

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

It is understood that all College and Departmental guidelines will adhere to Policy HR-23, the University's Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations.

I. DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

By the end of the spring semester, all academic units in the College of Arts and Architecture will have established their own Promotion and Tenure Committee(s) for the following year. Guidelines and procedures for establishment for these committees, approved by each departmental faculty will be on file in the Office of the Dean. The document will specify the composition of the committee(s), the term of membership, and the method of choosing a chair. Academic units are charged with evaluating all candidates for promotion as well as reviewing the progress toward tenure of all tenure-track faculty during the 2nd, 4th, and 6th year of provisional service to the University.

Committees shall evaluate each candidate based on established criteria in each of the three areas of consideration. The descriptor used to assess the level of contribution (outstanding, very good, satisfactory, needs improvement, unsatisfactory) in each area shall be a consensus of the committee view, including any statement(s) of minority opinions. Only one evaluative statement letter is written and should contain the committee's singular overall vote for each promotion and/or tenure action. The letter should not contain separate vote counts for each of the evaluative criteria. It is imperative to achieve a single, consensus descriptor, not just a record of individual opinions.

Although consideration for the award of tenure will normally be made in the penultimate year, the award of early tenure may be recommended in clearly exceptional cases.

Reviews for promotion are normally initiated by the department head/director after consultation with key faculty members.

II. PREPARATION OF DOSSIERS

The preparation of the dossier is the responsibility of department heads and school directors, in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed. The preparation of the factual materials to be included in the dossier should take place over the summer months and be completed by the candidate no later than September 1.

External evaluators of the candidate's creative accomplishment and research are approved by the dean. The candidate should suggest up to four outside evaluators to the department head or school director who will add up to four additional names not suggested by the candidate. This composite list should be forwarded to the dean no later than June 1. The dean may add additional names to the list. Unit heads will begin the process of contacting potential external evaluators over the summer to secure their agreement to serve in the fall. Ultimately, five to seven external evaluators will be

selected (including a representative number of evaluators from both the candidate's and the department head's/school director's suggestions).

If a department or school chooses, a limited number of internal letters may be solicited by the department head or school director from faculty, who have direct knowledge of the teaching, creative work, scholarship, and/or service of the person being evaluated. Those signed letters must be included in the dossier as it moves forward within the appropriate categories, as possible.

III. COLLEGE COMMITTEE

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

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

The term of membership will be two years and will be staggered, and all members must be elected by the end of the spring semester for service during the following academic year. The committee will elect its own chair. When necessary, in order to provide appropriate representation, the Dean may appoint up to two additional members as prescribed by HR 23 to review the credentials of faculty for promotion and/or tenure.

The duties of the committee include reviewing departmental/school recommendations for promotion and tenure in accordance with the guidelines set forth in HR-23.

When the committee has not reached a unanimous vote on a candidate, the evaluative statement shall include a discussion of the reasons for divergent opinions. Only one evaluative statement letter is written and should contain the committee's singular overall vote for each promotion and/or tenure action. The letter should not contain separate vote counts for each of the evaluative criteria.

IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

In addition to the general criteria listed in HR-23, the College of Arts and Architecture is often concerned with more specific values. The College regards the quality of teaching, the quality of research or creative accomplishment, and the quality of outreach and public service all to be important. The integration of these three elements is also highly valued. It is the department head/school director's responsibility to determine on a faculty by faculty basis the appropriate balance among these three elements.

It is also the head/director's responsibility to make clear to every faculty member what is expected in each of these areas and assure that this information is present in the dossier.

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

The College faculty and administrators have endorsed the use of five evaluation descriptors for faculty performance. These descriptors are to be used at every internal level of review for promotion and/or tenure applications.

OUTSTANDING – An exceptional level of accomplishment where excellence has clearly been achieved.

VERY GOOD – A very positive level of accomplishment that is clearly above basic expectations but has not yet attained true excellence.

ACCEPTABLE – Meets basic performance expectations, but improvement is encouraged.

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT – Does not meet basic performance expectations and improvement in the future is clearly necessary.

UNACCEPTABLE – Performance that clearly does not meet the standards of Penn State and cannot be continued.

At each level of review by committee, only one evaluative statement letter is written and should contain the committee's singular overall vote for each promotion and/or tenure action. While descriptors may be used for each section, the letter should not contain separate vote counts for each of the evaluative criteria.

1. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

The College is dedicated to maintaining rigorous academic standards with an awareness of the particular needs and aims of its individual departments and schools. Thus, the faculty member is responsible for the recognition of a student's talents and abilities and for fostering them not only by means of effective teaching but also by setting an example in creativity, performance, exhibition activity or scholarship, as may be appropriate to the discipline. In addition to inculcating a mastery of subject matter, instruction is to be directed toward developing the student's ability to communicate.

The College requires all sections of all courses be evaluated by the SRTE every time it is taught, except when there are fewer than five students in the class, whereby the students' anonymity might be compromised. The results from each of these evaluations must be included in the dossier. In some divisions of the College, a great deal of teaching is extended beyond the classroom. Therefore, in evaluating teaching in such areas, one must also judge the conduct of rehearsals, workshops and critiques. In areas where the normal operation of the department/school requires working closely with other faculty and students, it is expected that the candidate will interact with those individuals in an effective and productive manner.

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

2. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments

Creative or interpretive contributions in the fields of Architecture, Art, Art History, Landscape Architecture, Music, Theatre, and Integrative Arts are of special importance in the College of Arts and Architecture. Artistic creation and scholarly research are equally valued. Accomplishments are expected to be of high quality and of artistic, scholarly and/or professional significance. Contributions may include: new works of art; design (architectural, landscape, graphic, theatre); musical or theatrical performance; scholarly publication; preparation of and participation in exhibitions; commissioned and professional work; other comparable artistic and scholarly achievements. The College expects its faculty to be professional role models for students through an active commitment to research and/or creative activity.

There should be evidence of a thorough understanding of the faculty member's particular discipline through attendance, participation, and presentation at scholarly and professional meetings. There should also be evidence of a recognized reputation in the subject matter field as shown by invitations to lecture, to serve on panels, or to be a visiting artist, architect, scholar, judge, juror, or referee. The development of new courses and the refinement of existing courses in the faculty member's discipline can also be cited as evidence of scholarship and mastery of subject matter.

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

The dossier should contain evidence of the faculty member's contributions to departmental, college, and university committees and programs, and to the public through the extension of specialized knowledge and service to local, state, and national service and professional organizations.

Amended and Approved by the Faculty: Apr. 18, 2000

Titles of the criteria revised to reflect Senate legislation from March 26, 2002

Modified by the College Executive Council: Nov. 2001, Oct. 2003, May 2004

Revised and Approved by the Faculty: Oct. 6, 2004

Editorial changes made to reflect recent campus restructuring of the University: July 19, 2005

Reviewed: August 15, 2006

Editorial changes made for consistency with University guidelines and college department changes, Spring Semester 2012.