dissemination of Information about Dossier Preparation	12
E.	Role of the Faculty Member in Preparation of the Dossier	12
F.	Changes or New Information in the Informational Sections of the Dossier after the Review Process has begun	13
G.	External Letters of Assessment.....	13
IV.	REVIEW COMMITTEES	15
A.	Review Committees to Be Established	15
B.	Composition and Size of Review Committees	15
C.	Procedures for Establishing Review Committees.....	16
D.	Notification of the Establishment of Review Committees	17
E.	Independent Judgments of Review Committees.....	17
V.	REVIEW PROCEDURES	17
A.	Review Schedule.....	17
B.	Participants in the Review Process	18
C.	Nomination Process for Promotion.....	20
D.	Withdrawal of a Promotion Dossier After a Negative Department Review.....	20
E.	Process of review	20
F.	Faculty on Joint Appointments	21
G.	Consultation in the Review Process.....	22
H.	Role of Review Committees and Administrators	22
I.	Information to Faculty Members about Evaluations of Performance.....	25
J.	Reports to Be Submitted Regarding the Review Process	26
VI.	STAYING OF THE PROVISIONAL TENURE PERIOD	27
VII.	EXTENSION OF THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD DUE TO COVID-19	28

APPENDIX A.....	29
STATEMENT OF PRACTICES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE.....	29
APPENDIX B.....	36
TIMETABLE FOR <i>2023-2024</i> PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS.....	36
APPENDIX C.....	39
SAMPLE LETTERS TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS	39
APPENDIX D.....	43
LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE.....	43
APPENDIX E.....	44
SAMPLE CANDIDATE SIGNATURE STATEMENT.....	44
APPENDIX F.....	45
DOSSIER DIVIDERS AND FORMS.....	45
THE SCHOLARSHIP OF LIBRARIANSHIP.....	47
THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING.....	48
PATIENT CARE AND THE SCHOLARSHIP OF PATIENT CARE.....	49
THE SCHOLARSHIP OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS....	50
SERVICE AND THE SCHOLARSHIP OF SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, SOCIETY, AND THE PROFESSION.....	52
EXTERNAL LETTERS OF ASSESSMENT.....	53
APPENDIX G.....	56
GUIDELINES FOR STAYING OF THE PROVISIONAL TENURE PERIOD.....	56
APPENDIX H.....	57
GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDING FACULTY FOR EARLY TENURE	57
APPENDIX I.....	58
GUIDELINES FOR IMMEDIATE TENURE REVIEWS.....	58
APPENDIX J.....	61
GUIDELINES FOR OUT-OF-SEQUENCE PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS	61
APPENDIX K.....	63
SAMPLE LETTER INFORMING OF TERMINATION	63
APPENDIX L.....	64
PERTINENT UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND GUIDELINES.....	64
APPENDIX M.....	65
COVID GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS IN EFFECT SPRING OF 2020-SUMMER OF 2023.....	65
APPENDIX N.....	72
GUIDELINES FOR SHARING ELEMENTS OF THE DOSSIER FOLLOWING FORMAL REVIEWS FOR TENURE-LINE FACULTY.....	72

ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES FOR AC23:
PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES
AND REGULATIONS

Revised *July 1, 2023*

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose

The Administrative Guidelines are provided to implement the University's policy on promotion and tenure, AC23, "Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations." The Guidelines supplement but do not alter basic policies set forth in AC23.

B. Applicability of Policy and Guidelines

1. The revised University promotion and tenure policy, AC23, became effective on July 1, 1975.
2. The Administrative Guidelines are revised periodically to reflect recommendations of faculty committees and administrators for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the review process.
 - a. Faculty members being reviewed for promotion or tenure are subject to the particular version of the Administrative Guidelines in effect at the time of the review.
 - b. To the extent that there is substantial or material inconsistency between these administrative guidelines and guidelines at the academic unit level, the University's administrative guidelines will prevail. (BOLDED LAST YEAR)

C. Exceptions to the Guidelines

1. Exceptions to the Guidelines require the approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University.
2. In no case shall exceptions to the Guidelines alter the substantive rights granted under AC23.
3. Requests for exceptions to the Guidelines shall be forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost by the dean, together with documentation to justify the exception being requested.
4. Exceptions are approved for one review cycle only and must be resubmitted for subsequent review cycles if necessary.

D. Terminology

1. Throughout this document certain generic terms are used to refer to specific offices and administrators as follows:
 - a. Campus review: Reviews by campuses in the University College and for faculty members at Abington College; Altoona College; Berks College; Harrisburg, The Capital College; Erie, The Behrend College; and the Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies who hold tenure in a college at University Park.
 - b. Campus chancellor review: Reviews by campus chancellors in the 14 campuses in the University College, and the campus chancellors at Abington College; Altoona College; Berks College; Harrisburg, The Capital College; Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies; and Erie, The Behrend College.
 - c. Department review: Reviews by department, division, and school review committees.
 - d. Department head review: Reviews by heads of departments and divisions and directors of schools in the academic colleges; the University Libraries; the College of Medicine; the four-year colleges at other locations: Abington College; Altoona College; Berks College; Harrisburg, The Capital College; and Erie, The Behrend College.
 - e. College review: Reviews by college review committees or school review committees, as may be the case in the special mission campuses.
 - f. College dean review: Deans of the academic colleges, the dean of the University Libraries, Dean of the University College, and chancellors of the four-year colleges at other locations: Abington College; Altoona College; Berks College; Harrisburg, The Capital College; Erie; The Behrend College; **and Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies.**
2. Where a specific officer is required to participate in the review process, that officer has been referred to specifically in this document.

E. Confidentiality in the Promotion and Tenure Process

1. The overall promotion and tenure process allows for feedback to faculty candidates at appropriate times and through appropriate academic administrators (e.g., division and department heads, chief academic officers, and deans) as described by the Administrative Guidelines for

AC23 (section V.I.1.). “College deans shall be responsible for ensuring that all faculty members in their units are advised by the appropriate academic administrator of the general results of the evaluation of their performance.” Based on these guidelines, faculty members may inspect and review their dossiers upon completion of the review process each year, except for the documents in the external assessment section which are required for promotion or tenure recommendations.

2. All aspects of the promotion and tenure process are otherwise confidential, including deliberation in committee and the specific decisions that are made at each review level, which will be revealed at the appropriate times by the dean or department head. It is expected that both the candidate and the committees will adhere to the confidentiality of the promotion and tenure process. Members of promotion and tenure committees participate with the understanding that all matters related to their deliberations remain confidential. In addition, faculty candidates under review are discouraged from approaching committee members at any time concerning the disposition of their review and should understand that inquiries of this type are deemed entirely inappropriate.
3. Confidentiality of the promotion and tenure process is to be respected forever, not just during that particular year of review.

II. CRITERIA STATEMENTS

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. In an exceptional case, a decision can be made to tenure but not to promote; however, the burden would be on the committee(s) or administrator(s) who wish to separate promotion from a positive tenure decision to show why promotion is not warranted.

A. Role of the Academic Unit in Elaborating General Criteria

1. The policy directs that all candidates for promotion and tenure shall be evaluated according to three general criteria which should be further defined and elaborated by each academic unit. The three general criteria are:
 - a. The scholarship of teaching and learning;
 - b. The scholarship of research and creative accomplishments;
 - c. Service and the scholarship of service to the University, society,

and the profession.

2. Academic administrators, with appropriate faculty participation, should develop a written statement of criteria and expectations that elaborates on the three general criteria and is consistent with the mission of the academic unit and the professional responsibilities normally carried by faculty members in the unit.

B. Role of the Academic Unit in Specifying Evaluative Methods for the Three Criteria

Academic administrators, with appropriate faculty participation, may develop a written statement of evaluative methods to assess the extent to which faculty members have met the criteria and expectations of the unit.

C. Special Guidelines for the Criterion of The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

1. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be based on both student input and faculty **peer review** about the quality of the teaching. The process shall incorporate a variety of evidence from students, peers, and the faculty member under review that speaks to the quality and effectiveness of teaching:
 - a. Information from students: This category of information shall include multiple sources of evidence, some of which is suitable for comparative evaluations. In addition to the required data gained from SRTE forms (see Appendix A) other methods for assessing student responses shall include at least one of the following:¹
 - (1) Summary of written student evaluations.
 - (2) Summary of formal interviews with students at the end of the semester.
 - (3) Summary of exit surveys.
 - b. Information from the individual under review: This category of information can be satisfied in the narrative statement (see III.C.2.d.) in which faculty members reflect on their teaching philosophy or goals. Candidates may also wish to submit a

¹ In addition to the SRTEs and one or more of these other options for receiving information from students, units may choose to add evidence from other evaluation instruments with known psychometric properties. Examples include the Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ), Instructional Assessment System (University of Washington), and the Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment (Kansas State University). Information about these instruments and others may be obtained from the Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence (site@psu.edu or 814-865-8681).

teaching portfolio that places their work in context, much as faculty share their programs of research and creative activity, in order to facilitate peer review.

The formation of a teaching portfolio allows the individual faculty member to:

- (1) Explain the nature of the various teaching tasks assigned and undertaken.
- (2) Describe the means chosen to achieve those goals.
- (3) Provide evidence that the goals have been achieved.
- (4) State how one intends to teach more effectively in the future.
- (5) Write a statement about teaching philosophy.

Faculty members are free to include whatever evidence they may choose that displays how they go about teaching and what philosophy of teaching motivates their pedagogical decisions.

All material in a teaching portfolio supplied by the faculty member is not included in the dossier, but rather should be included in the supplementary material retained at the department level, just as are copies of research publications and examples of creative activity. It is assumed that, as with the case of supplementary materials for research, such supplementary teaching materials would be reviewed by evaluating committees and administrators prior to the college level, and that they would be available upon request at the college and university levels.

c. Information from other faculty (peer review):

Peer review is the process by which an individual's peers can evaluate a full range of teaching activities. Most usually it involves class visitation. Peer review shall consider a range of teaching activities, including, but not limited to, the development of materials such as case studies and class assignments, advising, research collaboration, and graduate student mentoring. (Some of this evidence might be made available to peers by the candidate via a teaching portfolio.) The specific means and methods employed by a particular unit shall be adopted by that unit to address its own unique standards and practices.

d. Information from other sources:

The review process may also include a review of information gathered from such sources as alumni, former students, national associations, and professional groups. Unit guidelines should determine when and how these procedures will be used.

2. Summary of **Changes to Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**

a. **Fall/spring 2023**

- i. **Effective fall of 2023, a revised student feedback survey (name to be determined) will be administered in all courses. This change will not impact 4th and 6th year reviews as those dossiers will not typically include student feedback data from the fall 2023 semester. In spring of 2024 only, dossiers will include data from the student feedback survey.**
- ii. **If measures of central tendency are referenced by either the administrator or the faculty member/instructor, both the median and mode must be referenced and discussed in the context of the distribution.**
- iii. **Alternate assessment from any previous formal promotion and tenure reviews should remain in the dossier in subsequent reviews. Faculty members should not change previous alternative assessments.**

b. **Spring/summer/fall 2021, spring/summer/fall 2022, and spring/summer 2023**

- i. The short-form SRTEs are to be included for all courses taught in faculty promotion and tenure review materials.
- ii. Faculty members are to include one alternate assessment of teaching effectiveness for each academic year. (see Appendix M)

c. **Fall 2020 semester**

- i. At the discretion of the faculty member, fall 2020 short-form SRTEs may be included in dossiers as evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- ii. If measures of central tendency are referenced by either the faculty member or the administrator, both the median and mode must be referenced and discussed in the context of the distribution.
- iii. The omission of SRTEs does not provide any evidence relevant to the assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- iv. Regardless of whether the SRTEs are included, at least one alternate assessment must be included. (see Appendix M)
- v. Peer teaching review was not suspended for the fall of 2020. Peer review can consist of a wide range of activities that may

or may not include class visitation.

- vi. This section will be removed when there are no candidates **under review** who were in their probationary period in calendar year 2020.

d. Spring/summer 2020 semester

- i. Spring and summer 2020 SRTEs were not required and reporting of results in formal reviews were discouraged except in rare circumstances.
- ii. The omission of SRTEs does not provide any evidence relevant to the assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- iii. Peer teaching reviews were suspended in March of 2020. The omission of a peer teaching observation does not provide any evidence relevant to the assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- iv. Inclusion of an alternate assessment was optional; the omission of an alternate assessment does not provide any evidence relevant to the assessment of teaching effectiveness. (see Appendix M)
- v. **This section will be removed when there are no candidates under review who were in their probationary period in calendar year 2020.**

D. Assessing the Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments

It is expected that units encourage and support collaborative and interdisciplinary research and that units will develop methods to assess these activities.

E. Role of the Executive Vice President and Provost

- 1. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall approve all statements of criteria and expectations.
- 2. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall maintain a master set of approved statements of criteria and expectations.

F. Dissemination of Criteria Statements

- 1. Deans shall ensure that faculty members are informed about the criteria and expectations that have been developed for their respective units.
- 2. Deans shall ensure that a copy of the current statement of criteria and expectations for their respective units is on file in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

III. THE DOSSIER

A. Forms for the Dossier

1. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall be responsible for developing and maintaining forms to be used in preparing each candidate's dossier.
2. The forms shall be distributed to the various academic units at the beginning of each review cycle upon request of the unit.

B. Responsibility for Preparation of the Dossier

1. Given that the faculty member under review supplies materials for the dossier, there is shared responsibility between the faculty member and the administrator for the timely preparation of the dossier. (See III.E.1.)
2. It is the responsibility of the college dean to ensure that each dossier follows the proper format and is accurate and complete; **it is the candidate's responsibility to provide the contents of the dossier and to ensure they are accurate and complete.**
 - a. For University College, the director of academic affairs of the candidate's campus **and the candidate share** responsibility for preparing the dossier.
 - b. For Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies, the dean or the dean's designee **and the candidate** share responsibility of preparing the dossier.
 - c. For colleges at University Park and other locations, the department head **and the candidate share** responsibility for preparing the dossier.

C. Content and Organization of Information in the Dossier

1. A standard format for presenting and organizing the information in the dossier shall be used by all academic units.
2. The dossier shall contain the following sections, organized according to the sequence provided below:
 - a. Promotion and tenure form(s);
 - b. Biographical data for promotion/tenure review form;
 - c. College criteria statement; department criteria statement where applicable;
 - d. A narrative statement indicates a candidate's sense of their

scholarship of teaching and learning; scholarship of research and creative accomplishments; and service and the scholarship of service to the University, society, and the profession. The purpose of this statement is not so much to call attention to achievements that are listed elsewhere in the dossier as it is to afford candidates the opportunity to place their work and activities in the context of their overall goals and agendas. Candidates for promotion and tenure were encouraged (but not required) to describe how the events of 2020/21 (e.g., COVID-19 pandemic, societal/racial tensions, political unrest) impacted their work, and the steps they took to manage these impacts, in the narrative that accompanies their dossier for promotion and/or tenure.

We encourage candidates to be as succinct as possible. The narrative statement should not exceed 2,000 words; this word length will be reduced to 1,600 words when there are no candidates pursuing tenure who were in their probationary period in calendar year 2020.

- e. Candidate signature statement (to be used for provisional reviews as well as promotion and final tenure reviews).
- f. The scholarship of teaching and learning (paginate A-1, A-2, etc.);
- g. The scholarship of research and creative accomplishments (paginate B-1, B-2, etc.);
- h. Service and the scholarship of service to the University, society, and the profession (paginate C-1, C-2, etc.);
- i. For faculty members in the University Libraries, a section on the scholarship of librarianship is included immediately preceding the section on the scholarship of teaching and learning (paginate L-1, L-2, etc.);
- j. For faculty members in the College of Medicine, a section on patient care activities is included immediately following the section on the scholarship of teaching and learning (paginate M-1, M-2, etc.);
- k. External letters of assessment (if appropriate), log of external letters, and statement of how external evaluators were selected; however, all internal letters evaluating teaching performance shall be placed in the section on the scholarship of teaching and learning (paginate D-1, D-2, etc.);
- l. Statements of evaluation of the candidate by review committees

and administrators (paginate E-1, E-2, etc.)

3. Items a. through j. in the list in section III.C.2. are factual and informational sections of the dossier; item k. is the confidential section of the dossier and shall not be accessible for review or inspection by the candidate.
4. More detailed descriptions of appropriate contents for dossier sections are printed on divider forms. (See Appendix F)
5. Supplemental support materials (e.g., books, reprints, syllabi/teaching portfolios, vita, and narrative statement) sent to external reviewers must be collected along with the dossier at the campus and departmental review levels and it is expected that they would be reviewed by campus and department peer review committees. These supplemental materials shall not be forwarded with the dossier unless requested by those responsible for the next level of review.
6. Outreach activities should be properly documented and considered in the promotion and tenure process: Under service when they are mostly service, under teaching when they involve teaching, and under research and scholarship when they result in publication or activity that can be valued in those terms.
7. Publications, whether journal articles, book chapters, conference proceedings, or in any of the other categories of publications listed in the divider for Scholarship of Research, and Creative Accomplishments, should be evaluated under the bullets described by the divider. For example:
 - a. Departments should use their existing criteria for evaluating publications, such as credentials of editorial board members, utilization of a blind review process, and reputation of the publisher.
 - b. Departments should consider the quality and reputation of the publisher. Examples of reputable publishers are well-known commercial presses, university presses, and established academic and professional associations.

Articles posted electronically by the individual faculty member without a formal review are not to be listed in the dossier.

8. Listings of work in progress and grants not funded should be eliminated from all sixth-year, ninth-year, and early tenure reviews and all promotion reviews beyond the assistant professor level or equivalent. Work accepted, submitted, or under contract should continue to be listed in all dossiers.

9. If a unit desires to make use of an internal letter where the knowledge or expertise of a faculty member(s) not on the promotion and tenure committee is solicited, the letter should be signed and included in its entirety in the section of the dossier that it addresses (i.e., the scholarship of teaching, research, or service). If more than one area is addressed, a decision will have to be made concerning in which section it should be placed.

Unlike the external letters, these letters will be accessible for review by the candidates.

10. Dossiers should not contain the following items unless unusual circumstances prevail, and the materials are necessary for making recommendations. (This judgment shall be made by the college dean.)
 - a. Evaluative statements written by the candidate;
 - b. Statements about a candidate's personal life unless they are germane to the quality of the candidate's work;
 - c. A vita which restates information presented elsewhere in the dossier;
 - d. Samples of the candidate's publications;
 - e. Letters of appreciation or thanks;
 - f. Course outlines.
11. All review committees and administrators shall have the same factual record available for the review.
12. Promotion and tenure decisions may require different documentation of prior reviews.
 - a. For candidates for tenure, the evaluative statements from the previous provisional tenure reviews shall be included in the dossier in the section labeled "Statements of Evaluation of the Candidate by Review Committees and Administrators." The actual statements (not an abstract) shall be presented in chronological order beginning with the earliest provisional reviews through the most recent provisional reviews. For candidates who were granted a stay of tenure or a leave, additional evaluations beyond the five years, and no more than the most recent seven years, may be included to provide sufficient evaluations.

- b. For candidates for promotion only, evaluative statements pertinent to the current promotion action are to be included. Evaluative statements from prior promotion reviews and from prior tenure reviews are not to be included.
- c. If actions to consider a tenure decision and a promotion decision are simultaneous, one dossier should be prepared with two copies of the promotion and tenure form (signatory pages), one to document decisions on the tenure consideration and the other to document decisions on the promotion consideration. In such cases, the dossier should include evaluative statements from previous provisional tenure reviews. External referees should address both concerns in a single letter. Moreover, both decisions should be addressed in a single letter from committee chairs and administrators. (See V.H.3.)

D. Dissemination of Information about Dossier Preparation

- 1. College deans and campus chancellors shall ensure that faculty members in their respective units are informed about the manner in which dossiers are prepared and the appropriate content of dossiers.
- 2. Colleges and departments/campuses/schools/divisions are obligated to provide candidates for promotion and tenure with the information they need to meet the tenure requirements of their units and to prepare for the necessary reviews in the tenure and/or promotion process. Workshops and other forms of support for candidates are strongly encouraged. Clear procedural guidelines should be presented in writing to the candidate by the department and/or college. Each college should hold an annual group meeting with candidates for promotion and tenure to discuss the process and expectations.
- 3. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall be responsible for ensuring that workshops to inform faculty members, review committees, and academic administrators about dossier preparation and review procedures are conducted periodically.

E. Role of the Faculty Member in Preparation of the Dossier

- 1. Each faculty member supplies relevant and accurate information for inclusion in the dossier. If the unit is using Activity Insight to generate the dossier, faculty members are responsible for ensuring their information is entered into Activity Insight in accordance with the timeline specified. (See III.B.5.)
- 2. Each faculty member shall be provided an opportunity to review for accuracy and completeness the factual records and informational material contained in the dossier prior to the beginning of the review process. For tenure reviews, the dossier will contain complete written copies of the

following materials prepared during earlier reviews:

- a. Written statements concerning peer review of teaching;
- b. Tenure review letters from department heads and deans;
- c. Tenure recommendations and other communications prepared by department and college review committees.

For promotion actions, recommendations and letters related to earlier promotion reviews shall not be included in the dossier. Faculty members shall not review those letters, recommendations, and other communications deemed confidential. (See III.C.3.)

3. Reviewers should come from lists of names submitted or created by sources other than the candidate, as well as from a list of possibilities submitted by the candidate, although it is not required that the final list of external reviewers include recommendations from the candidate. In no case should the candidate solicit directly the external assessment letters. (See III.G.)

F. Changes or New Information in the Informational Sections of the Dossier after the Review Process has begun

1. All review committees and administrators who have completed their review of a candidate shall be informed about any factual changes or new substantive information in the original materials in the dossier subsequent to their review.
2. All review committees and administrators who are informed about factual changes or new substantive information, as described above, shall have the opportunity to reconsider their recommendation.
3. SRTEs for courses available after the dossier is submitted are not considered a “factual change or new substantive information” and cannot be added to dossiers without approval from the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.
4. The deadline for submission of factual changes or new information is the weekday coincident with or immediately following February 1.

G. External Letters of Assessment

1. External letters of assessment must be obtained for candidates being reviewed for sixth-year or ninth year at the College of Medicine or early tenure and for promotion.

2. Dossiers shall include a minimum of four letters from external evaluators.
3. The college dean, **or their designee**, is responsible for obtaining external letters of assessment.
4. The process of obtaining external letters of assessment should begin far enough in advance of the review process that letters are in the dossier and available to review committees and administrators at all levels of review. If letters arrive after the review process has begun, individuals involved in those levels of review already completed shall be notified by the dean of the receipt of the letters, provided with access to the letters, and provided with an opportunity to reconsider their recommendation. (See III.C.11; III.F.)
5. A log shall be inserted in the dossier to document (the log should only include those evaluators who received items detailed in the External Letters of Assessment section):
 - a. Date of request to external evaluator;
 - b. Date of receipt of letter from external evaluator;
 - c. Date of entry of letter in dossier.
6. The log shall not be made available to the candidate at any time. (See III.C.3)
7. The college dean shall be responsible for providing a statement explaining the method by which the external evaluators were selected.
8. The college dean shall be responsible for providing a brief biographical statement about the qualifications of the external evaluator; special attention should be given to documenting the evaluator's standing in their discipline as part of the biographical statement.
9. A copy of the letter requesting the external evaluation shall be inserted in the dossier; the request should be for a critical evaluation of the candidate's achievements and reputation within their discipline, with reference to the mission and assignment of the candidate. Requests should be for letters of assessment, not for letters of recommendation. (See Appendix C)
 - a. If the same letter is sent to all external evaluators, one sample copy of the letter shall be inserted in the dossier. If different letters are used, a copy of each letter shall be inserted in the dossier.
10. Deans are urged to request letters from diverse sources and urged not to

request external assessments from the candidate's former teachers and students, those who have collaborated significantly with the candidate, or others whose relationship to the candidate might make objective assessments difficult. External evaluators should be asked to describe the nature of their association with the candidate. Evaluators should be in a position to make informed judgments about the candidate's work.

11. Deans should be consistent in what materials of the candidate they send to external evaluators. Appropriate materials usually include the candidate's vita and, depending on the number involved, all or a representative selection of the candidate's publications. Colleges may, if they wish, prescribe that candidates' narrative statements be included in the materials sent to external evaluators. Under no circumstance should the dossier as a whole be sent to the external evaluator. Since the focus of evaluation is to be on the candidate's research and/or creative activity, additional items related to teaching or service should not be included in materials that are sent to external reviewers. Units should describe their policy in their promotion and tenure guidelines (or criteria statements).
12. Deans must request external assessments from individuals who are of higher rank than the candidate. It is inappropriate to request assessments from non-tenured assistant professors for candidates for tenure or promotion to associate professor, and so forth.

IV. REVIEW COMMITTEES

A. Review Committees to Be Established

1. Non-University Park colleges and the Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies at the campus level shall provide the first level of review for faculty members whose locus of tenure is in a University Park college.
2. Each academic department (or similar academic unit) shall have a review committee to conduct promotion and tenure reviews for faculty members in that unit.
3. The academic colleges, the University Libraries, and the four-year colleges at other locations shall have a review committee to conduct promotion and tenure reviews for faculty members in that unit.
4. The University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall be constituted according to the provisions set forth in AC23. (See III: Review Procedures, Composition of University Review Committee in AC23.)

B. Composition and Size of Review Committees

1. Review committees shall have at least three members.
2. Although not required, it is recommended that review committees be limited to a maximum of seven members. To avoid tie votes, it is also recommended that committees have an odd number of members. A tie vote is considered to be a negative recommendation, and the “Not Recommended” block is to be checked on the “Promotion and Tenure Form” in such circumstances.
3. Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on promotion and tenure committees.
4. Only faculty of higher rank than the candidate shall make recommendations about promotion or consideration for promotion.
5. For faculty members at non-University Park locations whose tenure is at a University Park college, at least one member of the review committee at both the department and college levels must be from a non-University Park location.

C. Procedures for Establishing Review Committees

1. Members of review committees shall be selected according to procedures approved by the faculty of the respective unit and by the appropriate academic administrator. Only tenured and tenure-line faculty are eligible to vote for members of all promotion and tenure committees.
2. If a campus or an academic department does not have at least three faculty members who are eligible to serve on a review committee, faculty members in related fields from other campuses or academic departments shall be appointed by the campus chancellor or the department head, respectively, to serve on the committee.
3. When it is not possible to constitute a department committee with faculty of higher rank, the first priority in constituting a review committee shall be to add faculty of a higher rank from a similar discipline within the candidate’s college.
4. If the academic administrator must go beyond the candidate’s college to constitute a review committee, approval for such action is required from the Executive Vice President and Provost.
5. Although it is not required, it is recommended that review committees be selected as follows:
 - a. At least two-thirds of the membership elected by the faculty;

- b. At least one-quarter of the membership appointed by the academic administrator of the respective unit;
 - c. A majority of the faculty members should hold the rank of professor. (See IV.B.4.)
6. Chairs of review committees may be appointed by the academic administrator of the respective unit, subject to the provisions of section IV.C.1.

D. Notification of the Establishment of Review Committees

- 1. All campus, departmental, and college administrators shall submit the membership of the review committee of their respective unit at the beginning of each review cycle. (See Appendix B)
- 2. At the same time as the membership lists are submitted, academic administrators shall submit a report describing the establishment of the review committee in their respective unit or shall state in writing that the procedures for establishing the committee have not changed since the previous review cycle.
- 3. College deans are responsible for collecting membership lists from academic departments in their colleges and forwarding them to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

E. Independent Judgments of Review Committees

- 1. Each unit shall review its procedures to assure that they protect the independence of review committees from undue administrative influence. Administrators shall not be present during review discussions or when votes are being taken. Administrators may be invited for consultation if the committee deems it appropriate.
- 2. Academic administrators should not be appointed to committees or be present for discussion or votes.

V. REVIEW PROCEDURES

A. Review Schedule

- 1. The review process shall follow a consistent pattern and sequence of review for all candidates.
 - a. The timetable for the reviews is given in Appendix B.
 - b. Flow charts describing the events and the sequence in the review

process are given in Appendix D.

2. The review process is initiated each academic year with the issuance by the Executive Vice President and Provost of the Administrative Guidelines to be used for that year's review cycle.
 - a. Administrative Guidelines are distributed to college deans, who are responsible for further distribution of the Administrative Guidelines within their respective units.
3. **These unit reports are now provided in Workday and this section will be removed next year, when the 2024-2025 Administrative Guidelines are updated.**

The Office of Human Resources **previously** provided college deans with a list of all tenure-eligible faculty members in their respective units, together with an indication for each faculty member of the number of years of credit earned toward tenure as of the next July 1, and an identification of faculty members subject to:

 - a. Second-year provisional tenure review;
 - b. Third-year provisional tenure review (College of Medicine);
 - c. Fourth-year provisional tenure review;
 - d. Sixth-year provisional tenure review (College of Medicine);
 - e. Sixth-year (final) tenure review;
 - f. Ninth-year (final) tenure review (College of Medicine).
4. Promotion and tenure reviews should begin immediately following the actions described in sections V.A.2. and V.A.3. above.
5. The review processes for promotion and tenure may occur simultaneously and should if promotion is being considered prior to the sixth year, or for the College of Medicine prior to the ninth-year tenure review.

B. Participants in the Review Process

1. For provisional year (second- and fourth-year or for the College of Medicine the third- and sixth-year) tenure reviews, the following committees and administrators shall conduct reviews:
 - a. Campus review committee, if appropriate;
 - b. Campus chancellor, if appropriate;

- c. Department review committee, if appropriate;
 - d. Department head, if appropriate;
 - e. College dean.
2. For provisional year (i.e., prior to the final sixth-year, or for the College of Medicine the ninth-year, and early) tenure reviews, the college review committee may, but is not required to, conduct a review. However, if the dean is considering termination of a faculty member after any provisional reviews despite positive recommendations from both the department committee and the department head, then the dossier must also be reviewed by the college committee prior to the dean acting.
 3. All second-year reviews shall be held in the second semester of the second year. At the College of Medicine reviews will be held in the third year.
 4. For final (sixth-year or ninth-year at the College of Medicine) and early tenure reviews and promotion of tenure-line faculty, the following committees, and administrators shall conduct reviews:²
 - a. Campus review committee, if appropriate;
 - b. Campus chancellor, if appropriate;
 - c. Secondary department head, if appropriate;
 - d. Department review committee, if appropriate;
 - e. Department head, if appropriate;
 - f. College review committee, if appropriate;
 - g. College dean;
 - h. The University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, for candidates receiving positive recommendations from the dean (or all positive reviews prior to the dean's review);
 - i. The Executive Vice President and Provost, for those candidates reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee;

²Promotions to assistant professor that have been made contingent upon completion of the doctoral degree (or other terminal degree, as appropriate) do not follow the review process described in this section.

j. Approval or disapproval of recommendations for those candidates reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall be the responsibility of the President of the University.

6. For faculty members holding joint appointments in two or more colleges, the positive recommendation shall be forwarded by the college responsible for the largest share of the salary.

C. Nomination Process for Promotion

1. Tenure consideration for assistant professors will be accompanied by consideration for promotion to associate professor. In other situations, faculty members will be reviewed for promotion only after being nominated as follows:

a. Nominated by an appropriate academic administrator;

b. Nominated by the campus review committee (if appropriate) or by the department review committee after consultation with the appropriate academic administrator.

2. For faculty whose tenure is outside of the college of residence, local committees or administrators should not begin the promotion process without consultation with the department head. Unless the department head, the department committee, or the dean supports a recommendation to begin a promotion review, the process should not be initiated. It is also assumed that for faculty at non-University Park colleges, department heads would consult with campus or college administrators in the college of residence before initiating the promotion process.

D. Withdrawal of a Promotion Dossier After a Negative Department Review

1. When a tenured faculty member is being reviewed for promotion (unrelated to a tenure review), or an untenured faculty member is being reviewed for promotion prior to tenure, once the dossier has been prepared, reviewed, and signed by the candidate and submitted to the first review committee for consideration, the dossier cannot be withdrawn before action by the dean, unless the candidate so desires. If the department committee and the department head do not support a promotion after reviewing the completed dossier, the candidate should be so informed and given the option of withdrawing their candidacy. Prior to informing the candidate, the department head is to consult with the dean.

E. Process of review

1. Prior to the committee's first meeting, committee members must determine whether to meet in person or virtually for all of the committee meetings that involve discussions about candidates. Promotion and Tenure committees may not meet via a hybrid approach (i.e., with some members in person and some virtual) unless granted an exception by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.
2. Conflicts of interest should be declared prior to the discussion of any candidate and the member will be recused from the discussion and from voting.
3. Only those members present for the discussion of a candidate may vote on the candidate.
4. All aspects of the promotion and tenure process are confidential. Confidentiality of the promotion and tenure process is to be respected forever, not just during the particular year of review.

F. Faculty on Joint Appointments

1. If the dean of a college delegates the identification of external referees to the head of the department, and the faculty member being reviewed is on a permanently budgeted joint appointment, the department head should consult with the head of the secondary unit. The department head of the secondary unit is required to submit a letter for the dossier. Before writing that letter, the head of the secondary department should be given the complete dossier for review.
2. If the secondary department head chooses to consult with a departmental promotion and tenure committee before writing the letter, the dossier should be shared with that unit as well. (However, in no case will the committee of the secondary unit be invited to submit a letter of recommendation on its own.) The letter from the secondary department head will appear in the dossier in front of the primary department head's letter, but it should be made available to the promotion and tenure committee of the primary department before it begins its review. If the primary department head disagrees with the secondary department head, consultation should occur between the two department heads.
3. If a faculty member is co-funded in an inter-college consortia or institute, satisfactory progress in fulfilling the objectives agreed to by the college and consortia upon appointment will be necessary for the college to retain that co-funding. However, promotion and tenure are decisions determined by criteria set in the department and college; input from the consortia or institute is not required, but if input is sought, a given college must do so consistently for all candidates with that college.

4. For faculty members holding joint appointments in two colleges, the dean of the primary college must consult with the dean of the secondary college before writing their letter for any promotion or tenure review and copy the secondary on all communications. If the dean of the primary college disagrees with the dean of the secondary college, consultation should occur between the deans.

G. Consultation in the Review Process

1. Department heads, campus chancellors and deans should consult with the respective review committees to ensure that all committee members are well informed about each candidate.
2. Although it is not required, academic administrators may serve as resource persons to their respective review committees; however, the administrators and the committees shall render independent judgments of the candidates being reviewed. The academic administrator shall not be present during peer review discussions or when votes are being taken.
3. When an administrator differs with the committee at the same level of review—e.g., the department head and the department committee—or a committee differs with the administrator at the previous review level—e.g., the college committee and the department head—consultation must occur about reasons for divergence. Consultation should be initiated by the committee or administrator differing with or seeking clarification concerning the previous recommendation (e.g., a department head would initiate consultation with the departmental review committee and the dean with the college committee; the college committee would initiate consultation with the department head; and the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee with the dean). In cases when the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (1) differs from that of the dean's recommendation, and (2) when the dean's recommendation is contrary to all previous reviews, the University Committee must consult with the dean and may consult with the chair of the college committee as well. Consultation should be initiated after the previous review has been completed and a recommendation has been made in writing. The letter from the previous review level cannot be revised after the consultation. **Letters should reflect a consultation occurred and should provide a brief description of the issues discussed.**
4. All reviews of faculty whose tenure is with a college at a location different from the college of residence should receive input from the department head.

H. Role of Review Committees and Administrators

1. Review committees and administrators shall give special attention to the

candidate's assignment and the mission of the unit in applying criteria and expectations.

2. Review committees and administrators shall render independent judgments of the candidates being reviewed. Academic administrators and review committees are expected to consult as needed.
3. Each review committee and each administrative officer shall summarize in writing the independent evaluation of a candidate on each of the three criteria specified in AC23. If promotion and tenure considerations are simultaneous, both decisions should be addressed in a single letter from committee chairs and administrators.
 - a. These evaluative statements shall be placed in the dossier in the section labeled "Statements of Evaluation of the Candidate by Review Committees and Administrators." (See Appendix F)
 - b. Each evaluative statement shall be signed and dated; for committee statements, the name and rank of each member shall be listed and the statement shall be signed by at least the committee chair.
 - c. For committee recommendations, the numerical vote shall be reported in the evaluative statement.
 - d. When a committee has not reached a unanimous vote on a candidate, the evaluative statement shall include a discussion of the reasons for divergent opinions.
 - e. Committee members may be recused only when there is a legitimate conflict of interest, such as a relative being considered for promotion or tenure. Conflicts of interest are to be declared in advance of discussion about a candidate. If there is a recusal, the reason might be noted in the evaluative statement. A committee member who is recused should not be present for the discussion or the vote.
 - f. The letters from the department committee, department head, and college committee should be addressed to the dean, and the letter from the dean should be addressed to the Executive Vice President and Provost.
4. Review committees and administrators at each succeeding level of review shall be responsible for reviewing preceding committee and administrator evaluative statements.
5. At each level of review, special emphasis shall be given to the particular criteria and expectations for that level of review, consistent with the three

general criteria. For candidates who have completed interdisciplinary work, special attention shall be given to evaluating the quality and significance of such work.

6. Reviewers at each level of review shall exercise professional judgment about the accomplishments and potential of each candidate as follows:
 - a. **Department and** Campus reviews of University College faculty, or **tenure-line** faculty at a University Park college but residing at a non-University Park location
 - i. All three criteria should be evaluated.
 - ii. The review should contextualize the candidates work from a disciplinary perspective; subsequent levels of review rely on this analysis**
 - b. College: Review campus and/or department recommendations in light of **the following**:
 - (1) College criteria and expectations;
 - (2) Equity among departments; and
 - (3) Procedural fairness.
 - c. University: Review all previous recommendations in light of:
 - (1) University criteria and expectations;
 - (2) Equity within and among colleges; and
 - (3) Procedural fairness.
7. In their evaluations of candidates for promotion, committees and administrators shall understand that time-in-rank is not a criterion; it is incumbent on the reviewers to provide persuasive documentation for promotion recommendations that differ significantly from normal promotion patterns for a campus, department, or college.
8. The University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall forward all correspondence between the Committee and the deans to the Executive Vice President and Provost when the dossier is forwarded.
9. Throughout the review process, the privacy rights of individuals shall be respected.

- a. External evaluators shall not be identified in evaluative statements prepared by review committees or administrators.

I. Information to Faculty Members about Evaluations of Performance

1. College deans shall be responsible for ensuring that all faculty members in their units are advised by the appropriate academic administrator of the general results of the evaluation of their performance.
2. All candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be informed by the dean whether or not their dossiers have been forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.
3. As specified in AC23, faculty members who will not be continued in tenure-eligible positions shall be notified in writing. Notification must come no later than March 1 of the first academic year if termination is to occur by June 30 of that year. Thereafter, notification must come at least 12 months before June 30 of the following academic year.
4. Deans shall be responsible for promptly informing, in writing, those faculty members who do not receive a positive recommendation for permanent tenure at the college level. An unsatisfactory tenure review in provisional tenure years may result in termination prior to the sixth year, or ninth year at the College of Medicine. (See Appendix K)
5. For provisional tenure reviews prior to the final (sixth-year or ninth-year at the College of Medicine) or early tenure reviews, the college dean shall be required to write evaluative letters that are addressed directly to the candidate. The dean's letter will then be included in the dossiers submitted for subsequent tenure reviews. Department heads should discuss the results of these reviews, including the dean's letter, with the candidate. The candidate should receive written copies of all such evaluative letters.
 - a. For University College and Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies faculty members the communication to the faculty member shall be via the campus chancellor after consultation with the Dean of the University College or the Dean of the Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies. For the University College, a report of the reviews at the campus level should be included.
 - b. For non-University Park faculty members whose review has been by a University Park department head and dean, the results of the review may be communicated by the appropriate administrators of the college or campus of residence.

6. The President of the University shall inform, in writing, all candidates who are approved for promotion to associate professor and professor and for permanent tenure. Letters are sent to the candidate via the college dean.
 - a. When continuing faculty are awarded tenure, tenure status will be effective July 1 immediately following the decision. Those who are not awarded tenure in their sixth year, or ninth year at the College of Medicine, will be given written notice that University employment will terminate at the end of the seventh, or tenth year at the College of Medicine, and final year of their provisional period.
 - b. Copies of the letters shall be provided to the appropriate deans, campus chancellors, and the Office of Human Resources.
7. At the end of unsuccessful promotion cases of faculty in campus colleges who are tenured at University Park, deans should send copies of the college letters to the Dean of the University College who may share them with appropriate campus chancellors. The Vice President for the Commonwealth Campus should be copied on all correspondence.
8. **Consistent with AC-40, Evaluation of Faculty Performance, all faculty members must be reviewed annually by the appropriate administrative officer.**
 - a. The evaluations shall be conducted by the deans, department heads, and campus chancellors, as appropriate. University Park department heads of faculty members who have retained tenure with them will be expected to contribute to their yearly evaluations.
 - b. Department heads, college deans, or campus chancellors, shall inform faculty members of the results of these annual evaluations in writing prior to the end of the academic year.
 - c. **In years where a faculty member receives a formal promotion and/or tenure review, an academic unit may choose to not complete an additional annual review or to complete an abbreviated annual review.**
9. Upon completion of the entire review process, the dossier, except for the documents in the external assessment section, may be reviewed and inspected by the candidate in accordance with HR60, "Access to Personnel Files."

J. Reports to Be Submitted Regarding the Review Process

1. The deans shall provide a summary of the promotion and tenure decisions and recommendations at each review level to the Executive Vice President and Provost at the conclusion of each review cycle.
 - a. A description of the general processes followed in the reviews shall be included in the summary.
 - b. Decisions of the colleges regarding promotion to assistant professor and full professor shall be included in the summary.
2. A summary of the annual evaluations conducted for all faculty members shall be forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost at the end of each academic year.
 - a. The summary shall include a description of the procedures used in the evaluations and the procedures used to inform faculty members of the results of their evaluations.

VI. STAYING OF THE PROVISIONAL TENURE PERIOD

Sometimes extenuating circumstances create great hardships for a faculty member going through tenure review. In order to provide equity to provisional faculty during stressful times such as the birth or adoption of a child, the placement of a foster child in the home, serious personal illness, or the provision of care for a close family member, a temporary staying of the provisional tenure period may be granted. The intent of this policy is to make allowances for personal emergencies, and to give such affected faculty a more equal opportunity to earn tenure. This option should specifically not be made available to provisional faculty merely to give an extra year to prepare for the tenure review in the absence of extenuating circumstances.

A staying of the provisional tenure period should not penalize or adversely affect the faculty member in the tenure review. When promotion and tenure committee are charged, the following statement should be included as part of the charge. Deans should also include the statement in their letter when soliciting letters from external reviewers. “Recognizing the disruption to the scholarly, instructional, and service activities of faculty members due to the COVID-19 pandemic and social unrest in spring 2020, Penn State provided candidates for promotion and tenure the option to extend their tenure clock by one year. Candidates for promotion and tenure may also receive additional stays of the tenure clock according to university policy. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure at The Pennsylvania State University are the same for all faculty members regardless of length of service during the probationary period.”

Guidelines for requests for a staying of the provisional tenure period are given in Appendix G.

VII. EXTENSION OF THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD DUE TO COVID-19

In acknowledgment of the COVID-19 crisis and its extraordinary impacts on our faculty, Penn State extended the provisional tenure period for all faculty in their pre-tenure probationary period during calendar year 2020, as defined in University policy [AC23](#).

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT OF PRACTICES FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The information below is applicable to all candidates undergoing formal review for promotion and/or tenure in fall of 2023. Reviews conducted in spring of 2024 will adhere to the principles articulated below. Please note that SRTEs were not administered effective fall of 2023 and thus second year reviews conducted in spring of 2024 will instead utilize the student feedback surveys administered in fall of 2023.

Introduction

Policy AC23 requires that the evaluation of teaching effectiveness for purposes of promotion and tenure be based on both peer and student input. This statement outlines the procedures for obtaining and reporting that input as endorsed by the University Faculty Senate.

A. Student Evaluations

1. The Student Evaluations described below were administered through Summer of 2020.
 - a. All units shall use the Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) survey for student evaluation of teaching. This survey may be supplemented by other forms of student evaluation at the discretion of the faculty of the unit.
 - b. The SRTE survey is a “cafeteria” system with a fixed pool of items from which departments and individual faculty members select items most appropriate for their courses.
 - c. The SRTE survey consists of three sets of questions—a University core, a departmental core (the University’s course abbreviation codes serve as a proxy for “department”), and individual faculty items rating the quality of the course and the quality of the instructor.
 1. The University core consists of two global questions that are included on all survey forms, asking students to give an overall rating of the course and an overall rating of the instructor.
 2. The departmental core consists of as many as 15 additional items from the pool, selected by the faculty of the academic unit. These items should be selected to reflect the nature of the discipline, type of class, and other factors the

department faculty deem to be appropriate. Typically, course abbreviations have a number of different forms, each with questions that reflect the course type and/or instructional methods (e.g., introductory courses, seminars, labs, studios). The faculty of each unit shall be responsible for selecting the items that constitute the departmental forms, subject to the approval of the appropriate academic officer.

3. Individual faculty members may add up to five additional items from the pool to supplement the two global questions and the departmental core.
- d. The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost will be responsible for coordinating revisions to the SRTE survey. The Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence will be responsible for administrative procedures, scoring, and reporting in consultation with the faculty.
 - e. A pool of items (questions about teaching) was developed by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost in consultation with faculty members and administrators from each unit and the Committee on Faculty Affairs of the University Faculty Senate. The pool includes both general and specific items about the areas of organization, structure or clarity of the course or course material, teacher-student interaction, teaching skills, instructional environment, and specific instructional settings.
 - f. A set of demographic questions and information was developed to facilitate the proper interpretation of survey results. The survey includes items about the percentage of students in the class completing the survey, whether the course is required or an elective, and expected grade.
 - g. Items of the survey are rated on a seven-point scale with appropriate descriptors provided for the end points and the mid-point of the scale.
 - h. With the exception of spring and summer of 2020, results of the SRTE surveys shall belong to the faculty of the unit which administers them, not to the individual faculty member who was rated. Results shall be accessible to the department head for inclusion in promotion and tenure dossiers. The faculty member shall have access to their survey results. In spring and summer of 2020 due to the global pandemic, SRTE results belonged to the individual faculty member. For formal reviews that take place in fall 2020 and in subsequent years, inclusion of spring and summer

2020 SRTEs were not required and were discouraged except in rare circumstances.

2. The Student Evaluations described below were administered beginning Fall of 2021.
 - a. All units shall use the short form of the Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) survey for student evaluation of teaching. This survey may be supplemented by other forms of student evaluation at the discretion of the faculty of the unit.
 - b. Four University mandatory items are included.
 - A1: Are you taking this course as an elective?
 - A2: What grade do you expect to earn in this course?
 - A3: Rate how well this course increased your understanding of the course topics. (*Prior wording: Rate the overall quality of this course.*)
 - A4: Rate how well the instructor promoted a meaningful learning experience for you. (*Prior wording: Rate the overall quality of the instructor.*)
 - c. Two open-ended questions are administered.
 - Open 1: What aspects of this course helped you learn? (*Prior wording: What helped you learn in this course?*)
 - Open 2: What changes to this course could improve your learning? (*Prior wording: What changes would improve your learning?*)
 - d. The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost will be responsible for coordinating revisions to the SRTE survey. The Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence will be responsible for administrative procedures, scoring, and reporting in consultation with the faculty.
 - e. With the exception of fall 2020, results of the SRTE surveys shall belong to the faculty of the unit which administers them, not to the individual faculty member who was rated. Results shall be accessible to the department head for inclusion in promotion and tenure dossiers. The faculty member shall have access to their survey results.
3. Report of results:
 - a. Demographic information
 - (1) Appropriate demographic information is reported for each class completing the survey.

- b. Survey rating items
 - (1) The reporting of results of the surveys includes the following information:
 - (a) Percent of students selecting each response category;
 - (b) Number of students selecting each response category; and
 - (c) The Mean for each item was provided for items administered prior to fall 2020. Beginning with fall 2020, the median and mode are provided for each item.
- c. Appropriate controls for confidentiality of information shall be implemented by all units in distributing and storing the survey results.

4. Administration of the SRTE

- a. Administration of the SRTEs is based on the guidelines listed below.
 - (1) Responses to survey items must remain anonymous.
 - (2) Directions to the students are uniform across administrations.
 - (3) The candidate shall not participate in the administration, collection, or compilation of the survey results.
 - (4) The candidate shall not be present while students complete the evaluation.
 - (5) In a traditional semester-long course, the SRTE offering period begins two weeks before the end of regular instruction and ends the day before the final exams begin. For courses of shorter duration, their offering period is one day per week of regular classes; a four-week course has a four-day offering period.

5. Frequency of reviews

- a. The specific procedures for determining the frequency of reviews for the faculty members within a unit shall be determined by the

college. These procedures must be developed in consultation with the faculty of the college. In addition to policy, courses may be reviewed at the request of the faculty member. The following principles about the frequency of reviews apply:

- (1) Where possible, evaluations should be conducted over a period of years and in a variety of courses.
- (2) For provisional faculty and non-tenure line faculty, all sections of all courses shall be evaluated by the SRTE every time it is taught. The results from each of these evaluations must be included in the candidate's tenure dossier.

If there is some reason to explain the results or the absence of results in a particular case, the appropriate academic administrator shall make a note to that effect in the dossier. For example, in advance of a course being taught for the first time in an experimental way, an administrator and a faculty member might agree not to administer the SRTE. Such agreements should be in writing.

- (3) For all other faculty, each college must develop clear and specific guidelines for the frequency of the use of SRTEs, whether the college requires all courses to be reviewed or not. The guidelines must require frequent enough reviews to accomplish the purpose outlined in this Statement of Practices.

Since students now expect to have the opportunity to evaluate their instructors and their courses and since such evaluations continue to have value for many purposes, it is recommended that all sections of all courses shall be evaluated. College Guidelines will be reviewed by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost to ensure that they are consistent with these principles.

- (4) Faculty being reviewed for promotion, even when it is not coupled with a tenure review, should be able to demonstrate their teaching achievements in part through student evaluations that have been done over time and in a variety of courses.

B. Peer Review of Teaching

1. In addition to student evaluation of teaching, there shall also be evaluation of a candidate's teaching by peers from the candidate's unit and campus.

2. The methods of peer evaluation to be used by a unit or a campus, as well as the manner in which the results are presented in the dossier, shall be selected by the faculty of the unit or the campus. The procedures must be developed by or selected by the faculty of the unit (or campus) for purposes of evaluating teaching for promotion and tenure. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall give final approval to peer review of teaching procedures.

C. Review Committee Reports

It is the responsibility of the first level review committee (i.e., campus, department, division, or school) to make a judgment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness based on both peer and student reviews in terms of the following classifications: Excellent, very good, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. For faculty at non-University Park locations whose locus of tenure resides in a University Park college, the campus review committee shall also make a judgment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness in terms of the same four-category classification. Reviewers should understand that unsatisfactory carries a negative connotation; satisfactory conveys a neutral evaluation; very good, a positive one; and excellent, a highly positive evaluation. The review committee must provide appropriate documentation for its judgment.

D. Summary of Research on Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

1. There is an abundance of research on all aspects of student evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The consensus in the literature is that while student evaluations are the most common strategy of evaluation, by themselves they are not sufficient to provide a complete evaluation of teaching.
2. Students, however, are in a unique position to make evaluations and are an appropriate source of information when they are judging student-instructor relationships, organization of the course, their views of the instructor's professional and ethical behavior, their workload, what they have learned in the course, fairness of grading, and the instructor's ability to communicate. They are not good sources from which to judge relevance and recency of course content and knowledge and scholarship of the instructor.
3. Items found on student rating surveys are based on commonly identified characteristics of effective teaching and generally fall into three groups:
 - a. Organization, structure or clarity of course, and course material;
 - b. Teacher-student interaction; and,

- c. Teaching skill.

Other subjects of evaluation include evaluation of workload in the course, grading and examinations, student outcomes, and global questions. For promotion and tenure purposes, the global or general questions have been found to be the most stable. In addition to instructional quality and student learning, several factors have been found to have some relation to student ratings: class size, subject matter, and expected grade. Whether a course is in a student's major, is being used to fulfill a requirement outside the major or is an elective has also been found to have some relation to student ratings.

- 4. Student ratings have limitations.

- a. Because student evaluations commonly elicit numerical responses, it is easy to assign them a precision that they do not possess; i.e., it is easy to over-interpret small differences in average scores.
- b. When such data are used for personnel decisions, the possibility of faculty influencing the ratings must be taken into consideration. Standardized and systematic procedures for administering student evaluations are essential to ensuring the usefulness of ratings.
- c. Student evaluations alone are not sufficient for either personnel decisions or for improvement of teaching.

APPENDIX B

TIMETABLE FOR 2023-2024 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

On or Before

July 1, 2023

Administrative Guidelines distributed. **Unit guidelines sent to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.**

All promotion and tenure procedures **are** established. In most cases, units will have established procedures previously and will continue to use them. If, however, changes are recommended, the changes must be adopted formally by the faculty, approved by the dean, and approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost **by** this date.

August 8, 2023

These unit reports are now provided in Workday and this will be removed next year, when the 2024-2025 Administrative Guidelines are updated.

Office of Human Resources **used to** provide reports to deans indicating number of years of credit toward tenure earned by faculty in their respective academic units and listing all faculty in their respective units who will have second-, fourth- and sixth-year, and at the College of Medicine the third-, sixth-, and ninth-year tenure reviews in 2023-24.

October 3, 2023

All promotion and tenure review committees membership lists, including rank and title, for all promotion and tenure review committees are forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost, together with a statement of procedures for forming review committees or a statement that such procedures have not changed.

*Deadline established
by Units*

All reviews for faculty at non-University Park locations who have retained their tenure status in a college at University Park completed and forwarded to college deans.

*Deadline established
by Units*

All department, school, and division level reviews, except for second-year, completed and forwarded to the college dean.

February 1, 2024

All factual changes or new information must be submitted by this date.

March 1, 2024

All college-level reviews completed; 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 Promotion and Tenure Review Committee via the Office of Human Resources.

On or Before

March 1, 2024

Candidates in their first year of the probationary period who are to be terminated by June 30 of the same academic year must be notified. (V.I.3.)

April 1, 2024

All department and division level second-year reviews (and second-year reviews at campuses in the University College or Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies) completed and forwarded to the college dean.

April 15, 2024

All reviews completed by the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee; all recommendations forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

May 3, 2024

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

June 14, 2024

For all faculty not having a promotion or tenure review in 2023-24, annual personnel evaluations completed and faculty informed of results of these evaluations, in writing.

June 14, 2024

All reports required in AC23 and the Administrative Guidelines submitted.

June 28, 2024

All final decisions must be entered into WorkLion by the Human Resources Strategic Partner in the academic unit. Candidates who will not be continued in tenure-eligible positions must be notified in writing (V.I.3.).

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE LETTERS TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

In the sample letters below, double brackets indicate sections that should be omitted for promotion to the rank of Professor. Braces indicate wording that should be individualized for the candidate. While academic units may make minor adjustments to the letters below to reflect disciplinary considerations, Penn State's expectation is that units will utilize the language below when identifying external reviewers.

Because the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic will be felt for many years, the language below referring to the pandemic will be maintained in letters until there are no longer any candidates for tenure who were in the probationary period during calendar year 2020.

SAMPLE 1:

Dear _____:

{Dr} _____, {rank, unit}, is being considered for promotion to [[Associate]] Professor [[and the award of tenure]] at The Pennsylvania State University during the coming academic year. The informed assessment of recognized experts from outside our institution of a candidate's {research, creative practice, and scholarly accomplishments,} impact, and stature in their field are important factors in our decision to promote [[and award tenure to]] all tenure-line faculty members. I am requesting your confidential letter of assessment of the appropriateness of the promotion [and tenure] of {Dr.} _____.

Enclosed you will find {Dr.} _____'s curriculum vitae, a narrative {research/artistic} statement, and {copies of ___ selected publications/examples/evidence of their creative accomplishments}. Also enclosed is an excerpt from our College's "Statement of Expectations and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure." I would find it the most helpful to receive your responses to the following questions:

- In what capacity, if any, do you know {Dr.} _____? If you have had interactions with {Dr.} _____, please briefly describe the context of these interactions.
- Based on your direct knowledge, does {Dr.} _____'s {research/creative practice} justify promotion [[and award of tenure]]?
- Has {Dr.} _____'s {research/creative practice} had influence on other researchers in the field or the broader discipline or provided significant impact on people and society? [[Penn State recognizes that evidence of influence and impact may not be fully developed for early-career faculty members. Therefore, the potential for one's work to have influence and impact is a key factor in the award of tenure.]]
- [[If tenure is granted, how likely is it that {Dr.} _____ will elevate significantly the quality and reputation of our {academic unit} and continue on a trajectory for future promotion to Professor?]]

While activities such as teaching, advising, and university service to the profession also enter into the valuation of candidates, I do not assume you will have had the opportunity to assess

these activities. Therefore, I seek your comments only on competence of {Dr.} _____'s {research/creative practice}.

Recognizing the disruption to the scholarly, instructional, and service activities of faculty members due to the COVID-19 pandemic and social unrest in spring 2020, Penn State provided candidates for promotion and tenure the option to extend their tenure clock by one year. Candidates for promotion and tenure may also receive additional stays of the tenure clock according to university policy. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure at The Pennsylvania State University are the same for all faculty members regardless of length of service during the probationary period.

I also encourage you to make your assessment in the context of the disruption the university experienced beginning in March 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Research facilities, including core and individual laboratories, offices, libraries, as well as studios, museums, theaters, and performance venues were closed or had access significantly limited. Human subject research was suspended. Research administration and editorial activities also were impacted creating unanticipated delays in both the achievement of project milestones and in the peer review of scholarly product. All faculty had to move their courses from an in-person to a remote delivery mode within a week. To comply with physical distancing, most faculty had to work out of their homes, many K-12 students switched to online instruction or homeschooling, and childcare was reduced or unavailable to many faculty members with young children. While all faculty members were affected, the effects of the disruption were not uniform. Candidates were invited to address how the pandemic and other 2020 events of magnitude (e.g., racial/societal unrest) impacted their work into the statement that accompanies their materials. I trust you will keep in mind the effects of these disruptions as you formulate your assessment.

It is Penn State's policy to keep your letter confidential. Your letter will be shared only with the necessary review committees, administrators and executives responsible for making recommendations on promotion and tenure.

While I realize the burden of time and effort my request imposes, I would appreciate a response by _____, although I will also welcome a later response if meeting this due date poses a problem. Please send your letter to me via e-mail at _____@psu.edu with a copy to my administrative staff assistant at _____@psu.edu. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely,

SAMPLE 2: (University College example)

Dear _____:

{Dr} _____, {rank, unit}, is being considered for promotion to [[Associate]] Professor [[and the award of tenure]] at The Pennsylvania State University during the coming academic year. The informed assessment of recognized experts from outside our institution of a candidate's {research, creative practice, and scholarly accomplishments,} impact, and stature in their field are important factors in our decision to promote [[and award tenure to]] all tenure-line faculty members. I am requesting your confidential letter of assessment of the appropriateness of the promotion [and tenure] of {Dr.} _____.

Dr. _____ is located at the _____ campus, which is one of 14 campuses in the University College. This campus focuses heavily on lower-division undergraduate teaching with selected associate degrees; however, we also offer several baccalaureate degree programs. Please see our website for additional information about the campus at http://_____.

The largest demand on faculty time is teaching, with a typical load of three classes each semester. We also expect the faculty to be engaged in research and other scholarly activities, and to serve the campus and community in various ways. Activities such as student advising; campus, college, and university service; and public and community service enter into the evaluation of candidates. However, we do not expect you to judge these other activities. We seek your comments only on research and scholarly competence and reputation.

Enclosed you will find {Dr.} _____'s curriculum vitae, a narrative {research/artistic} statement, and {copies of _____ selected publications/examples/evidence of their creative accomplishments}. Also enclosed is an excerpt from our College's "Statement of Expectations and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure." I would find it the most helpful to receive your responses to the following questions:

- In what capacity, if any, do you know {Dr.} _____? If you have had interactions with {Dr.} _____, please briefly describe the context of these interactions.
- Based on your direct knowledge, does {Dr.} _____'s {research/creative practice} justify promotion [[and award of tenure]]?
- Has {Dr.} _____'s {research/creative practice} had influence on other researchers in the field or the broader discipline or provided significant impact on people and society? [[Penn State recognizes that evidence of influence and impact may not be fully developed for early-career faculty members. Therefore, the potential for one's work to have influence and impact is a key factor in the award of tenure.]]
- [[If tenure is granted, how likely is it that {Dr.} _____ will elevate significantly the quality and reputation of our {academic unit} and continue on a trajectory for future promotion to Professor?]]

While activities such as teaching, advising, and university service to the profession also enter into the valuation of candidates, I do not assume you will have had the opportunity to assess these activities. Therefore, I seek your comments only on competence of {Dr.} _____'s {research/creative practice}.

Recognizing the disruption to the scholarly, instructional, and service activities of faculty members due to the COVID-19 pandemic and social unrest in spring 2020, Penn State provided candidates for promotion and tenure the option to extend their tenure clock by one year. Candidates for promotion and tenure may also receive additional stays of the tenure clock according to university policy. Our policy states that the criteria for promotion and tenure at The Pennsylvania State University are the same for all faculty members regardless of length of service during the probationary period.

I also encourage you to make your assessment in the context of the disruption the university experienced beginning in March 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Research facilities, including core and individual laboratories, offices, libraries, as well as studios, museums, theaters, and performance venues were closed or had access significantly limited. Human subject research was suspended. Research administration and editorial activities also were impacted creating unanticipated delays in both the achievement of project milestones and in the peer review of scholarly product. All faculty had to move their courses from an in-person to a remote delivery mode within a week. To comply with physical distancing, most faculty had to work out of their homes, many K-12 students switched to online instruction or homeschooling, and childcare was reduced or unavailable to many faculty members with young children. While all faculty members were affected, the effects of the disruption were not uniform. Candidates were invited to address how the pandemic and other 2020 events of magnitude (e.g., racial/societal unrest) impacted their work into the statement that accompanies their materials. I trust you will keep in mind the effects of these disruptions as you formulate your assessment.


It is Penn State's policy to keep your letter confidential. Your letter will be shared only with the necessary review committees, administrators, and executives responsible for making recommendations on promotion and tenure.

While I realize the burden of time and effort my request imposes, I would appreciate a response by _____, although I will also welcome a later response if meeting this due date poses a problem. Please send your letter to me via e-mail at _____@psu.edu with a copy to my administrative staff assistant at _____@psu.edu. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX D

LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE



APPENDIX E

SAMPLE CANDIDATE SIGNATURE STATEMENT

A variety of candidate signature pages have been used in the past. After consultation with the University Faculty Senate officers in February 1989, the following wording has been recommended for use on the signature page and is to be used for provisional reviews as well as promotion and final tenure reviews:

I have reviewed the contents of my dossier, with the exception of confidential materials, as defined in the AC23 Guidelines.

Candidate Signature

Date

APPENDIX F

DOSSIER DIVIDERS AND FORMS

The promotion and tenure forms are available only in GURU's General Forms Usage Guide at <http://guru.psu.edu/forms/4-21PromotionandTenureForms.html> which allow the user to download the forms electronically.

- Promotion and Tenure Form *(07-01-2023)*
- Biographical Data for Promotion/Tenure Review *(07-01-2021)*
- The Scholarship of Librarianship *(07-01-2020)*
- The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning *(07-01-2023)*
- Patient Care and the Scholarship of Patient Care *(07-01-2023)*
- The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments *(07-01-2022)*
- Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession *(07-01-2023)*
- External Letters of Assessment (For Promotion and Final Tenure Reviews) *(07-01-2014)*
- Log of External Letters *(07-01-2016)*
- Statements of Evaluation of the Candidate by Review Committees and Administrators *(07-01-2014)*



PROMOTION AND TENURE FORM

Purpose: This recommendation form is used for (1) recommending or not recommending continuance on the tenure track; (2) awarding tenure to the ranks of professor, librarian, associate professor, associate librarian, and assistant professor; and (3) for promotion to the ranks of professor, librarian, senior scientist, associate professor, associate librarian, and senior research associate.

Instructions: See the Promotion and Tenure instruction page on GURU for details. Date: _____

Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial: _____ PSU-ID: _____

Promotion [] Early Tenure [] Year Tenure []

Current Exact Rank and Title: _____

Campus: _____ College: _____

Department/Division/School: _____

Graduate Faculty Status: Member [] Nonmember []

Rank and Date of Initial Appointment to the University: _____

Rank and Date of Appointment to Tenure-Eligible Position: _____

Years of Credit Granted Toward Tenure at Appointment to Tenure-Eligible Position: _____

Rank and Date of Previous Promotions: _____

Date(s) of Stay(s) of Provisional Tenure: _____

Proposed Rank and Title (For Promotion Only): _____

Date Tenured: _____

(Check One)

Table with 5 columns: Unit, Recommended, Not Recommended, Signature, Date. Rows include Campus, Department, College, and University with checkboxes and signature lines for various roles like Chair, Department Head, and President.



THE SCHOLARSHIP OF LIBRARIANSHIP

This section contains:

- Statement of core responsibilities
- A description of accomplishments which illustrate unique contributions and abilities in librarianship, emphasizing their nature and significance
- Professional development activities related to your librarianship activities
- Letters of peer evaluation

(07-01-2020)



THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

This section contains the following in reverse chronological order, with the most recent date listed first:

- List of credit courses taught at Penn State for each semester with enrollments in each course
- List of non-credit courses and workshops taught in support of outreach-based instruction
- Concise compilation of results of student **feedback** from multiple sources, documented evaluation of candidate's programs, activities, and skills in relating to clientele
- List of advising responsibilities
- Other evidence of resident and/or outreach-based teaching and advising effectiveness (e.g., performance of students in subsequent courses; tangible results and benefits derived by clientele; recipient of teaching *and advising* awards)
- Supervision of, and membership on, graduate and undergraduate dissertations, theses, projects, monographs, performances, productions, and exhibitions required for degrees; types of degrees and years granted
- Faculty input concerning the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, including any statements from colleagues who have visited the candidate's classroom and evaluated the candidate's teaching, or who are in good position to evaluate outreach-based instruction or advising
 - Peer review shall consider a range of teaching activities including, but not limited to, the development of materials such as case studies and class assignments, course or teaching portfolios, advising, research collaboration, and graduate student mentoring. Internal letters about teaching effectiveness should be included in this section.
- Any statements from administrators which attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness
- If student comments from such sources as student evaluations, formal interviews, or exit surveys are reviewed, the findings should be presented by a summary statement that conveys the students' sense of strengths and weaknesses

(07-01-2023)



PATIENT CARE AND THE SCHOLARSHIP OF PATIENT CARE

This section contains:

- Summary of the candidate's clinical assignments at the **Penn State Health Milton S. Hershey Medical Center**, Regional Campus, or affiliated sites, including effort commitments and number and complexity of cases for the period under review (since last promotion or **past 10 years**, whichever is shorter). Candidates should ensure that the Narrative Statement at the beginning of the dossier describes their clinical expertise and area of focus.
- Documentation of the quality of care provided for the period under review (e.g., summaries of patient satisfaction scores and/or anonymous patient comments, evidence of patient outcomes)
- Documentation of candidate's participation in quality improvement efforts or other activities to improve the quality of patient care at the divisional, departmental, or institutional levels
- Documentation of any awards or other recognition for excellence in patient care (e.g., from professional societies; patient advocacy groups; government agencies)
- Letters solicited from internal colleagues (who are senior to the candidate) and/or from referring physicians (if appropriate) providing comments on the candidate's clinical expertise and effectiveness of patient care

NOTE: Letters from individuals internal to Penn State are solicited by the Department Chair; letters from individuals outside Penn State are solicited by the Office of Faculty Affairs on behalf of the Dean.

(07-01-2023)



THE SCHOLARSHIP OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This section contains the following, listed in standard bibliographic form with the most recent date first. (Do not include material contained in other sections of the dossier.). The list below is intentionally comprehensive and inclusive of all disciplines. Candidates are not expected to have an entry for every category.

- Research and/or scholarly publications

Citations should include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages, where appropriate; for multiple-authored works, the contribution of the candidate should be clearly indicated (e.g., co-author, supervised person who authored the work, etc. and percent of contribution). Electronic journals should be listed in appropriate categories with documentation as outlined in the Administrative Guidelines, III.C.7.

Publications should be listed as follows

1. Articles published in refereed journals (include only articles in refereed journals in this section)
 2. Books
 3. Parts of books
 4. Book reviews
 5. Refereed conference proceedings
 6. Articles published in nonrefereed journals
 7. Articles in in-house publications
 8. Research reports to sponsor
 9. Manuscripts accepted for publication (substantiated by letter of acceptance) – Indicate if peer-reviewed and number of pages of manuscript
 10. Manuscripts submitted for publication, with an indication of where submitted and when – Indicate if peer-reviewed and number of pages of manuscript
 11. Manuscripts in progress (Second-, third-, fourth-, and fifth-year reviews only. For the College of Medicine this also includes, sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-year reviews.)
 12. Cooperative extension bulletins and circulars
- Creative accomplishments
Exhibition, installation, production, or publication of original works of architecture, dance, design, electronic media, film, journalism, landscape architecture, literature, music, theatre, and visual art
Performance of original dance, literary, musical, visual arts, or theatrical works or works from traditional and contemporary repertoires of the performing arts
 - Papers, presentations, seminars, and workshops
Papers presented at technical and professional meetings (meeting and paper titles); indication about whether the candidate was the presenter.
Record of participation in, and description of, seminars and workshops (short description of activity, with titles, dates, sponsors, etc.); indication of role in seminar or workshop, e.g. student, invited participant, etc.



THE SCHOLARSHIP OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS (continued)

- Description of outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of candidate's expertise (consulting, journal editor, reviewer for refereed journals or presses, peer reviewer of grants, speaking engagements, services to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions, etc.)
- Projects, grants, commissions, and contracts (date, title, where submitted, amount, percent credit):
 1. Awarded (Fully processed financial award)
 2. Pending (Submitted proposal that is awaiting funding status from sponsor)
 3. Not funded (Notification received from sponsor or principal investigator that proposal was not funded [Second-, third-, fourth, and fifth-year reviews only. For the College of Medicine this also includes, sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-year reviews])
- List of grants and contracts for improvement of instruction, with an indication of the candidate's role and percent credit in preparing and administering the grants and contracts
- Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (patents, new product development, new art forms, citation index analysis, etc.) including impact in society and research scholarship and creative accomplishments
- Record of pursuit of advanced degrees and/or further academic studies
- Record of membership in professional and learned societies
- Description of new courses and/or programs developed, including service-learning and outreach courses
- Description of new computer software programs developed
- Description of new methods of teaching established courses and/or programs
- List of honors or awards for scholarship, research, or creative activities
- Applications of research scholarship in the field including new applications developed and tested; new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions, etc.
- Technology transferred or adapted in the field
- Technical assistance provided
- If there are unit-specific objective criteria used for assessing the scholarly substance and quality of the candidate's achievement in research and creative accomplishment, list the candidate's performance as measured by these criteria

(07-01-2022)



SERVICE AND THE SCHOLARSHIP OF SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, SOCIETY,
AND THE PROFESSION

This section contains the following in reverse chronological order with the most recent date listed first: The list below is intentionally comprehensive and inclusive of all disciplines. Candidates are not expected to have an entry for every category. Service to the University

1. Record of administrative assignments at department, division, school, campus, college, and University levels
 2. Record of committee work at the department, division, school, campus, college, and University levels
 3. Participation in campus and/or University-wide governance bodies and related activities
 4. Record of **academic leadership and support work** (college representative, faculty mentoring, assessment activities, etc.)
 5. Record of contributions to the University's programs to enhance diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging
 6. Assistance to student organizations
 7. Participation in recruitment and retention activities
 8. Participation in development/fundraising activities
 9. Other
- Service to society as a representative of the University (limit the list to those activities that use the candidate's professional expertise)
 1. Participation in community affairs
 2. Service to governmental agencies at the international, federal, state, or local levels
 3. Service to business and industry
 4. Service to public and private organizations
 5. Service to citizen/client groups
 6. Testifying as an expert witness
 7. Service to enhance diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging
 8. Other (e.g., participation in task forces, authorities, meetings, etc. of public nonprofit, or private organizations.
 - Service to the disciplines and to the profession
 1. Organizing conferences, service on conference committees
 2. Active participation in professional and learned societies (e.g., offices held, committee work, and other responsibilities)
 3. Service to enhance diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging
 4. Other
 - List of honors or awards for leadership and/or service to the University, community, or the profession

(07-01-2023)



EXTERNAL LETTERS OF ASSESSMENT
(FOR PROMOTION AND FINAL TENURE REVIEWS)

This section contains:

- Description of how the letters of assessment were solicited, including a sample letter or request, and a description of the procedure for selecting external evaluators. Note: When letters are solicited, the request should be for letters of assessment rather than “recommendations” or “endorsements,” and evaluators should be encouraged to concentrate on those aspects of the candidate’s record which are most important to the external visibility and professional standing of the candidate.
- List of materials sent to external evaluators (e.g., copies of publications, vita, narrative statement, etc.)
- Identification of those who have written assessments, including a brief statement of the referee’s achievements and standing in their discipline.
- A log showing the date on which each external letter was requested by the department/dean, and the date the letter was received. All requests should be entered regardless of whether a response was obtained. Only those external letter writers who agreed to serve as an external letter writer and were subsequently sent the materials specified in the request to external letter writers, typically the curriculum vitae, a narrative {research/artistic} statement, and copies of selected publications/examples/evidence of their creative accomplishments should be recorded in the log.

(07-01-2014)



STATEMENTS OF EVALUATION OF THE CANDIDATE BY REVIEW COMMITTEES AND ADMINISTRATORS

This section contains:

* Evaluative statements assessing the candidate's strengths and weaknesses with respect to University and local criteria shall be provided at campus, department, college, and University levels. Each of these evaluative statements is inserted in the candidate's dossier at each step in the review process in the following order:

1. For tenure cases, all previous tenure review evaluations, presented in chronological order, beginning with the earliest probationary reviews
2. Campus review committee (if appropriate)
3. Campus chancellor (if appropriate)
4. Secondary department head (if appropriate)
- **5. Department review committee (if appropriate)
6. Department head, or other appropriate unit head; e.g., division head or school director (if appropriate)
7. College review committee (if appropriate)
8. College dean or campus chancellor
9. University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (if appropriate)

The author(s) of the comments and recommendations at each of the above levels of review shall indicate the relative emphasis given to each of the University and local criteria/expectations in the evaluation of each candidate for promotion and tenure. When a candidate has not received a unanimous committee vote, the evaluation shall include a discussion of the reasons for the divergent opinions.

All committee reports should list the entire membership, and be signed and dated by at least the Chair.

The numerical vote of each committee should be reported.

* Evaluative statements are required for tenure cases only. Post-tenure dossiers do not require prior evaluative statements.

** An individual's performance in an intercollege research program should be evaluated in writing by the program director or by appropriate faculty member(s).

(07-01-2014)

APPENDIX G

GUIDELINES FOR STAYING OF THE PROVISIONAL TENURE PERIOD

1. A faculty member desiring a temporary staying of the provisional tenure period must submit such a request in writing through:
 - a. the department head and the dean; and,
 - b. to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Although the final decision on the granting of this request shall rest with the Executive Vice President and Provost. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall confer with appropriate academic administrators and with the faculty member as needed. Further, the Executive Vice President and Provost may impanel a special faculty review board to advise on the merits of individual requests.

2. Whenever possible, the request should be submitted prior to the start of the tenure year in question. If a request is submitted after the start of the tenure process, it may not be approved for that year but could be considered for the following year in the tenure cycle. Requests will be reviewed in a timely manner; individuals presenting requests will be notified of approval or denial as quickly as possible.
3. The intent of this temporary staying of the provisional period is to ensure equity in the tenure system. If extenuating circumstances prevent a faculty member from having an equal opportunity to have their academic record upheld during the tenure review, the faculty member should qualify for this exception. Therefore, the primary purpose of the policy is to create an equal opportunity for all provisional faculty. It is not intended to improve their teaching record or scholarly productivity in the absence of extenuating circumstances and should not be invoked for the usual vicissitudes of a faculty member's life.
4. Faculty are eligible to stop the tenure clock for one year for each occurrence during the period leading up to tenure, for a maximum total of two years. A stay should not penalize or adversely affect the faculty member in the tenure review. (See VI)
5. In order to evaluate the request, additional documentation, such as medical information, may be required.
6. This provision is not necessarily linked to a leave of absence with or without salary. However, in the event that a faculty member is considered to be employed between half-time and full-time and/or is receiving commensurate pay and benefits, this stopping-out provision may be applied. This provision is not the basis for determining if a faculty member should be employed full-time or should receive full pay and benefits. Those decisions are made separately prior to the request to stay the tenure provisional period. Such decisions shall be made in accordance with appropriate University policies. (See Appendix L)

APPENDIX H

GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDING FACULTY FOR EARLY TENURE

The normal provisional tenure period is seven years, or ten years at the College of Medicine with the decision being made as a part of the sixth year, or the ninth year at the College of Medicine, review. In order to consider individuals for tenure prior to this period, an extremely strong case must be presented. The number of years and achievements beyond the completion of the doctoral degree (or the highest professional degree in the discipline) are key factors in early tenure considerations. In some instances, there may be unusual or extenuating circumstances that may merit consideration of early tenure. If this is the case, the following procedures should be followed:

1. The dean should submit a request and justification in writing to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs complete with the accompanying documentation, to consider a faculty member for early tenure.
2. Accompanying documentation should include the most current vita of the candidate and significant accomplishments achieved by the candidate that would support an early tenure review. A statement of support from the department head should be included as well as some indication that the department promotion and tenure review committee is willing to undertake a review of the case.
3. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will review each request on a case-by-case basis, and consult with the Executive Vice President and Provost. If the decision is to support the request to consider early tenure, the dean will be advised to prepare the case for an early tenure review, without any guarantee that the candidate will receive tenure through an early review. If the decision is not to support the request, the dean will be so advised with reasons for the evaluation.
4. If a candidate is successful in receiving tenure through an early review process, he or she will be notified of the award of tenure at the time that all promotion and tenure decisions are released at the University level. If a candidate is not successful in receiving tenure through an early review process, he or she is not penalized in any way or disadvantaged from the normal tenure review sequence at a later time.

APPENDIX I

GUIDELINES FOR IMMEDIATE TENURE REVIEWS

Applicability

Immediate tenure reviews are appropriate for persons being considered for faculty or academic administrative positions at the University. The immediate tenure process is not appropriate for faculty members or academic administrators already under contract. Immediate tenure may be granted to new faculty appointments, almost always when they have a tenured appointment at the institution they are leaving. The “out-of-sequence” process or a hybrid of the immediate tenure and the out-of-sequence processes should be utilized when there is a desire to hire individuals who do not currently have tenure at their home institution. Because out-of-sequence requests for promotion and tenure reviews will not be handled by the immediate tenure review process, please contact the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs to initiate this process (see Appendix J). *The immediate tenure process must begin prior to the candidate’s start date **but does not need to be completed prior to the person starting in the role. In the rare cases when a candidate is denied immediate tenure, the candidate is moved to probationary status on the tenure-line.***

To the extent possible, it is expected that the same college and department review committees that were appointed at the beginning of the review process will be reconvened to make recommendations in cases of immediate tenure. *Given that the committee’s charge is to determine whether the candidate’s record merits the awarding of tenure, the committee may be composed of tenured faculty members of any rank.*

University Review Committee

An Immediate Tenure Review Committee will be appointed annually consisting of former members of the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, divided into separate subcommittees. These individuals have considerable experience in promotion and tenure review procedures. A member of each subcommittee serves as chair and works closely with the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost in coordinating immediate tenure reviews.

The chair of the Immediate Tenure Review Subcommittee will submit a recommendation to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost at which time a final decision will be made. The dean will be informed of the final decision by written confirmation.

Time Frame for Reviews

In most cases, University-level review of candidates for immediate tenure are completed in two weeks once the case has been assigned to a university review committee, depending on the subcommittee members’ availability. To expedite the review at the University level, it is helpful for the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs to be alerted to a forthcoming case, to ensure that the dossiers are complete and organized in the order outlined above, and to ensure that the candidate has a signed Authorization and Disclosure of Misconduct form on file in the Office of the Vice

Provost for Faculty Affairs (see <https://vpfa.psu.edu/disclosure-of-misconduct/>). Lack of required documentation may delay the process.

Process and Documentation

In general, reviews for immediate tenure parallel closely the policies and procedures of AC23 (formerly HR23) but are not identical to them. For example, while the candidate's achievements or potential in all three cells—teaching, research and scholarship, and service—should be addressed by all levels of review, they need not be presented in formal dossiers with dividers, nor should the promotion and tenure signature page from our formal promotion and tenure dossier be used.

Adequate documentation must be included so that the Immediate Tenure Review Committee can make an informed judgment about tenure. Particularly when prospective faculty members are being considered, every effort should be made to obtain documentation about teaching effectiveness. In cases where information about teaching effectiveness may not be available, a review of speaking engagements and guest lectureships or letters from the candidate's peers that address teaching effectiveness may provide insight. Follow-up telephone calls are encouraged and appropriate to further document teaching effectiveness. A scanned PDF copy of the following documentation must be submitted in the order below for a candidate who is being reviewed for immediate tenure. It is helpful to have materials organized by using bookmarks in the pdf file.

1. *Title page: Including name and college*
2. *Copies of the college and department criteria statements.*
3. *Curriculum vitae: Include the most current vita of the candidate.*
4. *Scholarship of Teaching: Summary of documentation of teaching effectiveness (i.e., student and peer evaluations; please do not include all of the candidate's prior teaching evaluations). If such information is not available please provide a summary of other documentation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, such as a review of speaking engagements and guest lectureships, letters from the candidate's peers that address teaching effectiveness, or a summary of follow-up phone calls made to further document teaching effectiveness.*
5. *External letters: Dossiers shall include a minimum of four external letters. Letters of reference that were used in the search process may be acceptable; all should address the candidate's qualifications for tenure. Administrators are expected to consult with the chair of the unit's promotion and tenure committee to make the determination of whether additional letters should be requested. **The unit's standard practice for soliciting external writers should be utilized and similar to the selection of external writers for promotion and tenure reviews during the normal cycle, external letters should be written by letter writers who are external to Penn State and at a higher rank than the candidate.***

6. *Statements of evaluation and recommendations on department/college letterhead from:*

- a. *The department promotion and tenure review committee*
- b. *The department head.*
- c. *The college, campus review committee, Dickinson Law, Penn State Law, or the University Libraries review committee*
- d. *Dean of the College or Chancellor.*

In making evaluations and recommendations, peer review committees and administrators should not feel compelled to make judgments about areas for which they have insufficient data.

Reinstatement

If the candidate was previously awarded tenure at Penn State three or less years ago, please contact the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for information about how to proceed. Candidates awarded tenure at Penn State more than three years ago must follow the immediate tenure guidelines.

APPENDIX J

GUIDELINES FOR OUT-OF-SEQUENCE PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

Requests and Applicability

A request for an out-of-sequence review must be made to the Executive Vice President and Provost for demonstrable reason concerning why the review had not or could not be done according to the regular timetable. If approved, a formal letter from the dean indicating the reason for the out-of-sequence request must accompany the dossier.

Procedure

Requests for out-of-sequence promotion and tenure reviews will not be handled by the immediate tenure review process, but rather will be reviewed by the regular University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee as quickly as it can be convened.

College and Department Promotion and Tenure Review Committees

To the extent possible, it is expected that the same college and department review committees that were appointed at the beginning of the review process will be convened to make recommendations in cases of out-of-sequence reviews.

University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee

The University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee will be convened as soon as possible upon receipt of the dossier from the college. That Committee will follow their standard procedures in conducting a review of the out-of-sequence case and will forward the case with their recommendation to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Review by the Executive Vice President and Provost and the President of the University

The Executive Vice President and Provost and the President of the University will conduct their review of the out-of-sequence case keeping with their standard procedures. The candidate will receive a letter from the President of the University awarding the new rank in the event of a promotion review, and awarding tenure for a positive tenure review. In the event of a negative tenure review, the candidate will also receive a letter from the President of the University. In all cases, letters are sent to the candidate via the college dean.

Documentation

In order to consider an out-of-sequence review, the dossier must be accompanied by a letter from the dean indicating the reason for the out-of-sequence review. If the case involves an early tenure review, those guidelines (Appendix H) must also be followed which states that the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost must have an opportunity to review the candidate's vita prior to the dean initiating the review.

A standard dossier must be presented, with all three cells addressed, and must include external letters. An original of the dossier must be provided and sent to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost via the Office of Human Resources.

Implementation Date for New Rank or Tenure

As is the case for promotion and tenure decisions made in the regular sequence, new rank or tenure would be implemented at the start of the next academic year following the decision.

APPENDIX K

SAMPLE LETTER INFORMING OF TERMINATION

Dear Dr. _____:

In accordance with procedures set forth for review in The Pennsylvania State University's Policy AC23, I regret to inform you of the decision that promotion and tenure will not be granted. Your employment as a member of the University faculty will terminate June 30, _____, and we will expect you to carry out the full responsibilities of your faculty position through the completion of your appointment.

Sincerely,

Dean or Chancellor

APPENDIX L

PERTINENT UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

Academic and Human Resources policies and guidelines are located at <https://policies.psu.edu/>.

Pertinent Academic and Human Resources Policies

- HR11 Affirmative Action in Employment at The Pennsylvania State University
- HR16 Leave of Absence without Salary (Other Than for Active Military Service or Training)
- AC18 Graduate Study Leave of Absence
- HR19 Leave of Absence for Active Military Service or Training
- AC23 Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations
- AC40 Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance
- HR60 Access to Personnel Files
- AC61 Faculty Contracts
- AC76 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

Pertinent Human Resources Guidelines

- HRG11 Family and Medical Leave
- HRG18 Paid Parental Leave for Faculty

The Administrative Guidelines for Policy AC23 are posted online at:
<https://vpfa.psu.edu/promotion-and-tenure/>.

APPENDIX M

COVID GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS IN EFFECT SPRING OF 2020-SUMMER OF 2023

This appendix contains COVID guidance documents that impacted candidates in the probationary period between Spring of 2020 and Summer of 2023. These include “Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness” and “Options for Alternative Assessment.”

GUIDANCE ON THE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

(This guidance is a summary of how teaching effectiveness was assessed between Spring of 2020 and summer of 2023. It was last updated 10.21.22)

This document summarizes the university’s approach to the assessment of teaching effectiveness beginning with Spring 2020. This guidance applies to all faculty members, instructors, and graduate students serving as the instructor-of-record or as a graduate teaching assistant. At the end of the document please find three tables, “Use of Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness for Courses Taught-2020-2023” and “Use of Alternate Assessments for 2020-2023 in Promotion and Tenure Reviews.”

- **ANNUAL REVIEWS**

- **2022**

To ensure that student input is included in the assessment of teaching effectiveness, the “university-wide experimental SRTE short-form” (see “Summary of Short-form SRTE modifications made in fall 2020 and calendar year 2021” below) will be administered in all classes taught from spring 2021-spring 2023. The results will be made available to both faculty and administrators at rateteaching.psu.edu and in Activity Insight reports.

In annual reviews, the assessment of teaching effectiveness for courses taught beginning in spring 2021, should adhere to the following guidelines.

- Short-form SRTEs for all courses taught will be included in faculty annual review materials.
 - If measures of central tendency are referenced by either the administrator or the faculty member/instructor, both the median and mode must be referenced and discussed in the context of the distribution.
 - Administrators are urged to review the [University Faculty Senate Report on Effective Use of SRTE Data](#) to inform their interpretation of results.
 - Faculty members/instructors will include one alternate assessment of teaching effectiveness for each calendar year (see “Options for Alternate Assessment” below) in their annual review materials.

- **PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEWS FOR TENURE-LINE AND NON-TENURE-LINE FACULTY MEMBERS**

- **Spring 2021-Spring 2023**

To ensure that student input is included in the assessment of teaching effectiveness for faculty, the university-wide experimental SRTE short-form (see “Summary of Short-form SRTE modifications made in fall 2020 and calendar year 2021” below) will be administered in all classes. The results will be made available to both faculty and administrators at rateteaching.psu.edu and in Activity Insight reports. For promotion and tenure reviews, the assessment of teaching effectiveness for courses taught will adhere to the following guidelines.

- The short-form SRTEs will be included for all courses taught in faculty promotion and tenure review materials.
- If measures of central tendency are referenced by either the administrator or the faculty member/instructor, both the median and mode must be referenced and discussed in the context of the distribution.
- Faculty members/instructors will include one alternate assessment of teaching effectiveness for each academic year (see comprehensive list below).

- **Fall 2020**

For promotion and tenure reviews for tenure-line and non-tenure-line faculty members, assessment of teaching effectiveness for courses taught in fall 2020 will adhere to the following guidelines.

- At the discretion of the faculty member, fall 2020 short-form SRTEs may be included in dossiers as evidence of teaching effectiveness.
- If measures of central tendency are referenced by either the faculty member or the administrator, both the median and mode must be referenced and discussed in the context of the distribution.
- Consistent with the 2020-2021 P&T Administrative Guidelines (II C. 2), the omission of SRTEs does not provide any evidence relevant to the assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- Faculty members/instructors will include one alternate assessment of teaching effectiveness for each academic year (see comprehensive list below).
- Peer teaching review is not suspended for the fall of 2020. Peer review can consist of a wide range of activities that may or may not include class visitation. See promotion and tenure FAQs #68 and #69.
- Once a faculty member determines what data for fall 2020 to include in a formal review, that decision may not be changed in dossiers created for subsequent reviews.
- For example, relative to assessment of teaching effectiveness for fall 2020, Dr. Z included fall 2020 SRTEs in the 4th year review. Dr. Z must include SRTE scores for fall 2020 in subsequent formal reviews (e.g., 6th-year review). The decision made at the earliest review governs what is included at a later review.

- Similarly, if Dr. Z submits “formative feedback from students” for fall 2020, Dr. Z must include this self-reflection on fall 2020 courses in dossiers created for subsequent formal reviews. No additional alternate assessments may be included for fall 2020 in subsequent formal reviews.

- **Spring/summer 2020**

In regard to promotion and tenure reviews for tenure-line and non-tenure-line faculty members, assessment of teaching effectiveness for courses taught in spring/summer 2020 will adhere to the following guidelines.

- For formal reviews that take place in fall 2020 and in subsequent years, inclusion of spring and summer 2020 SRTEs is not required and is discouraged except in rare circumstances. See promotion and tenure FAQ #67.
- Consistent with the 2020-2021 P&T Administrative Guidelines (II C. 2), the omission of SRTEs does not provide any evidence relevant to the assessment of teaching effectiveness. See promotion and tenure FAQs #68 and #69.
- Peer teaching reviews were suspended in March 2020. The omission of a peer teaching observation does not provide any evidence relevant to the assessment of teaching effectiveness. See promotion and tenure FAQs #68 and #69.
- Inclusion of an alternate assessment is optional; the omission of an alternate assessment does not provide any evidence relevant to the assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- Once a faculty member determines what data to include for spring/summer 2020 in a formal review, that decision may not be changed in dossiers created for subsequent formal reviews.
 - For example, relative to assessment of teaching effectiveness for spring/summer 2020, Dr. X did not include spring or summer 2020 SRTEs in the second-year review. Dr. X may not include SRTE scores for spring or summer 2020 in subsequent reviews (e.g., 4th and 6th-year reviews). **The decision made at the earliest review governs what is included at a later review.**
 - Similarly, if Dr. X submits a “lesson learned” self-reflection on teaching for spring or summer 2020, Dr. X must include this self-reflection on spring or summer 2020 courses in the dossier created for subsequent formal reviews. No additional alternate assessments may be included for spring/summer 2020 in subsequent formal reviews.

Summary of Short-form SRTE modifications made in Fall 2020 and Calendar Year 2021

The short-form SRTE as currently configured was not well-suited to the conditions in place during fall 2020. There is value, however, in having a tool that systematically collects data from large numbers of students, provides useful feedback for faculty and administrators, and can help to establish trajectory in development of teaching skills.

- Summary of changes to the SRTE
 - Four University mandatory items will be administered.

- A1:** Are you taking this course as an elective?
- A2:** What grade do you expect to earn in this course?
- A3:** Rate how well this course increased your understanding of the course topics. (*Prior wording: Rate the overall quality of this course.*)
- A4:** Rate how well the instructor promoted a meaningful learning experience for you. (*Prior wording: Rate the overall quality of the instructor.*)
- Two revised open-ended questions will be administered.
 - Open 1:** What aspects of this course helped you learn? (*Prior wording: What helped you learn in this course?*)
 - Open 2:** What changes to this course could improve your learning? (*Prior wording: What changes would improve your learning?*)
 - No items from the Academic Unit or Instructor section will be administered.
 - The mean for the two items will not be reported in any SRTE report, given that the mean is not the best measure of central tendency for a skewed distribution.
 - The distribution of scores (count and percent) across the 7-point scale will be provided.
 - The mean will be replaced with two measures of central tendency that are more appropriate for skewed distributions: Median and Mode.
 - If measures of central tendency are referenced, both the median and mode must be referenced and discussed in the context of the distribution.

Options for Alternate Assessment

Options for self-reflection

Lessons Learned. The candidate's statement may emphasize what they learned about their own teaching or students' learning during the spring 2020 semester. This reflection should not belabor what went wrong, but instead could describe what went well and/or what the faculty member plans to integrate in future face-to-face or remote teaching. Faculty might reflect on how their teaching changed to maintain student engagement in their learning, effectively monitor student progress, effectively assess student learning, and/or integrate greater flexibility into their courses.

Course Objectives. Faculty may choose to reflect on how course objectives were met despite the shift to remote instruction. This reflection might include adaptations of assignments linked to specific course objectives, revision of exam or quiz items linked to course objectives, revision of objectives to provide additional options for demonstrating learning, analysis of grades and grading rubrics as evidence of student learning, and/or examples of student work (by grade level or quality rank).

Student Interactions. The abrupt shift to remote teaching and learning created challenges that involved additional invisible and emotional labor on the part of many faculty. Faculty may reflect on what they did to support students during this time of disruption, such as mentoring students and reducing student apprehension and anxiety. Below are questions faculty may wish to answer as part of a self-reflection.

- What actions did you take as an instructor to reduce student apprehension and anxiety during this time of disruption?
- What might you do differently next time?

- How might you use what you learned about the importance of faculty-student connections in future courses?
- What unexpected student needs arose and how did you respond?

Professional Development for Teaching (instructional improvement). Reflection on the abrupt change to remote instruction. Examples might include a discussion of activities or the benefits of participating in a faculty teaching community; consulting with college instructional designers, Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence faculty, Teaching and Learning with Technology (TLT) assistants, or multimedia staff; collaborating with librarians; and/or independent work through readings, webinars, or virtual teaching conferences.

Intellectual Work of Teaching. Faculty may reflect on the expertise involved in teaching their spring 2020 courses, citing specific examples. Example topics that may guide this reflection include course planning that includes content knowledge, selection of sources, anticipation of students' prior learning or misconceptions; creating connections to research in the field or professional practice; course design that links assignments, readings, lectures, discussions, and/or other course elements; and course changes in response to pedagogic innovation, student learning needs, or remote learning modes.

Student input

Formative Feedback from Students. The faculty member may summarize the results of this feedback and how that feedback was used to adjust or improve the course. Many faculty members regularly use Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) to gather feedback from students during the semester. Student feedback may serve to quickly assess, without grading, students' learning related to the course content such as Think-Pair-Share, Jigsaw, Concept Mapping, 3-2-1 (3 ideas, 2 examples, 1 question), or a Minute Paper. Other feedback is more general including open-ended questions (what helps you learn/what could be changed), Critical Incident Questionnaires, Midterm Class Interviews, or exit surveys.

Student Work. The faculty member could summarize what the student work represents relative to course goals or objectives. Many faculty members already collect examples of student work for professional accreditation or degree program assessment. Examples of students' work can provide evidence of students' learning or achievement relative to a grading rubric/matrix.

Formative feedback from course assistants. This option is written by student(s) who have firsthand knowledge of how enrolled students are engaged in the course. For example, teaching assistants could comment on the instructor's planning and delivery of a course as well as guidance provided for TAs. Undergraduate learning assistants (or teaching interns) could comment on the instructional environment created by the faculty member and how that helped students learn. Feedback from others can be coupled with a commentary from the faculty member about why and how they integrate TAs or learning assistants into the course.

Analysis of a course based on real-time adjustments

Provide specific examples of how you modified instruction given changes in context (e.g., in-

person vs. remote) and technology. Describe the resulting positive and negative short- and long-term impacts of such changes. Describe the resulting positive and negative short- and long-term impacts of such changes.

Comparisons to previous year assessments and goals, if applicable

Review previous annual reviews, including the available evidence and resulting goals. Given the available evidence, compare how this year compared to previous year’s assessments. Delineate new goals that build upon your assessment.

Use of Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness for courses taught 2020-2023

	Spring/summer 2020 SRTEs	Fall 2020 SRTEs	Spring 2021-Spring 2023
Annual review	N/A	Optional.	Required
Two-year review	N/A	Optional; at the faculty member’s discretion*	Required
Four-year review	N/A	Optional; at the faculty member’s discretion*	Required
Six-year review	N/A	Optional: at the faculty member’s discretion*	Required
Promotion to Full Professor	N/A	Optional: at the faculty member’s discretion*	Required
Non-tenure-line promotions	N/A	Optional; at the faculty member’s discretion*	Required

*Consistent with standard practice, evidence of teaching effectiveness may not be submitted once the dossier has been submitted for review. For example, SRTE results for courses taught in fall 2020 may not be included in 2nd, 4th or 6th year or promotion-to-full reviews that take place in fall 2020. Fall 2020 SRTEs may be included in dossiers for formal reviews that take place in spring 2021 or later.

Use of Alternate Assessments for calendar years 2020-2023 in Annual Reviews*

	Spring/summer 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021-Spring 2023
Annual review	N/A	Establish that a “good faith effort” was made to deliver instruction. alternate assessment required	One alternate assessment per calendar year is required

Use of Alternate Assessments for 2020-2023 in Promotion and Tenure Reviews*

Only one alternate assessment per academic year is to be included in the dossier.

	Spring/summer 2020	Fall 2020-Spring 2023
Two-year review	N/A	One alternate assessment per academic year is required*
Four-year review	N/A	One alternate assessment per academic year is required*
Six-year review	N/A	One alternate assessment per academic year is required*
Promotion to Full Professor	N/A	One alternate assessment per academic year is required*
Non-tenure-line promotions	N/A	One alternate assessment per academic year is required*

*Consistent with standard practice, evidence of teaching effectiveness may not be submitted once the dossier has been submitted for review. For example, alternate assessments for courses taught in fall 2020 may not be included in 2nd, 4th or 6th year or promotion-to-full reviews that take place in fall 2020. Alternate assessments for courses taught in fall 2020 may be included in 2nd, 4th, or 6th year or promotion-to-full reviews that take in place spring 2021 or later.

APPENDIX N

GUIDELINES FOR SHARING ELEMENTS OF THE DOSSIER FOLLOWING FORMAL REVIEWS FOR TENURE-LINE FACULTY

Policies Governing the Communication and Sharing of Evaluations

The two policies that govern the disclosure of elements of a faculty member's dossier are [AC23](#), "Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations," and [HR60](#), "Access to Personnel Files".

Regarding second- and fourth-year reviews, AC23 states, "... the college dean shall be required to write evaluative letters that are shared with candidates and may be addressed directly to them. The dean's letter will then be included in the dossiers submitted for subsequent tenure reviews." (V.I.5 of the *Administrative Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* contains similar language.)

For reviews occurring in the second, fourth, or sixth year*, the policy states that, "The general results of the evaluation should be made known to the faculty member...." The policy does not prohibit units from sharing any evaluative letters with a faculty member, nor does it specify the manner in which the evaluative letters can be shared.

HR60 allows faculty members to request to view their personnel file and to have a copy of the file "upon reasonable request."

Guidance for Sharing Evaluations with Faculty Members

No element of the dossier may be shared until the review process is complete at all levels for the candidate. Per III.F.4 in the *Administrative Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*, "The deadline for submission of factual changes or new information to be included in the dossier is the weekday coincident with or immediately following February 1." Because the addition of new information means that the dossier must go through every level of review again, the promotion and tenure decision is not final until the dossier is in its final form and thus no information about the process may be shared until after February 1.

*Second- and Fourth-Year Reviews***

Units must share the evaluative letters (either hard copy or electronic) from second- and fourth-year reviews, including the dean's/chancellor's letter, regardless of whether the faculty member is being continued on the tenure line. These letters may only be shared when the review process is complete, i.e., after the February 1 deadline for submitting new material to the dossier. The academic unit head (department head/division head/school director/DAA) may also receive a hard copy or electronic copy of the college-level review committee's letter and/or the dean's/chancellor's letter.

Sixth-Year (Tenure) Reviews

Following a sixth-year (tenure) review that advances to the university level, if a faculty member wants to review any part of their dossier, including the evaluative memos, then they must make an HR60 "access to personnel file" request as described in the policy after the process has concluded for the candidate at all levels. They may specifically request to view or receive the evaluative letters as part of that request. Following an HR60 request,

units may provide to the faculty member all contents of the dossier (either hard copy or electronic) *except the external evaluations*. If the candidate wishes to view the evaluative letter from the University P&T committee, the final dossier must be obtained from the central Human Resources office, which stores the final version of the document including signatory pages and the University-level committee documents. If a review concludes in the college, then the faculty member can make a request within their unit to view any part of the dossier except the external evaluations.

Promotion to Full Reviews

For promotion to full, per V.D.1 of the *Administrative Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*, “When a tenured faculty member is being reviewed for promotion (unrelated to a tenure review)...If the department committee and the academic unit head do not support a promotion after reviewing the completed dossier, the candidate should be so informed and given the option of withdrawing their candidacy. Prior to informing the candidate, the department head is to consult with the dean.” If the candidate decides to withdraw their dossier, no element of the dossier will be retained and the committee letter and the academic unit head letter are not retained or shared with the candidate. After the February 1 deadline for adding information to the dossier has passed, department heads are encouraged to provide the candidate with a summary of why the dossier was not supported.

For promotion reviews that advance to the University level, if a faculty member wants to review any part of their dossier, including the evaluative memos, then they must make an HR60 “access to personnel file” request as described in the policy after the process has concluded for the candidate at all levels. They may specifically request to view or receive the evaluative letters as part of that request. Following an HR60 request, units may provide to the faculty member all contents of the dossier (either hard copy or electronic) *except the external evaluations*. If the candidate wishes to view the evaluative letter from University P&T committee, the final dossier must be obtained from the central Human Resources office, which stores the final version of the document including signatory pages and the University-level committee documents. If a review concludes in the college, then the faculty member can make a request within their unit to view any part of the dossier except the external evaluations.

Confidentiality of Promotion Documents

When receiving materials related to the promotion process, such as evaluative letters, candidates should be reminded that promotion is a confidential process. Faculty members who receive evaluative letters and other materials related to the process should not distribute them widely.

**This guidance also applies to reviews in the College of Medicine that occur in the third, sixth, and ninth year.*

***Guidance regarding second- and fourth-year reviews also applies to special third- or fifth-year reviews.*

INDEX

Abington College	2, 3
abstention.....	27
academic administrator.....	3, 4, 14, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 39, 65, 68
Access to Personnel Files.....	32, 74
Affirmative Action.....	74
Altoona College	2, 3
annual evaluations.....	31, 32
applicability.....	1, 68, 71
article	12
assessment	3, 11, 15, 16, 17, 32, 60
non-tenure assistant professors	17
assignment	
class.....	6, 54
clinical	56
awarded.....	31
Berks College	2, 3
biographical data	10
biographical statement.....	17
campus college	31
Capital College	2, 3
chancellor	2, 14, 19, 22, 23, 26, 30, 31, 63
class assignments	6, 54
classification	40
clinical assignment.....	56
clock.....	65
co-funded	25
College of Medicine	2, 11, 1-74, 21, 22, 30, 31, 42, 67
college of residence.....	24, 27
Committee on Faculty Affairs	35
conference proceedings	12
confidentiality.....	37
conflict of interest	27
consortia	25
consultation.....	20, 24, 26, 30, 35, 37, 38, 50
contracts.....	74
correspondence.....	29
course outlines	13
courses.....	34, 35, 38, 39, 54
credit.....	54
non-credit	54
credit	
years of	21, 42
criteria	4, 8, 10, 12, 17, 25, 27, 28, 29, 63
criteria statement	4, 8, 10, 17
dean.....	1, 3, 9, 13, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 42, 43, 44, 60, 63, 65, 67, 68, 71, 72
decisions	3, 6, 13, 14, 25, 27, 32, 66, 67, 72
final decisions	44
defense-related research units.....	18
department head.....	2, 3, 9, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 63, 65, 67, 70, 83
<i>Dickinson Law</i>	70
director of academic affairs.....	9
divergence	26

divergent opinions.....	27, 63
dossier	6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 39, 40, 50, 56, 63, 69, 71, 72
confidential section	11
dividers	11, 12, 69
factual and informational sections	11
forms.....	9, 11, 34, 35, 36, 51, 69
early tenure	12, 16, 22, 30, 67, 72
Erie, the Behrend College	2, 3
evaluations	5, 29, 31, 32, 38, 39, 40, 44, 63, 70
student.....	5, 39, 40, 41, 54
evaluative statements	13, 14, 27, 28, 29, 63, 64
exceptions.....	1
Executive Vice President and Provost ...	1, 8, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 32, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 44, 65, 67, 68, 71, 72
external evaluators.....	11, 16, 17, 29, 60
external letters	13, 16, 72
log	11, 16, 60, 62
factual changes.....	15, 16, 43, 82, 83
Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.....	74
Family and Medical Leave.....	74
final decision.....	65, 68
fixed-term faculty	38
fourth-year	21, 22, 42
four-year colleges	2, 3, 18
grants.....	12
not funded	12
Great Valley	2, 18, 30, 44
HR60	32, 74
immediate tenure.....	68, 69, 71
independent judgments	26, 27
information to faculty members	29
institute	25
interdisciplinary.....	28
internal letters	11
joint appointments	23, 25
leave of absence	65
graduate study.....	74
military service.....	74
without salary	65
librarianship.....	11, 53
mentoring	6, 54
narrative statement.....	5, 10, 11, 17, 60
negative	18, 24, 40, 72
tie vote.....	18
negative review	24
new information	15, 16, 43, 82, 83
ninth-year	16, 1-74, 1-74, 22, 30, 31, 42, 67
non-University Park faculty	19, 24, 28, 30, 40, 42
numerical vote.....	27, 63
Office of Human Resources	21, 31, 42, 43, 72
out-of-sequence	71, 72
outreach	54
Paid Parental Leave for Faculty	74
peer review.....	5, 6, 12, 15, 26, 40, 70

<i>Penn State Law</i>	70
personnel decisions	41, 44
policies and guidelines.....	74
preparation.....	9, 14
President of the University	23, 30, 44, 71, 72
privacy rights	29
procedures.....	7, 14, 19, 20, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73
promotion and tenure form	14, 51
promotion only.....	13, 23
provisional faculty	32, 38, 65
publications	6, 12, 13, 17, 60
electronic	12, 51
purpose.....	1, 10, 39, 65
recent date	54
reports	42, 44, 63
review committees	2, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, 42
campus.....	2, 9, 11, 14, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 39, 40, 63
department....	2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 43, 44, 60, 63, 65, 67, 68, 70, 71, 83
establishment	20
immediate tenure	68, 69, 71
procedures.....	7, 14, 19, 20, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73
review level.....	3, 11, 26, 32
campus review	24, 40
chancellor	2, 14, 19, 26, 30, 31, 63
college review	2, 15, 22
department review	24, 68, 70, 71
University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee	18, 23, 26, 29, 43, 44, 63, 68, 71
reviews.....	10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 50, 63, 68, 69, 71
fourth-year.....	21, 22, 42
out-of-sequence.....	71, 72
second-year	21, 22, 42, 43, 44
sixth-year	12, 16, 21, 22, 30, 31, 42, 67
sample letter.....	60
scholarship.....	4, 10, 11, 12, 40, 69
scholarship of research and creative accomplishments.....	4, 8, 10
scholarship of teaching and learning.....	4, 5, 10, 11, 54
secondary department head	25
second-year	21, 22, 42, 43, 44
separate promotion.....	4
service to the University.....	4, 10, 11
signature statement	10
sixth-	42
sixth-year	12, 16, 21, 22, 30, 31, 42, 67
SRTE	5, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39
staying of the provisional tenure period	32, 65
student evaluations	5, 39, 40, 41, 54
Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness	34, 36
forms.....	5, 34, 35, 36
numerical responses.....	41
SRTE	5, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39
summary.....	32, 54
supplemental	

supplemental materials	6, 11
survey	34, 35, 36, 37, 38
teaching effectiveness	5, 34, 40, 54, 69
teaching portfolio	5, 6, 11, 54
tenth-year	31
tenure clock	65
tenure-eligible faculty members	21
terminate	31, 73
termination	22, 29, 30
third-	22, 42
third-year	21
tie vote	18
negative	18, 40, 72
time-in-rank	29
timetable	20, 71
unanimous	27, 63
University College	2, 9, 28, 30, 44
University Faculty Senate	34, 35, 50
University Libraries	2, 3, 11, 18, 70
University Park	2, 9, 19, 28, 30, 31, 40, 42
University policies	66, 74
University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee	18, 23, 26, 29, 43, 44, 63, 68, 71
Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses	3
vita	11, 13, 17, 60, 67, 69, 72
vote	18
tie vote	18
unanimous	27, 63
work in progress	12
workshops	14, 54
years of credit	21, 42