College of Engineering
Promotion and Tenure Workshop

September 2023
Key Resources

• Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Website [https://vpfa.psu.edu/promotion-and-tenure/](https://vpfa.psu.edu/promotion-and-tenure/)
  • 2023-2024 Administrative Guidelines for AC23
  • 2023-2024 Promotion and Tenure FAQs
  • 2023-2024 Summary of Revisions to Administrative Guidelines and FAQs for AC23
  • 2023-2024 Recommended Charge to Promotion and Tenure Committees
  • Guidance for Promotion and Tenure Narratives (2022, still applicable)
  • Guidance for Administrators and Members of P&T Committees for 2023-2024
  • Guidance on the Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness (now in guidelines)

• COE Faculty Resources Website [https://www.engr.psu.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-resources.aspx](https://www.engr.psu.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-resources.aspx)

• Amy Corbett, Faculty Affairs Administrative Coordinator
Upcoming VPFA Workshops

https://vpfa.psu.edu/promotion-and-tenure-workshop-series/

Administrator and Staff Engagement in the Tenure-line and Non-tenure-line Promotion Reviews Process
Date and Time: Thursday, September 14, 2023, from 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.
Target Audience: Academic Unit Heads, Unit Executives, FAAC, and Staff (who support promotion and tenure)

Committee Chair and Committee Member Engagement in the Tenure-line Promotion Review Process
Date and Time: Tuesday, September 19, 2023, 3:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Target Audience: College and Unit Committee Chairs and Committee Members (who will oversee P&T committee work this academic year)

Preparing for Promotion and Tenure at Penn State for Pre-Tenured Faculty
Date and Time: Thursday, September 28, 2023, 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Target Audience: Pre-tenure tenure-line Faculty
Dossier Quality Matters

- Allows evaluators to concentrate valuable time on assessing the candidate’s record
- Noticed by University committee
- 60+ COE tenure-line faculty scheduled for a review this year
  - If the department committee, department head, or staff assistant notices errors or discrepancies in a dossier, please correct it before it leaves the department
- Dossier is a *shared responsibility* between the academic unit head and the faculty member AG III.B; FAQ #3
  - Academic unit head takes lead and sets timeline; faculty member assembles materials
  - Be sure there are checks in place and the checkers are knowledgeable about dossiers
Key Points for Committee Members, Chairs and Department Heads

• Scan the VPFA website
• Scan the table of contents of the Administrative Guidelines (AG) to AC23 for sections that pertain to your role
• Read the sections covering your responsibilities in the AG
  • Section V. Review Procedures
    • Do we have policy and guidelines?
    • Did we follow them? Procedure is critical.
• Don’t forget the FAQs!!
• The “Revisions” document is also useful
• Read the Recommended Charge to the P&T Committee
  • Decide if meetings will be in-person or virtual (no hybrid!)—intended for academic year but absolute for each cohort
  • Conflicts of Interest AG V.H.E. (p 23) – Don’t use alternates for single cases
  • Consultation in the Review Process AG V.G. (p 21)
    • Required when recommendation would be counter to prior level; also for clarifications
    • Document that consultation happened in the letter
• Confidentiality is forever
• Evaluations based only on content of the dossier (including the letters and allowable supplemental materials)
• For split votes on overall recommendation, include majority and minority opinions
Key Points for Committee Members, Chairs and Department Heads

• **NO split ratings** should be used at the request of the University Committee and VPFA. Any split ratings will be interpreted as only the lowest. *Very Good to Excellent = Very Good*

• Read the COVID-specific additions/changes to the guidelines
  - The impact is uneven and can be a source of inequity
  - Dossiers will look different due to COVID impacts
    - Some experienced little impact due to the nature of their research or their personal situation
    - Some temporarily derailed
    - Some permanently detoured
  - Despite setbacks, is the faculty member demonstrating the characteristics of a successful faculty member?
  - Independent of whether they accepted the COVID extension

• Stays and Extensions
• Faculty on joint appointments (not research institutes) AG V.F (p 20)
• Provide feedback on narrative statement (via the Department Head)
• Review the candidate’s prior evaluations (e.g., 2nd and 4th year) for consistency of advice
• For 4th or earlier reviews using our prior guidelines, provide feedback and advice (out of letter) relevant to the new COE guidelines
• If appropriate, make recommendation in 4th-year reviews on consideration for early tenure
Key Points for Administrative Staff

• Dates on letters and P&T forms
• Narrative Statement word limit (1600 words bumped to 2000 words to allow space for pandemic impacts)
• Number of external letters
  • University requires 4
  • COE expects 5
• Forms and Dossier Dividers [https://guru.psu.edu/forms/promotion-and-tenure-forms#C](https://guru.psu.edu/forms/promotion-and-tenure-forms#C)
• SRTEs and alternate assessment
  • No more SRTEs
    • New student feedback survey this year (SEEQ)
    • *Plan* is for the student feedback numbers to not go directly into the dossier by next year
  • No new alternate assessments should be added to the dossier
Narrative Statement

• Narrative statement should be part of a faculty member’s career development, not just for P&T
  ➢ Self-assessment, annual reviews, mentoring, advising/coaching

• Should focus on what the faculty member wants evaluators to know that may not be reflected in the dossier

• Written with non-expert evaluators in mind

• Explain the “why”

• Goals, intended impacts, progress, next steps

• Fostering equity and inclusion and the Penn State Values

• See VPFA and COE Faculty Resources websites for more details
  ➢ Prior VPFA workshop on writing narrative statements—recording available
  ➢ Appendix A of the COE 2022 P&T Guidelines
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23-24 REVIEWS</th>
<th>DEFAULT</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Year</strong></td>
<td>New Guidelines</td>
<td>Requests for exceptions are allowed for those starting prior to 7/1/22 but, in general, we would advise against the choice—it will be an outlier by the time of their 6th-year review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th Year</strong></td>
<td>Free Choice (or as per 3rd year review or subsequent decision)</td>
<td>Should receive feedback from department committee if under old guidelines regarding which guidelines would be preferable for subsequent reviews. <em>(Feedback to dept head outside of review letter)</em> Decision for subsequent reviews made by May 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Tenure</strong></td>
<td>As per 4th year review</td>
<td>If 4th year review was conducted under new guidelines, remain with new guidelines. If 4th year review was conducted under old guidelines, as per the subsequent decision made based on department feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6th Year</strong></td>
<td>Free Choice</td>
<td>New guidelines recommended if preferred by the faculty member and sent with the requests for external letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion to Full</strong></td>
<td>Free Choice for those tenured and promoted prior to 7/1/22</td>
<td>New guidelines can be used if preferred by the faculty member and sent with the requests for external letters. New Guidelines for those tenured or promoted after 7/1/22.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Once a faculty member has moved to the new guidelines, they cannot move back to the old guidelines.
- Guidelines used for reviews should be stated in the first paragraph of the department committee letter.
Questions and Discussion