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Review HR-23 (P&T Procedures and Regulations) and Other Documents

- Located on Web at: http://www.psu.edu/vpaa
  - HR-23 Policy
  - Administrative Guidelines for HR-23
  - Frequently Asked Questions
  - Legal Issues for Administrators & Committee Members
- College and Department Materials
  - Committee Lists and Administrators
  - P&T Guidelines

Final P&T Decisions

- Who can deny tenure & promotions?

- Who can award tenure & promotions?
Yearly Reminder:
Promotion and Tenure Rules for
Administrators and Committees

- Do everything you can to help faculty members to succeed, but make the necessary judgments when the time comes to make them.
- Understand our system of checks and balances, of independent but mutually informed recommendations by faculty peers and administrators reviewing the same set of materials.
- Recognize our goal: to achieve a faculty appropriate to a major research university with a commitment to teaching and service, so that the internal and external reputations of each unit are constantly improving.

Respectful, civil, and thoughtful disagreements and deliberations are to be expected, and are part of a healthy, academic discourse.
Criteria Statements

- HR23 does NOT assign weights to any item in the dossier.
- Criteria statements should be the basis upon which the evidence in the dossier is evaluated; the criteria statements provide an evaluative benchmark.
- As you review a dossier, the criteria statements should be the basis of measurement for evaluating the candidate’s record; they provide an evaluative benchmark.

Levels of Independent Review and Judgment

- Department/Campus Level of Review
  - Most familiar with candidate’s discipline, quality and quantity standards.
- College Level of Review
  - Evaluate record using the college criteria and expectations in context with the departmental criteria.
  - Strive for consistent standards within the college.
- University Level of Review
  - Ensure compliance with both departmental and college standards while striving for consistent faculty excellence across the University.
Candidate’s Narrative Statement

- The intent of the narrative statement is for the candidate to place her or his work and activities into the context of her or his overall goals and agendas.
- No longer than one or two pages, with three pages being the outer limit.
- Can be written as a single statement at the beginning of the dossier; or divided into three parts to accompany the sections of the dossier (i.e., RST).

External Letters

- Avoid fellow graduate students, co-PIs, former faculty colleagues and significant collaborators.
- Use judgment and discretion.
- No contact between the candidate and the reviewer.
- Colleges that make courtesy advance contacts to potential reviewers should make such calls through the dean or department head.
Staying of the Provisional Tenure Period

- Should not be prejudicial for or against the candidate! Reasons for the stay are confidential and revealed only during the stay request to those with a “need-to-know.”
- Other than on the signatory page, there should be no mention of the stay anywhere in the dossier.

Confidentiality

- Essential to the process.
- Responsibility of everyone involved to support this basic tenet.
- Candidates should not prod committee members or administrators . . . and . . . committee members and administrators should not divulge information to candidates, or anyone, through words, innuendos or gestures.
Revisions to the 2009-10 Administrative Guidelines for HR-23

Rainbow Dividers

Composition and Size of Review Committees

[and routine yearly update to timetable]

Rainbow Dividers

- In accordance with recommendation from the Faculty Senate’s Committee on Faculty Affairs, assessment activities was added to:
  - “The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning”
  - “Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession”
Composition and Size of Review Committees

- Clarification that a tie vote is treated as a NEGATIVE recommendation.
- In such case the "Not Recommended" block on the Promotion and Tenure Form is marked.
- Avoid tie votes by having an odd number of committee members; thus limiting the possibility of tie votes to the rare occasions of abstentions.

Committee Evaluative Letters

- Committee Chair is responsible for writing the letter with input from committee.
- Minority opinion MUST be included.
- One letter with a vote for tenure and a vote for promotion; should not contain separate votes for research, service, & teaching.
6th-Year Tenure Reviews

• 91 6th-year tenure cases in 2008-09
  ▪ 13 cases denied at college level, thus never reached the University level.
  ▪ 78 cases forwarded to University Committee, with all 78 cases (including 5 early tenure cases) carrying positive recommendations by the submitting dean.
  ▪ Of the 78 cases, the University Committee recommended 76 cases; the President concurred with the University Committee and denied tenure in 2 cases.
• 83.5% received tenure (76 of 91 cases)

http://www.psu.edu/president/pia/planning_research/reports

Legal Considerations

Legal challenges may be based on one or more of the following:

**Procedural Error** – Avoidable. Become and remain informed of (1) HR-23 and the Administrative Guidelines and (2) your unit’s guidelines.

**Discrimination** – Allegation based on the candidate’s membership in one or more protected classes under federal or state law.

**Arbitrary or Capricious** – Allegation that a negative decision was made in an arbitrary or capricious manner (NOTE: An academic judgment made in good faith is not arbitrary or capricious).
Questions!