Faculty and Staff
Awards
### Atherton, Eisenhower, and Alumni Teaching Awards

#### Timetable for Selection

**2016 Awards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 23, 2015</td>
<td>Nominations sent to the appropriate Dean or Chancellor. Colleges and campuses identify final candidates according to the college/campus custom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 16, 2015</td>
<td>Names of the final candidates and individuals assisting or coordinating candidate packet preparation provided to Schreyer Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13, 2015</td>
<td>Campus /college uploads candidate packets into ANGEL group (directions provided).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20, 2015</td>
<td>Review committee members receive candidate packets for evaluation and ranking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
<td>Rubric evaluations due from reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11-15, 2016</td>
<td>Review committees meet to discuss candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 22, 2016</td>
<td>Winner information sent to President and Provost for final approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29, 2016</td>
<td>Winner information sent to University Relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2016</td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff Awards Recognition Luncheon Nittany Lion Inn, Alumni Ballroom, Noon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Undergraduate Teaching Awards
Faculty Nominees

College of Engineering

Faculty awarded Penn State’s highest honors for teaching excellence are not only admired by their students, they stand out among other excellent teachers at Penn State. Award recipients demonstrate an exceptional commitment to undergraduate students’ learning, using effective instructional methods, and improving their own and others’ teaching. Their packets should include evidence supporting this extraordinary status.

Eligibility Criteria
Please carefully consider which of the instructors below meet the eligibility criteria for an award. We would not want you to make the effort to compile a Candidate Packet for an individual who is not eligible to receive the award. To be considered as a Candidate, Nominees must meet the qualifications for at least one of the three awards.

All Candidates must hold a full-time appointment at Penn State that includes undergraduate teaching as a primary responsibility. Faculty members are not eligible if they only occasionally teach undergraduates, even if they have a full-time appointment. Likewise, faculty who tend to teach more graduate courses than undergraduate courses may be better suited for other teaching awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Additional Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>≥ 3 years teaching Penn State undergraduates</td>
<td>Additional Alumni Assoc. obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Fixed-Term 1</td>
<td>≥ 3 years teaching Penn State undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Eisenhower                | Full-time   | Tenured  | ≥ 10 years teaching Penn State undergraduates | • Career-long commitment to teaching excellence  
|                           | Undergraduate teaching a primary responsibility | FT Multi-Year         |                                                   | • Faculty peer mentoring |
|                           | Undergraduate teaching a primary responsibility | Tenure-line          |                                                   |                                                   |

Last   First    Department                                # Nominations
Alley   Michael  Engineering Communication                1
Beaury  Robert   Engineering Design, Technology and Professional Programs 9
Beyerle Susan   Engineering Design                          1
Boyer   Philip   Engineering Design, Technology and Professional Programs 4
Brown   Justin   Bioengineering                              2
Cheng   Bo       Mechanical Engineering                      1
Cimbala John   Mechanical Engineering                      1
Doherty John   Electrical Engineering                       1
Drapaca Corina Engineering Science and Mechanics            2
El-Chabib Hassan  Civil Engineering                          1
Erdman  Andrew  Engineering Design, Tech & Prof Programs      1
Fathy   Hosam   Mechanical Engineering                      1
Gray    Gary     Engineering Science and Mechanics            2
Kim     Seugjin  Mechanical Engineering                      1
Kim     Hojong   Materials Sciences and Engineering           1
Kraft   Reuben   Mechanical Engineering                      1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th># Nominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kremer</td>
<td>Gul</td>
<td>Engineering Design, Tech &amp; Prof Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakhtakia</td>
<td>Akhlesh</td>
<td>Engineering Science and Mechanics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ling</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Keefe</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Biological Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcternan</td>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehta</td>
<td>Khanjan</td>
<td>Engineering Design, Technology and Professional Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrick</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mockensturm</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palacios</td>
<td>Jose</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Engineering Design, Technology and Professional Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perosa</td>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riggio</td>
<td>Sal</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rim</td>
<td>Donghyun</td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solonosky</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmage</td>
<td>Gita</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velegol</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei</td>
<td>Min-Chen</td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>Nanyin</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Institutional Cooperation Department Executive Officers Program

In 1997-98 the CIC initiated an annual program of leadership development opportunities for department heads and chairs (Department Executive Officers or DEOs). Participants include seasoned veterans as well as newer department heads and chairs. Seminar topics include departmental leadership skills, and will emphasize in-depth analysis of case studies, focusing on the challenges facing DEOs. In addition to addressing actual problems confronting DEOs, the case studies employed at the Seminars address broader issues. Information on the program is available on the CIC web site, http://www.cic.net/projects/leadership/deo/introduction.

I am seeking nominations for DEO Fellows at this time and would like for each of you to nominate one or two individuals from your unit. Candidates should be department or division heads, or school directors who have demonstrated leadership ability through University administrative assignments or through other significant leadership positions in public, private or professional organizations. Each nomination must be accompanied by a very brief biographical sketch and a statement indicating how the nominee’s participation could benefit the unit, the University, and the individual. I encourage you to consider qualified women and minority administrators in making your nominations.

Funding for the DEOs’ participation in the seminar will be provided by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Selection of participants will be based upon the individual’s ability to use the knowledge gained from the seminar, and to also ensure a class of Fellows who represent a diverse set of backgrounds and disciplines.

Attached for your information is a list of previous DEO Fellows from Penn State. Please contact me if you have any questions regarding the program. I look forward to receiving your nominations.
The Academic Leadership Program (ALP) was established by CIC members in 1987 to help develop the leadership and managerial skills of faculty on CIC campuses who have demonstrated exceptional ability and administrative promise. The program involves Fellows in a series of three, 3-day seminars, as well as background readings and participation in related activities on their home campuses between seminars. The seminars, which are hosted by CIC institutions, follow a format designed to maximize interaction among the Fellows. Program faculty develop aspects of the seminar topic through case studies, workshops, and other group exercises. Fellows are appointed to terms of one year.

Candidates should be tenured faculty members who have demonstrated leadership ability through University administrative assignments (e.g., graduate or undergraduate coordinators, associate heads, assistant or associate deans, officers of the University Faculty Senate, chairs of key University-wide committees, etc.) or through other significant leadership positions in public, private, or professional organizations. Each nomination must be accompanied by a brief biographical sketch and a statement indicating how the nominee’s participation will benefit the unit, the University, and the individual. In making your nominations, please consider outstanding women and minority faculty. **Note:** Please do not nominate department heads or similar administrators. The CIC conducts the Department Executive Officer (DEO) seminar specifically for such individuals and we will request separate nominations.

Funding for each ALP Fellow will be provided by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Selection of participants will be based upon the individual’s ability to use the knowledge gained from the seminars, and to also ensure a class of Fellows who represent a diverse set of backgrounds and disciplines.

The Academic Leadership Program will consist of three seminars:

- Contemporary Issues and Ideas
- Internal and External Relationships
- Money, Management, and Strategies

Information on the ALP is available at [http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/cic.htm](http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/cic.htm).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title at Time of Participation in Program</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abington</td>
<td>Gary S. Calore</td>
<td>Division Head, Social Sciences</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Leah Devlin</td>
<td>Division Head, Science and Engineering</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Knodt</td>
<td>Department Head, English</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah Kliger Peltz</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samir Ouzomgi</td>
<td>Division Head, Science and Engineering</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Blannie E. Bowen</td>
<td>Department Head, Agricultural &amp; Extension Education</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Terry D. Etherton</td>
<td>Department Head, Dairy and Animal Science</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry A. Nielsen</td>
<td>School Director, Forest Resources</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Roberts</td>
<td>Department Head, Food Science</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David M. Sylvia</td>
<td>Department Head, Crop and Soil Sciences</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann R. Tickamyer</td>
<td>Department Head, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>Lori Bechtel-Wherry</td>
<td>Division Head, Education, Human Development, and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timothy Slekar</td>
<td>Division Head, Education, Human Development and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valerie Stratton</td>
<td>Division Head, Education, Human Development and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and</td>
<td>Dan Carter</td>
<td>School Director, Theatre</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Charles R. Garoian</td>
<td>School Director, Visual Arts</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mehrdad Hadighi</td>
<td>Department Head, Architecture</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sue E. Haug *</td>
<td>School Director, Music</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Kelly</td>
<td>Department Head, Integrative Arts</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Orland</td>
<td>Department Head, Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliza Pennypacker</td>
<td>Department Head, Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel E. Willis</td>
<td>Interim Department Head, Architecture</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>Janelle Larson</td>
<td>Division Head, Engineering, Business, and Computing</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl R. Lovitt</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Steven J. Huddart</td>
<td>Department Head, Accounting</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linda K. Treviño</td>
<td>Department Head, Management and Organization</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Jeremy Cohen</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Olorunmisola</td>
<td>Department Head, Film-Video and Media Studies</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert D. Richards</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Mineral</td>
<td>Timothy J. Bralower</td>
<td>Department Head, Geosciences</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Lee Kump</td>
<td>Department Head, Geosciences</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Scaroni</td>
<td>Department Head, Energy and Mineral Engineering</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yaw Yeboah</td>
<td>Department Head, Energy and Mineral Engineering</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl S. Zimmerer</td>
<td>Department Head, Geography</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Kathy Bieschke</td>
<td>Department Head, Psychology, Counseling and Special Education</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Hendrickson</td>
<td>Department Head, Education Policy Studies</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald K. LeTendre</td>
<td>Department Head, Education Policy Studies</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title at Time of Participation in Program</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spencer Niles *</td>
<td>Department Head, Education Policy Studies&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology, and Rehabilitation Services&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Adult Education, Instructional Systems, and Workforce Education and Development&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Educational and School Psychology and Special Education&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Education Policy Studies</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyle L. Peck</td>
<td>Department Head, Architectural Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Aerospace Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy L. Ruhl</td>
<td>Department Head, Architectural Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Aerospace Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Stefkovich</td>
<td>Department Head, Architectural Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Aerospace Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Head, Architectural Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Aerospace Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Head, Architectural Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Aerospace Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Head, Architectural Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Aerospace Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Head, Architectural Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Aerospace Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department Head, Architectural Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Civil and Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Aerospace Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>John M. Magenau</td>
<td>Director, Sam and Irene Black School of Business</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>Omid Ansary</td>
<td>School Director, Science, Engineering, and Technology</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Henk</td>
<td>School Director, Behavioral Sciences and Education</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven A. Peterson</td>
<td>School Director, Public Affairs</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen P. Schappe</td>
<td>School Director, Business Administration</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human</td>
<td>Collins Airhihenbuwa</td>
<td>Department Head, Biobehavioral Health&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Health Policy Administration&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Kinesiology</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>John Dattilo</td>
<td>Department Head, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Health Policy Administration&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Kinesiology</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter B. Newman</td>
<td>Department Head, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Health Policy Administration&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Kinesiology</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis G. Shea</td>
<td>Department Head, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Health Policy Administration&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Kinesiology</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Williams</td>
<td>Department Head, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Health Policy Administration&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Kinesiology</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Sciences</td>
<td>Michael D. McNeese</td>
<td>Professor-In-Charge&lt;br&gt;Professor-In-Charge</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Technology</td>
<td>John Yen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>D. Scott Bennett</td>
<td>Department Head, Political Science&lt;br&gt;Department Head, English&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese&lt;br&gt;Department Head, English&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Sociology, and Crime, Law, and Justice&lt;br&gt;Associate Department Head, English</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Bialostosky</td>
<td>Department Head, English&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese&lt;br&gt;Department Head, English&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Sociology, and Crime, Law, and Justice&lt;br&gt;Associate Department Head, English</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paola Dussias</td>
<td>Department Head, English&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese&lt;br&gt;Department Head, English&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Sociology, and Crime, Law, and Justice&lt;br&gt;Associate Department Head, English</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert L. Caserio</td>
<td>Department Head, English&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese&lt;br&gt;Department Head, English&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Sociology, and Crime, Law, and Justice&lt;br&gt;Associate Department Head, English</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Kelly Hall</td>
<td>Department Head, Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Sociology, and Crime, Law, and Justice&lt;br&gt;Associate Department Head, English</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Iceland</td>
<td>Department Head, Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Sociology, and Crime, Law, and Justice&lt;br&gt;Associate Department Head, English</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie Secor</td>
<td>Department Head, Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;Department Head, Sociology, and Crime, Law, and Justice&lt;br&gt;Associate Department Head, English</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title at Time of Participation in Program</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Dean Snow</td>
<td>Department Head, Anthropology</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Yuxi Zheng</td>
<td>Department Head, Mathematics</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Aron Lukacher</td>
<td>Chair, Microbiology and Immunology</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timothy J. Mosher</td>
<td>Chair, Radiology</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dani S. Zander</td>
<td>Chair, Pathology</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>David R. Hunter</td>
<td>Department Head, Statistics</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Schlegel</td>
<td>Department Head, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuxi Zheng</td>
<td>Department Head, Mathematics</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>Michael Doncheski</td>
<td>Chief Academic Officer, Mont Alto campus</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph P. McCormick</td>
<td>Director, Academic Affairs, York campus</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Wright</td>
<td>Director, Academic Affairs, Hazleton</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>Sally Kalin</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loanne Snavely</td>
<td>Head, Instructional Programs</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary White</td>
<td>Head, Schreyer Library</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Drs. Haug, Niles, and Zydney were not able to attend the 2007 seminar due to inclement weather and were invited to participate in 2008.
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Under FNG04 – Employee Reward and Recognition Programs, all programs that include an award (monetary, gift or special professional development activity, etc.) in addition to a Certificate of Achievement must be formally documented to identify:

- Purpose
- Eligibility criteria
- Number of recipients
- Frequency of the award
- Type of award
- Nomination and selection process
- Evaluation and selection criteria
- Guidelines for presentation

All of these programs must be reviewed and receive approval by the following prior to being implemented:

- Human Resources Manager
- Financial Officer
- Dean

Certain types of awards are subject to taxation via payroll as determined by IRS regulations.

General funds may NOT be used for cash, checks or gift certificates. Unrestricted gift funds must be used for these.

Use of general funds is permissible for other types of awards such as certificates, plaques, statues, and other small Penn State momentos with a $100 per award limit.

College has set maximum of $250 per individual award.

General funds may be used for award presentations (maximum of $200 per recipient). Departments are encouraged to combine presentations with professional development, training or other regularly scheduled business sessions or meetings.

Use form template to document department award program. All signatures must be on the documentation before program is valid.
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
DEPARTMENT STAFF AWARD PROGRAM

Department:

Date of Documentation:

Name of Award:

Purpose of Award:

**Eligibility Criteria:** Includes years employed (should be employed a minimum of one year to be eligible), type of employee, status (full-time, etc.), and how often can win award (should be minimum of once every 2 years)

Number of Recipients:

Frequency Given:

Type of Award & How Funded (certificate, memento, cash, etc.):

Nomination and Selection Process:

Evaluation Factors and Selection Criteria:

Presentation Process:
Approved:

______________________________   ______________________
Director of Human Resources     Date

______________________________   ______________________
Director of Finance             Date

______________________________   ______________________
Dean, College of Engineering     Date
Nominations for Title of DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR in the College of Engineering

Purpose:
It is the purpose of the College of Engineering to recognize, in accordance with University Policy HR-10 (*Distinguished Professorships*) a limited number of outstanding Professors in the College, for whom endowed chairs or professorships are otherwise unavailable, by awarding the title of Distinguished Professor upon recommendation of their peers and the administration.

Selection Criteria:
Criteria for awarding the title of Distinguished Professor are as follows; candidates must:

1. be current, full-time active members of the faculty holding the rank of Professor.
2. not currently hold an endowed chair, professorship, or faculty fellowship.
3. be acknowledged leaders in their fields of research or creative activity. This national and international leadership would be documented by (a) notable contributions to research published in leading journals and/or books and creative accomplishments widely recognized for excellence; (b) prestigious awards and citations; and (c) a substantial record of invited lectures or performances delivered at prestigious institutions.
4. have demonstrated significant leadership in raising the standards of the University with respect to teaching, research or creative activity, and service.
5. have demonstrated excellent teaching skills and contributed significantly to the education of students who subsequently have achieved recognition of excellence in their fields.

Selection Procedures:
Nomination of a candidate for the title of Distinguished Professor may be initiated by any faculty member in the College to the head of the department in which the nominee is assigned.

1. The department head is responsible for the preparation of the candidate’s nomination with proper supporting documentation, which shall include, but is not limited to, the following:
   - Record of achievement in the areas listed above under “Selection Criteria”;
   - Three internal letters of support including one from the nominee’s department head. Recent letters solicited for other purposes, including external letters of evaluation, may be submitted if available.
   - Specific evidence of national/international reputation.
2. The department head will forward the dossier, along with his/her letter of recommendation, to the Dean.

3. The Dean will form a committee to review the nominations and recommend candidates to the Dean.

4. Upon receipt of the committee’s recommendation, the Dean will forward dossiers of the candidates selected for further consideration to the Office of the President.

**Review Committee:**
The Committee to Review Distinguished Professor Nominations consists of three (3) full Professors in the College of Engineering. The members of the Committee are appointed by the Dean and are past and/or present members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College (all of whom are Professors elected by their respective departments).

**Conditions of Title:**
In accordance with University Policy HR-10, appointments as Distinguished Professor will be made for a period of five (5) years, subject to the same College performance review process at 5-year intervals as for endowed professorships and chairs. Renewal of the appointment is dependent upon the Distinguished Professor continuing the same high level of performance evident at the time of appointment. Faculty members who are awarded the title of Distinguished Professor will relinquish that title if appointed to an endowed professorship or chair. In accordance with University Policy HR-10, there is no additional remuneration resulting from the designation of Distinguished Professor.
CoE Early Career Professorships
Request for Nominations

Opportunity Description: The College of Engineering announces a call for nominations from department and school heads/directors for Early Career Professorships. These Professorships are intended to provide critical financial support and encouragement for faculty starting an academic career. The term of the Professorships is three years and they provide approximately $20,000 in discretionary funds per year of the appointment.

The College anticipates making approximately six appointments. The final number depends upon the number of nominations that merit support.

Eligibility: Full time, tenure-track or tenured faculty members with the academic rank of assistant professor or higher. Preference will be given to faculty members early in their careers. Newly hired faculty who will start their positions during the 2015-16 academic year are also eligible. Nominations will not be accepted for faculty members who have seven or more years of service at Penn State. Current or past holders of Early Career Professorships are not eligible.

Submission Deadline: Nominations must be submitted electronically by _______.

Nomination Guidelines: All nominations should be submitted in a single PDF file and must include:
1. Cover Page including name, academic rank, department, date hired at PSU of the nominee,
2. Nomination letter from Department Head,
3. Complete CV of nominee including educational and professional background, and teaching, research and service accomplishments.

Review Criteria: Nominations will be reviewed by an ad-hoc committee. The ad-hoc committee will provide funding recommendations to the Dean and Associate Deans of Engineering, who will make the final selection. Depending upon the number of proposals received, the Dean and Associate Deans may conduct an initial screening. Review criteria for nominees are the following:
• Adherence to nomination criteria and guidelines above,
• Record of and potential for significant accomplishment of the nominee in the three critical areas of teaching, research and service,
• Relevance to the College of Engineering’s five strategic education and research thrusts as described in the College’s Strategic Plan.

For Additional Information: Questions regarding this solicitation may be directed to Bobbi Schaffer (blr4@psu.edu).
When considering nominees for the Evan Pugh University Professorship, nomination materials should be developed in the most confidential manner possible, preferably without the knowledge of the nominee. Very few Evan Pugh’s are named at any selection period, although as many as two per college may be nominated. It is an honor to be nominated; but, realistically, not being named can be a source of disappointment, particularly since this is an internal competition.

Please submit the nomination package as one PDF file, in the order listed below.

Nomination Statement

☑ Concise nomination statement that makes the case for conferring the Evan Pugh University Professorship, to include:
  • A summary of the nominee’s qualifications and accomplishments
  • The unique scholarly contributions that the candidate has made in teaching, research or other creative work, and professional activities.
  • Signature of the dean

Curriculum Vitae

☑ Up-to-date curriculum vitae plus the following attachments as appropriate:
  • List of publications with a one-page evaluation statement regarding quality and importance.
  • Citation index for the top 5-10 papers (for candidates in science and technology).
  NOTE: Citation count need not be confined to first-author listings; care should be taken to insure names have not been confused with scholars with similar or identical names.
  • Contributions to the creative and performing arts.
  • Enumeration of services to the University.

Summary of Outstanding Teaching

☑ Summary of evidence demonstrating outstanding teacher-student relationship, such as teaching evaluation scores, course developments, and awards.

Compilation of Graduate Students

☑ Compilation of graduate students supervised and the titles of their theses and dissertations.
  • Include subsequent careers of these graduate students, including positions achieved and other evidence of their success as scholars and professionals, insofar as possible.

Five Reference Letters

☑ Five (5) reference letters from internal evaluators (to be solicited by the Dean).
  • Internal references must be able to analyze in depth the candidate’s unique scholarly contributions made in teaching, research/creative work, and professional activities at Penn State.
  • Each name must be identified in terms of his/her own status, scholarly qualifications, and professional (present or former) relationship to the nominee.

In addition, two separate PDF files:

Ten Page Curriculum Vitae

☑ The candidate’s curriculum vitae only, limited to a maximum of ten (10) pages. These CVs will be emailed to external referees prior to phone calls or requests for letters.
Six External Reference Names

- List of six (6) names of leaders in the field external to Penn State for potential reference checking.

- It is expected that the leaders will be in the candidate’s field, will enjoy a sufficiently established reputation to be potential Evan Pugh University Professors in their own organizations, and will be located at institutions with stature at least equal to Penn State. Academic recognition of referee is of paramount importance.
- Each name is to be identified in terms of his/her own status, scholarly qualifications, and professional (present or former) relationship to the nominee.
- A copy of the paragraph on referee from Who’s Who in relevant field should be provided, when available.
- As a general rule, at least two (2) of the names must be from outside the United States.
- Current mailing address (complete), phone and fax numbers, and e-mail address must be included for each.

Every effort will be made to minimize the visibility of the nomination to anyone outside the committee. Thus, reference checking will be conducted if deemed by the committee to be necessary. If, however, the individual has already received an honor external to the University which the committee felt was so significant that it precluded the need to check references, they will be free to dispense with reference collection. Similarly, if the committee were sufficiently unfamiliar with the preeminence of the scholarship of the nominee, reference checking would be highly appropriate. The committee chair or their designee will call the prospective referee(s) and, before revealing the name of the candidate, will explain the need for utmost discretion and will ask the individual to insure that he or she will not reveal to anyone, including the candidate, that they were called to provide input.

Problems and questions regarding the collection of materials should be sent to:

Ruth Weber
304 Old Main
(814)867-1463; rim100@psu.edu
EXCELLENCE IN ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP – FALL 2016
REQUEST FOR NOMINATIONS

Program Description
This fall the University will offer a unique leadership development program for academic administrators. The Excellence in Academic Leadership program, offered by the Office of Human Resources in partnership with our Office of Academic Affairs, will be held on the University Park campus and led by respected external partners with proven experience in both academic leadership development and higher education.

Program Benefits
Over six days during the fall semester (September through early December), participants will have an opportunity to network with other academic leaders, learn from senior University administrators, and grow in the areas of:

☐ Personal Mastery. The ability to know oneself and learn from experience.

☐ Interpersonal Mastery. The ability to communicate, influence, and work well with others, particularly during difficult conversations.

☐ Team Mastery. The ability to develop and lead groups of individuals towards common goals while promoting a high performing work environment.

☐ Systems Mastery. The ability to think systemically and lead the organization through a strategic change process in a way that develops commitment and learning.

2016 Program Schedule
A detailed program schedule is available at the end of this document.

☐ Discovering Leadership – September 7
☐ Personal Mastery – September 8
☐ Achieving Agreement: Dialogue, Conflict Resolution & Negotiation – October 5
☐ Cultivating Allies and Expanding Interpersonal Influence – November 1
☐ System and Personal Mastery – November 15
☐ Diversity & Inclusion, Ethics and Talent Management – November 30

Who Should Attend
Excellence in Academic Leadership is designed for academic administrators with a minimum of 1 year and no more than five years of experience in their current position. We are expecting participants to fall into one of the following titles: Department Head, Department Chair, Director of Academic Affairs, and Assistant or Associate Dean.
Nomination Criteria
Qualified candidates will meet the following criteria:

1. Be committed to their personal leadership development and growth.

2. Hold the title of Department Head, Department Chair, School Director, Director of Academic Affairs, and Assistant, Associate Dean or an equivalent title within their college, campus or unit.

3. Have been in their current role no less than 1 year and no more than 5 years.

4. Be able to attend all of the program sessions. Please refer to the schedule in this document.

5. Be willing to participate in a 360-degree feedback process in which anonymous feedback will be gathered electronically (through third party vendor, Qualtrics) from the participants themselves and their direct reports, supervisor, and peers.

Nomination Process
Prior to submitting their name (a nomination) for consideration, let the individual know that you are nominating them (him or her) for this program.

Next, send the name, contact information and a brief explanation as to why you are nominating them (the administrator) for the program to Christy Helms at cwh19@psu.edu.

Christy will reach out to all of the nominees to confirm interest and availability and respond to any questions they have about the program purpose and content.

The deadline to submit nominations is Friday, July 29, 2016. We will admit 25 participants to the program and nominations will be processed as they are received.

Program Cost
This program is offered at no charge to the participants.
Faculty Scholar Medals
Guidelines for 2015-2016

Each year a faculty award for excellence in scholarship, research, and the arts honors those who have excelled in creative work and will express the University's gratitude and appreciation for their achievements.

The awards are given in recognition of scholarly or creative excellence represented by a single contribution or a series of contributions around a coherent theme. The contribution may be original basic research in any area of science; it may represent application of knowledge in the creation and/or commercial transfer of a process or device useful to society; the contribution may be in any area of the arts or humanities such as poetry, musical composition, design, sculpture, paintings, ceramics, theatre arts, and photography, history, literature, philosophy, etc.

Candidates are considered annually in each of the following areas:

- Arts and Humanities
- Engineering
- Entrepreneurship, Technology Transfer and Economic Development
- Life and Health Sciences
- Physical Sciences
- Social and Behavioral Sciences

The award in each area will consist of a medal and a check for $5,000. This award program will be provided from undesignated gifts to the University. Peer committees will review nominations. The prime criterion will be scholarly or creative excellence. Each of the six committees may or may not recommend to the President a medalist for recognition in a given year.

The medal will include an engraved plate indicating the following information:

Presented to
(Jane Doe)
Arts and Humanities
2016

Criteria and Eligibility

Members of the University as defined for the electorate of the Senate are eligible with the exception of those who have already received the medal, those designated as Evan Pugh University Professors and those holding endowed professor and chair positions. With reference to the booklet, "Constitution By-Laws and Standing Rules of the University Faculty Senate," "University faculty" means all persons who are not candidates for degrees at Penn State who hold full-time academic appointments, and who fall into one of the following categories: those holding professional, research (excluding non-continuing research appointees), or librarian titles and those who are full-time instructors or assistant librarians.

The attainment for which the candidate is to be honored shall have occurred or culminated during the five years preceding the nomination for the award. The award will be made solely on the basis of
scholarly or creative achievement. It should not be anticipated that awards will be made in all six categories every year.

**Nomination Procedure**

Annually in September, the President will invite nominations from peers in the six areas in all academic units in the University. Suitable biographical data must accompany each nomination. Nominations should be submitted by the Dean or in cases where the faculty member’s home is not in a College, by the Director of his or her unit. Nomination dossiers should include: a letter from the Dean or Director endorsing the candidate; and a letter from the Unit Head such as the Department Head where applicable. These letters should provide a detailed description of the achievement that focuses on evidence of the superior scholarly or creative accomplishments occurring or culminating in the past five years. Dossiers should also include (1) nominee’s vita; (2) a representative sample of the achievement: selected articles, sections of books, a visual arts portfolio, recording of performances, patents, etc.; (3) published reviews of the key works, where relevant; and (4) credible outside evaluations from faculty at peer institutions which substantiate the claim of the national or international importance (brief identification notes on the authors of the letters should be furnished). The dossier should be selective: it should be no more than 100 pages long, where sample sections of books are included in item 2, and in some fields, it can be much shorter; no more that 5 key external evaluations should be provided.

**The dossier should be provided electronically, preferably as PDF files.** Supplementary materials such as books, for example, or an artistic portfolio not easily provided electronically, may also be submitted; if so, one copy should be submitted to be shared with the members of the selection panel and any such supplements are to be submitted at the same time as the nominations packet. Nominations received by the deadline will be assigned to the appropriate area review panel. Each selection panel will review the nomination materials and make one of the following recommendations to the President:

a. Name of the selected candidate
b. No award if suitable candidates are not available, in the judgment of the committee

**Selection Panels**

In the fall of each year the President will appoint six selection panels, one in each of the five main scholarly areas. Each panel will consist of five to seven members. All should be at the Professor rank or have significant academic administrative roles and a majority shall be faculty who are recognized scholars in that area. Insofar as possible, panels should include one or more previous winners of college or university level awards for research or creative achievement. In addition to internal representation, members may be drawn from outside the University.

Chairs of the Graduate Council Committee on Graduate Research and the Senate Committee on Research will be asked to recommend faculty and academic administrators for the five panels. The terms of appointment are for three years.

**Awards Ceremony**

The awards will be presented annually during the University awards program held each spring.
2016 President’s Award for Engagement with Students
Office of the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education
417 Old Main, University Park, PA 16802, 814-863-1864; 814-863-7452 (fax)

Purpose
Through the gift of a generous donor, the President’s Award for Engagement with Students recognizes a faculty member who goes well beyond the typical responsibilities of a professor by demonstrating exceptional involvement with students’ learning and special efforts to engage and encourage students in academic endeavors. The honoree will have taken specific actions to be involved in student growth and learning—academic, social, and professional. Such professors typically make themselves available to, and interact with, students outside class, link students to opportunities, and help them build their confidence as learners and potential contributors to society. The $5,000 award consists of $3,000 that goes directly to the recipient and $2,000 that goes to the professor’s department, to be managed by the recipient and used for extending the kinds of activities the award recognizes. These activities could include:

- Receptions, lunches, or picnics for students
- Field trips and museum visits for students in classes
- Purchasing books, software, personal computing assistants, compact discs, or access to portals and databases to enhance student involvement or to improve learning experiences for students
- Taking students to participate or present at research meetings, internships, performances and the like
- Networking with student organizations, for example, providing support for materials that the professor might bring to a student club or association when serving as a speaker or adviser
- Bringing speakers from other locations to meet with students
- Faculty travel to professional meetings for teaching/learning enhancements
- Involving students in research

Eligibility

- tenured or tenure-track faculty member

Nomination
Each college dean or campus chancellor may nominate one person. Nominations should be submitted to Sally Butts at sbg108@psu.edu or 417 Old Main and must include:
- a completed nomination form
- a narrative statement, not exceeding two pages, stating why the professor qualifies for the award

Please do not append letters of support from colleagues, the nominee’s CV, or other materials.

Deadline
December 11, 2015

Selection Process
A screening panel will forward up to three nominations to the President for final selection. The recipient will be recognized at the annual Faculty/Staff Recognition Luncheon in the spring.
Please complete the following information about the person being nominated for this award:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nominee</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nominator</th>
<th>College/Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date

Attach statement of nomination (two pages maximum)
THE PRESIDENT’S AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN ACADEMIC INTEGRATION

The President’s Award for Excellence in Academic Integration is given to a full-time member of the faculty of the University who has exhibited extraordinary achievement in the integration of teaching, research or creative accomplishments, and service. The award was established in 1996 to recognize faculty members who have excelled in all three areas of their professions and consists of a specially-designated certificate and a cash gift in the amount of $3,000. Recipients of the award typically have a strong outreach component as a substantive element of their scholarship. The communities reached by faculty outreach activities are generally those not normally encountered during the performance of normal scholarly activities.

Criteria

1. The award is intended to celebrate accomplishments that are consistent with the President’s goal for “Penn State to be the top University in the United States in the integration of teaching, research, and service.” As such, the record of integration should, for the most part, reflect the accomplishments of the individual as a Penn State faculty member, although the entire record of achievement in a career may be considered.

2. The purpose of the Award is to recognize integration in a broad sense over the full spectrum of teaching effectiveness; research and scholarship; and service to the University, the public, and the profession; rather than narrowly focused instances of integration.

3. Nominees are expected to show a degree of excellence in each of the three separate areas of endeavor in addition to a common integrative thread that ties them together. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that there would be some demonstrated recognition of excellence in one or more of the areas through previous citations or awards at the college, University, or national level.

4. The achievements of nominees should be of such distinction that they have already earned for them the rank of Professor.

Nomination Packet

1. A nomination packet, including a curriculum vita, should be no longer than 30 pages. The packet should be stapled or use a binder clip. Please, do not use a notebook or spiral bind the packet.

2. The packet should include detailed letters of support from the department or division head and the dean of the college indicating the nature of the candidate’s integrated excellence.

3. The packet should include evidence of superior teaching (including student letters and evaluations), research and scholarship, and service to the University, public or profession.

4. The packet should include up to three letters of support from professional colleagues in and outside the University and speak to the candidate’s major achievements, especially innovative approaches developed by the nominee to engage the public—that is, constituencies that are not traditionally engaged by the discipline.

September 2, 2015
# Penn State Engineering Alumni Society Faculty, Staff, and Service Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Circle of Excellence Award</td>
<td>Full-Time Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and Inclusion Award</td>
<td>Full-Time Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Staff Award</td>
<td>Full-Time Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Star Award</td>
<td>Full-Time Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Award</td>
<td>Full-Time Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Innovation Award</td>
<td>Full-Time Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leadership Award</td>
<td>Full-Time Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Advising</td>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Research</td>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Teaching</td>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier Research</td>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier Teaching</td>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World-Class Engineering Faculty Award</td>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Service Award</td>
<td>Alumni, Friends, Former Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Alumni Achievement Award</td>
<td>Engineering Alumni, 35 years and younger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details for each award can be found at: [http://www.engr.psu.edu/alumni/pseas/awards/default.aspx](http://www.engr.psu.edu/alumni/pseas/awards/default.aspx)

Nominations are due mid-January and should be emailed **(PDF format only)** to [PSESNOM@engr.psu.edu](mailto:PSESNOM@engr.psu.edu).

Awards will be presented at the College's awards luncheon in the Spring.

Questions may be directed to Emily Gallagher at 865-9031 or [emg5174@psu.edu](mailto:emg5174@psu.edu).
2016 Undergraduate Program Leadership Award
Office of the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education
417 Old Main, University Park, PA  16802, 814-863-1864; 814-863-7452 (fax)

Purpose
The Undergraduate Program Leadership Award recognizes a faculty member who demonstrates exemplary leadership benefiting an existing Penn State undergraduate degree program. The award spotlights individuals whose leadership has transformed or revitalized an undergraduate program. The recipient will receive a cash award of $1,000. Examples of exemplary leadership may include, but is not limited to:

- enhancement of the undergraduate curriculum (content, organization, or mode of delivery) within a program
- enhancement of student recruitment, professional development, and placement
- mentoring faculty colleagues to improve undergraduate education within a program
- enhancement of program diversity, educational quality, and resources
- showcasing of the program, providing national or international visibility
- promotion of professional ethics and the integration of ethics into all elements of undergraduate programming
- other efforts designed to enhance the internal and external stature of the undergraduate program

Eligibility
- full-time faculty appointment within a degree-granting unit
- demonstrated excellence in leadership of undergraduate education
- not currently serving as an assistant or associate dean, head or chair of an academic department, school or division

Nomination
Each college dean or campus chancellor may nominate one person. Nominations should be submitted to Susan Ake at sja1@psu.edu or 417 Old Main and must include:

- a completed nomination form
- a narrative statement, not exceeding two pages, describing the qualities that distinguish the faculty member nominated

Please do not append letters of support from colleagues, the nominee’s CV, or other materials.

Deadline
December 11, 2015

Selection Process
The Undergraduate Program Leadership Review Committee will review nominations and submit recommendations to the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education. The recipient will be recognized at the annual Faculty/Staff Recognition Luncheon in the spring.
2016 Undergraduate Program Leadership Award

NOMINATION FORM

Office of the Vice President and Dean for Undergraduate Education
417 Old Main, University Park, PA 16802; 814-863-1864; 814-863-7452 (fax)

Please complete the following information about the person being nominated for this award:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nominee</th>
<th>Program Administered By Nominee (if applicable)</th>
<th>Administrative/Academic Home of Nominee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Work Address</th>
<th>Telephone Number</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nominator</th>
<th>College/Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date

Attach statement of nomination (two pages maximum)
Advisory Boards
Industrial and Professional Advisory Council

The College looks to its Industrial and Professional Advisory Council (IPAC) to act as a link between the College and its industrial and professional partners. This select group of industry, government, and academic representatives advise the College on academic issues and on current trends and future directions in engineering. The College uses the ideas generated and the recommendations made during these forums to identify actions the College should take to continuously improve our educational and research programs and to take on global engineering grand challenges.

For more information on the College of Engineering IPAC, College of Engineering Alumni Relations Office at alumni@engr.psu.edu.

IPAC Duties

The Industrial and Professional Advisory Council (IPAC) is a select group of representatives from industry, government agencies, academia, and the profession who advise the College of Engineering on academic issues and on current trends and future directions in engineering. IPAC is a forum where ideas are exchanged and recommendations are made. IPAC provides direct linkage and communication between the College and the engineering profession.

Function

The Industrial and Professional Advisory Council is expected to:
- Act as an advisory group to each department, as well as to the College, on specific academic and research issues.
- Act as a link between the College and its industrial and professional partners, providing an opportunity for communication of current and future industry and professional needs to the College.
- Identify actions that the College should take to meet special College-wide or departmental needs.
- Provide recommendations on initiatives that the College should undertake to continuously improve educational and research programs to meet the needs of the world and the profession.

Organization

- Department Councils: Each College department has an Industrial and Professional Advisory Council consisting of individuals from industry, professional practice, and government, and up to two members from academia. Each departmental IPAC shall have a chair and vice chair elected from the department council. The term of office for chairpersons and vice-chairpersons is one year (or until the next annual meeting). The vice chair becomes the chair.
- Executive Committee: The chairpersons of each IPAC constitute an Executive Committee to advise the Dean's Office on general college issues. This body is governed by a chair and vice chair elected from its own ranks. In normal succession, the vice chair usually advances to become the chair. All chairs and vice-chairs are elected for a one three-day session (or until the next annual meeting) and are expected to be present at the opening and closing executive sessions.

Membership

Departmental IPAC members are selected by the department head; each selection is subject to the review by the Dean. Membership on IPAC is for one three-year term. Each member may not serve more than two consecutive terms (maximum of six years) unless additional time is needed to fulfill commitments as chair or vice chair of the Executive Committee.
Membership Responsibilities
Each IPAC member is expected to
• Attend the annual meeting and any departmental meetings scheduled during the year by the department head. IPAC members are selected for their individual merit and expertise, not as organizational representatives. For this reason, and to help assure continuity, only members (not substitutes) are invited to attend.
• Become familiar with the operations and programs of the department and the College.
• Contribute to the identification of important issues and assist in the formulation of recommendations to help the department and the College in continuously improving academic and research programs.

Meetings
The full IPAC meets once annually, beginning with an opening Executive Committee session. All members are requested to be present when a College-wide program is scheduled. One full day is devoted to departmental issues.

It is expected in the departmental meetings that IPAC members will have an opportunity to meet with undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty to hold discussion concerning any issues that may be relevant to the department's progress and to identify significant opportunities and/or barriers to the department's progress. As a result of these meetings and other discussions held with the department leadership, a report will be prepared by the departmental IPAC committee, which will be shared with the department head and subsequently presented to the IPAC Executive Committee at the closing Executive Committee Session. The opening Executive Committee Session is expected to be attended by IPAC chairs, vice-chairs, department heads, and engineering deans. Only IPAC chairs and the Dean of the College attend the closing session, unless other College personnel are invited.

As part of the College and departmental reports to IPAC, the status of recommendations and findings resulting from previous IPAC meetings will be discussed. It is also expected that periodically throughout the year, the department will communicate with its IPAC members concerning department developments and activities.
## Industrial and Professional Advisory Council Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Deadlines</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Send save-the-date email to IPAC regarding next year’s meeting dates</td>
<td>Dean/Executive Asst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule Provost to attend next year’s IPAC Dinner</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Dean response to IPAC recommendations</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Request IPAC Overall Chair recommendations from Department Heads</td>
<td>Alumni Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Appoint IPAC Overall Chair</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Develop discussion themes</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Department IPAC membership list updates due to Dean’s Office</td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IPAC Welcome Letter Template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IPAC Reappointment Template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IPAC Thank you Template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updated Roster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule meetings between Dean and Overall IPAC Chair</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update IPAC Database and Listserv</td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Send to IPAC Members:</td>
<td>Dean/Executive Asst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dean’s response to last year’s IPAC recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IPAC discussion topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send Presentation Plan to Kate and all involved parties</td>
<td>Dean/Executive Asst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forward updated IPAC member lists to Sharon Bassett in Old Main</td>
<td>Dean’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Department IPAC meeting attendee list due to Dean’s Office (two weeks prior)</td>
<td>Department Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department IPAC Thursday dinner attendee list due to Dean’s Office (two weeks prior)</td>
<td>Department Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribute Report-Out Slide to Departments</td>
<td>Alumni Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review meeting day notes</td>
<td>Dean’s Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPAC Meeting BEO/Function Agreement/Room Layout</td>
<td>Alumni Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule event space for next year’s meeting</td>
<td>Alumni Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See electronic manual on file in the Dean’s Office for backup material*
Lynn Tressler

From: College of Engineering IPAC Board <L-ENGR-IPAC@lists.psu.edu> on behalf of Amr S. Elnashai
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 5:19 PM
To: L-ENGR-IPAC@LISTS.PSU.EDU
Subject: March 22-23, 2017 IPAC

Dear IPAC Members,

I am looking forward to welcoming you to campus for the upcoming Industrial and Professional Advisory Council Meeting (IPAC). The schedule for the overall meeting is listed below. In the coming weeks, your respective department head will be sending you the agenda for your individual IPAC meetings. I would like to extend my appreciation and thanks to Marjorie Rawhouser, BME MS/PhD, who has agreed to serve as our overall chair for IPAC this year. In this capacity, Marjorie will be facilitating the opening executive session and the final report session.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS
In preparation for our meeting, I have included the following documents:
- 2016 IPAC Dean Updates – this document provides my updates to your recommendations. I recommend that you read all of the recommendations and responses for each department, since there is a lot of overlap.
- 2017 IPAC Discussion Topics by Department

MEETING SCHEDULE
Wednesday, March 22
8:00-8:45 a.m.  Registration
(The Nittany Lion Inn, Atrium)

8:15 a.m.  Opening Session
Dean, Senior Director of Development, Manager of Alumni Relations, IPAC Chairs and Vice Chairs ONLY
(The Nittany Lion Inn, Alumni Lounge)

8:45 a.m.  Social Time
All IPAC Members, Deans, Department Heads and Staff, Development and Alumni Relations Staff, Communications Staff
(The Nittany Lion Inn, Ballroom ABC)

9:15 a.m.  State of the College Address
All IPAC Members, Deans, Department Heads and Staff, Development and Alumni Relations Staff, Communications Staff
(The Nittany Lion Inn, Ballroom ABC)

10:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.  IPAC Members in their departments

Thursday, March 23
8:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.  IPAC Members in the Departments
3:30-4:30 p.m.  
Chairs to Prepare Reports for Report-out Session

4:30 p.m.  
IPAC Report-out Session  
IPAC Chairs and Vice-Chairs ONLY will present to the Dean, Development and Alumni Relations Staff  
(The Nittany Lion Inn, Alumni Lounge)  
Note: At Wednesday’s opening session, chairs will be given a flash drive with a template that is to be used when completing the final report presentation.

6:00 p.m.  
Closing Dinner  
All IPAC members, Deans, Department Heads and Staff, Development and Alumni Relations Staff, Communications Staff  
(The Nittany Lion Inn, Boardroom 1)  
Provost Nicholas Jones will give the opening remarks at our closing IPAC dinner on Thursday evening.

HOTEL ACCOMMODATIONS  
Please note that our room block at The Nittany Lion Inn and Penn Stater is sold out. As a result, we have obtained a small block of rooms at The Atherton Hotel at a discounted rate of $95. IPAC members can reserve rooms by calling the Atherton at (814) 231-2100. Please reference Group ID “IPAC 2017.”

I look forward to seeing you soon.

Warm regards,
Amr

Amr S. Elnashai,  FREng
Harold and Inge Marcus Dean of Engineering
101 Hammond, College of Engineering
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
Industrial and Professional Advisory Council
2017 Annual Meeting
Selected Discussion Topics

The department heads/directors and the deans of the College of Engineering have agreed on the set of topics for discussion at the March 2017 IPAC meetings. Short statements describing each topic are given below, followed by a table that provides the selections made by departments and approved by the dean:

1. Pros and cons of admitting students in the first, second or third semesters, and possible measures of controlling the undergraduate population. The unmanaged number of undergraduate students admitted through the current process is a serious threat to the quality of education in Penn State Engineering and the advice of the IPACs would broaden the discussion and open new options. The IPACs advocacy with PSU may also be important.

2. Operations and priorities for our newly established office of Corporate Innovation and Development; this office is functioning at a high level of activity, to expand our corporate outreach and engagement effort, to establish new institutional research collaborations and to encourage more corporate involvement in support of programs in the College of Engineering. Advice from the IPACs would increase our effectiveness and improve our selection of priority engagements as well as the selection of sectors of industry.

3. Managing the College through metrics and data has been a priority since 2014. The newly established office of Data and Assessment is working on a comprehensive annual report that will encompass all available and attainable statistics and metrics of performance. The advice of the IPAC members on the content of the report, and use of the collected data in more effectively managing our enterprise would improve our performance in the future.

4. Strategies and tactics for growing the research enterprise under the constraints of high teaching loads, and limited federal research budgets. The advice of the IPAC members on diversifying our research portfolio by working with corporations, foundations, and global partners would be valuable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Topic 1</th>
<th>Topic 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag and Bio Engineering</td>
<td>1. Early Entrance to Major</td>
<td>2. Corporate Outreach/Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>1. Early Entrance to Major</td>
<td>4. Growing Research Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2: Corporate Outreach/Engagement</td>
<td>Write-in: Thriving While in Temporary Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>1. Early Entrance to Major</td>
<td>2. Corporate Outreach/Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Manufacturing Eng.</td>
<td>1. Early Entrance to Major</td>
<td>2. Corporate Outreach/Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/ Nuclear Engineering</td>
<td>1. Early Entrance to Major</td>
<td>4. Growing Research Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDTAPP</td>
<td>1. Early Entrance to Major</td>
<td>4. Growing Research Enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPAC members are asked to communicate with their respective departments to prepare for these discussions by exchanging data, benchmarks and further thoughts on the desired outcome from the discussion.
College of Engineering Background Check Process:
1) Departments initiate the background check process.
   a. Go to the gen-info (\engrcdc) (Q:) shared Drive
   b. Go to the Human Resources folder
   c. Go to the Background Check Instructions
   d. Complete the BatchTemplate
   e. Emailed the BatchTemplate to: backgroundcheck@engr.psu.edu

2) First Advantage will send an email to the potential employee inviting them to complete an online profile.
3) First Advantage will conduct their analysis
4) If a candidate is “eligible”, First Advantage will email the results to the Engineering Human Resource Office.
5) Engineering Human Resource Office will email the department to relay the results of the background check with the following message:

   CANDIDATES NAME

   “Please be advised that the criminal background check for the above individual has been completed. No convictions or issues were found that would have an adverse action on the hiring decision or the individual’s continued employment.

   CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: This message (including any attachments) contains information intended for a specific individual(s) and purpose that may be privileged, Confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure pursuant to applicable law. Any inappropriate use, distribution or copying of the message is strictly prohibited and may subject you to criminal or civil penalty. If you have received this transmission in error, please reply to the sender indicating this error and delete the transmission from your system immediately.”

6) If “not eligible”, the Engineering Human Resource Office will contact the department to relay the result and the Recruitment and Compensation Office will notify the potential employee of their background check results.
1. **Committee selection made by the Senior Associate Dean/Dean**

2. **Committee charge meeting – Senior Associate Dean/Dean attend**
   a) **Amr’s talking points:**
      - Confidentiality – before AND after process. Sensitivity to internal and external candidates.
      - Reaching out personally and collectively to seek nominations and applications.
      - Having phone interviews is better than 2 rounds of interviews.
      - Bring 3-4 candidates on campus for full interviews.
      - Prior to campus visit, all reference letters must be received. No visiting campus without letters.
      - Recommend 2 unranked formally to Dean; committee will meet with dean to get a feeling for their relative merits from each member.
      - Recommend using assessment form to avoid any bias to help committee reach robust decisions.
      - We will have a formal charge letter.
   b) **Discussion Topics:**
      - Introductions of the search committee
      - Timeline (depending on time of year)
        - Early October – ad posted
        - November 15 – begin reviewing applications
        - December 15 – begin telephone interviews/asking for reference letters
        - January 5 – send invitations for on-campus interviews
        - January-February - campus interviews
        - March 5 – final committee recommendations
   c) Ad
   d) Candidate Evaluation Form
   e) Future meetings

3. **Ad**
   a) Committee reviews/edits and makes suggestions for ad placement
   b) Ad approved by the Dean
   c) Lisa Lingle
      - assigns a job number
      - submits the request for ad placement
      - provides viewing access and link
   d) Kate Myers generates a nicer looking ad for distribution
   e) Post ad to our Blog site (Stefanie Tomlinson)
   f) link to websites (college/department) (Jane Harris)

4. **Candidates** ([https://app3.ohr.psu.edu/jobs/home_EJMS/](https://app3.ohr.psu.edu/jobs/home_EJMS/))
   a) pull candidate information from EJMS, merge into one PDF and place in BOX
   b) as candidates apply send out acknowledgement email

5. **The Committee chooses a short list of candidates**
   a) phone Interviews - (if more than 3 qualified candidates)
   b) notify department faculty/staff that candidates are being invited
   c) On-campus interviewing - email goes out under the Dean’s email account to invite to campus and request approval for contacting references.
      - References – An email with specifics goes out under the Dean’s email account requesting references.

6. **Interviews**
   a) Calendars – see attached draft schedule
   b) Candidates - Contact via email for on-campus visit
      - Include suggested dates,
      - make hotel reservations and flight arrangements (if requested)
      - work with department to prepare itinerary
Name
Candidate, Department Head, Department

Arrival Day
Depart
Arrive
Depart
Arrive State College

XXXXXX will transport you from the University Park Airport, provide tour of State College, and proceed to The Nittany Lion Inn

6:00 p.m. Dinner

Overnight: The Nittany Lion Inn
Confirmation #
200 West Park Avenue
State College, PA 16803
814-865-8500

Day 1 and 2
Include Breakfast – Lunch - Dinner

7:30 a.m.- 5:00 p.m.
Meetings with:
- Provost – ½ hour
- Dean – 1 hour (or dinner)
- Senior Associate Dean – ½ hour
- Associate Dean for Undergraduate and Graduate Education – ½ hour
- Associate Deans for Research and Innovation – ½ hour
- Department Heads (as group) – 1 hour
- Department faculty – 1 hour
- Search Committee Chair – 1 hour (or dinner)
- Search Committee – 1 hour
- Department Staff – 1 hour
- Department Graduate Student Advisory Committee – ½ hour
- Department Undergraduate Student Advisory Committee – ½ hour
- Break and seminar prep – ½ hour
- Research Seminar/Department Vision Seminar/Q&A session - 1 ½ hours
- Exit interview with Amr Elnashai, Dean, College of Engineering – 1 hour

Day 3
Nittany Lion Inn Shuttle to University Park Airport
Depart University Park Airport
External Review of Departments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Deadlines</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Sample review materials to department being reviewed (itinerary, overview report, etc.) in BOX.</td>
<td>Sr. Assoc. Dean (SAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Department Head secures agreement of the External Review Committee (ERC) comprised of six members  Send charge letter to ERC Members from the Dean  Set up budget/cost center  Contact the review committee to schedule an on-campus meeting of the ERC for the Fall of the next year (send a copy of review panel contact/bio information to each committee member). Consult calendars of Department Head, Dean and Senior Associate Dean and confirm all. Arrange hotel room block (one full day and one half day, using the second day for panel to draft their report)</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Meet with Department Head and Assistant to talk about timeline and process</td>
<td>Bobbi/Lynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Department drafts preliminary itinerary</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department drafts table of contents of overview report</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review itinerary and table of contents with the Dean</td>
<td>Department/Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Communicate (via phone call, email, or teleconference) with the External Review Committee to review both the preliminary itinerary and the table of contents overview report and make any necessary adjustments at this point  Finalize itinerary and overview report table of contents. Confirm with ERC.</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Hold Department meetings to review report assessment and adjust report table of contents as needed</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold meeting with key faculty to confirm role responsibilities of the report contents and site visit</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Arrange meeting space and catering</td>
<td>SAD/Bobbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrange for needed technology and admin support of the ERC to develop their report BEFORE leaving State College (printer, laptops, etc.)</td>
<td>SAD/Bobbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Compile details of full overview report and circulate for comments to the department participants and the Senior Associate Dean  Update and make any needed changes  Arrange teleconference with ERC to review content of overview report and gather any additional information required by the ERC</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Distribute responsibilities for slides production  Compile presentations, review and adjust  Finalize arrangements for laboratory tours, other labs outside of the department and/or college</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Send both report and slides to ERC; include template for their feedback  Distribute responsibilities to the ERC for drafting the overview report/assign chair of the ERC Committee</td>
<td>SAD/Bobbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Month Prior</td>
<td>Distribute final materials to ERC members, Dean and Senior Associate Dean</td>
<td>SAD/Bobbi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>ERC on-campus meeting  (1 full day in Department – ½ day for reporting)</td>
<td>All ERC Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Regular Review of Departments
College of Engineering at Penn State

Preamble
We discussed and agreed in principle to implement a 5-year cycle for reviewing our departments by an external panel of experts in higher education. As discussed in the UEC meeting of August 28, 2014, and summarized in the meeting notes, the budget and personnel reviews that we have recently completed were the first step in preparing for external reviews by the departments. In fall 2016, we will complete the second and final step by having education and research reviews of all departments. It is therefore necessary to plan for the first department reviews during fall 2017. Comments received after the UEC meeting of April 21, 2016 on the draft plan from 8 department heads have been responded to separately. Best practice amongst our peers lean towards a five-year cycle, and a panel of 5 or more. We would like the review panels to have 6 members per department (to allow for possible last-minute withdrawals, and also to provide intellectual breadth), with at least 4 current or recent career academics and up to 2 industrial members who have deep knowledge of the academy. The reviews will be managed by the Dean’s office through the office of the senior associate dean. Of course, close coordination will be maintained with the department head, and the departmental front office.

Time Schedule
The table below depicts a proposed timeline to review our 11 units (9 departments and 2 schools), subject to confirmation by department heads, school head and school director.

Table 1: Proposed timeline for review of CoE units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESM</th>
<th>IME</th>
<th>CEE</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Aerospace</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>SEDTAPP</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>ABE</th>
<th>ChemE</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BME</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EECS³</td>
<td></td>
<td>MNE²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 S members for Aerospace, 2 for Acoustics
2 S members for ME, 2 for NE
3 Number could exceed 6 if the School wishes

The review will be typically of one full and one half day, using the rest of the second day for the panel to draft their report. It is essential to select a chair that will manage to focus discussions and develop a complete draft of the report before the panel departs. Panel members would have the opportunity of commenting on the content, and editing as necessary. A complete draft is nonetheless required before they depart.

Criteria for Selection of Department Review Panels
The criteria below are guidelines, not rules. The dean’s office requests that the heads adhere to them as much as possible. If there are major departures from these guidelines, a chance to comment and discuss with the dean prior to inviting panel members is necessary.

- Total of 6 members, subject to the notes under table 1
- At least 2 members of the National Academy of Engineering
- No more than 1 alumna/alumnus
- No more than 2 non-academic members
- Academics; experience as department head or a higher responsibility in an academic institution, from a top 20 ranked department (UG or Grad)
• Non-academics; leadership position in a national lab, an R and D unit of a major industry, and some familiarity with academic institutions
• Retirees; still active in the profession and has retired for ~5 years or less

In addition to the above criteria, personal attributes are also very important. We are interested individuals who are willing to put the effort, spend time to read, understand and question the heads, and invest their creative thought into recommendations. It is important that the formal invitations come from the Dean’s office, since the panel members are supposed to be scrutinizing the departments and pointing out strengths as well as opportunities for improvement.

Overview Report
An overview report is required for the departmental review. The recommended contents of the report are in Annex 1. The recommended contents are important to have, and to quantitatively assess our academic units. If this information is available, or partially available, then the effort is not onerous. If many items are not available, then the effort to collect, check and present is very worthwhile. The report should be sent to the panel one month before the campus visit.

Itinerary
Panel members are encouraged to arrive in the afternoon before the review. The later afternoon could be used to arrange tours and visits to laboratory facilities, and a group buffet dinner with the faculty and student representatives. The first day would start with a panel briefing session with the dean and associate deans, followed by the main departmental meeting with the panel. The rest of the day would be a series of presentations and discussions sessions, where the discussion sessions are long enough to allow the panel members to gain a deeper understanding of the department than allowed by the overview report. During one of the breaks, it is expected to allow the faculty to meet with the panel without the department leadership, and the first day lunch should be for the panel members to meet with representatives of the students. The panel members are expected to list a number of queries and issues that require clarification for the department leadership team to respond to at the beginning of the second day. Meetings and discussions should be concluded by mid-morning, followed by a short debriefing meeting of the panel members with the dean and associate deans. It also may be appropriate to invite the departmental leadership to the debriefing meeting. The remaining time should be dedicated to writing the draft review report. The department should allocate space, laptops/desktops and administration support for the panel. A generic agenda is attached. Note that the start/finish times on the left and the event duration on the right are linked through equations, in case editing is needed. Departments may develop their own agendas as they see fit.

Costs
There are two main elements of cost, namely the cost of the event itself and the honoraria that will be offered to the review panel members. A token honorarium of $1000 per member is suggested. Since the review panel reports to the dean’s office, that office will cover this cost element. The dean’s office will also provide $5000 to each department towards the cost of travel, meals and other meeting expenses.
Annex 1: Proposed Contents of Overview Report

1 Introduction
1.1 Historical Background
1.2 Purpose
1.3 Organization of Report
2 Departmental Overview
2.1 Mission
2.2 Vision
2.3 Structure and Governance
3 Degree Programs and Student Activities
3.1 Undergraduate Curriculum
3.2 Graduate Degrees and Curriculum
3.3 Certificates
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Appendices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>Arrival in UP Airport and pick up</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>In transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 - 8:00 PM</td>
<td>Visits to labs</td>
<td>selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 – 9:00 PM</td>
<td>Light dinner in department/school</td>
<td>Dean, Assoc Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>7:30 AM</td>
<td>Breakfast at hotel - on your own</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>Transfer from hotel to Venue</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>In transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:20 AM</td>
<td>Review Panel closed session</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>Meeting with the Dean and Assoc Deans</td>
<td>Exchange of ideas and expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:15 AM</td>
<td>Logistics, plan and outcomes</td>
<td>Head/Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:25 AM</td>
<td>Overview of the Department/School</td>
<td>Highlights of the report and activities in department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:45 AM</td>
<td>Impressions and Requirements</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Undergraduate Program</td>
<td>Analysis of current and future of UG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:25 AM</td>
<td>Graduate, Online and OYM Program</td>
<td>Analysis of current and future of Grad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:45 AM</td>
<td>Research Program</td>
<td>Analysis of current and future research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Q/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:15 AM</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:25 AM</td>
<td>Overview of Labs not visited, related research</td>
<td>Projects and use of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:35 AM</td>
<td>Overview of Labs - 1</td>
<td>Projects and use of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:45 AM</td>
<td>Overview of Labs - 2</td>
<td>Projects and use of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:55 AM</td>
<td>Overview of Labs - 3</td>
<td>Projects and use of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:05 PM</td>
<td>Q/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:20 PM</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td>Informal lunch with students (UG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>Planning and Implementation, Priorities</td>
<td>Process of developing, implementing and monitoring progress</td>
<td>Head/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 PM</td>
<td>Hiring and monitoring policies</td>
<td>Consistency with Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:45 PM</td>
<td>Integration of research groups and themes</td>
<td>Systems, networks, water, sustainable infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Q/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:10 PM</td>
<td>Global Educational Initiatives &amp; Current</td>
<td>Specific projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:25 PM</td>
<td>Global Research Initiatives &amp; Current</td>
<td>Specific projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:45 PM</td>
<td>Q/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:05 PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:05 PM</td>
<td>Overview of Communications</td>
<td>Existing, plans and performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:15 PM</td>
<td>Overview of Development</td>
<td>Existing, plans and performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:25 PM</td>
<td>Administration and Finances</td>
<td>Budgeting priorities and practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:40 PM</td>
<td>Q/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>Executive session for RP</td>
<td>Formulation of Questions to department leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>Presentation of questions</td>
<td>RP presents “10 questions”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:25 PM</td>
<td>Informal discussion</td>
<td>Questions and expectations</td>
<td>Head/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Interaction with Grad students</td>
<td>Reception with students (Grad)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:30 PM</td>
<td>Working session for department leadership</td>
<td>Dinner (department/school leadership only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
<td>Transfer to hotel</td>
<td>Cars will be arranged</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>Breakfast at hotel - on your own</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>Transfer from hotel to Venue</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>In transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>Response from department/school</td>
<td>Slides response to 30 questions</td>
<td>Several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Meeting with the Dean and Assoc Deans</td>
<td>Closed session for Dean/assoc Deans with Review Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:45 AM</td>
<td>Discussion on all issues</td>
<td>Review of all issues and priorities</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Executive session</td>
<td>Report writing; provide IT and admin support</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:40 PM</td>
<td>Working lunch</td>
<td>Finalizing report; provide IT and admin support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:40 PM</td>
<td>Transfer to UP Airport for departure</td>
<td>Cars will be arranged</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-technical
Technical
Questions and Answers
Review Panel Members
Review Panel Members
Date: August 29, 2016

To: External Review Committee for the Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics

From: Amr S. Elnashai
Harold and Inge Marcus Dean of Engineering

Subject: Charge to the External Review Committee

The Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics at the Pennsylvania State University has a strong record of scholarship and achievement. Its past accomplishments have been a major contributor to the success of the College of Engineering, and it continues to play a central role in our effort to accomplish the strategic goals of the College and of the University, especially in interdisciplinary and impactful research and education. Our aim is to create an environment that enables the learning, discovery and engagement activities in the Department to be both deep in fundamentals and broad in innovation and creativity. Our ambition for the department is to be unequivocally recognized as one of the preeminent engineering science and mechanics departments worldwide. For us to achieve this goal, we must critically assess and promote the strengths of the Department. We must also recognize the opportunities that the department has not yet benefited from, and provide the conditions for taking full advantage of these opportunities.

Your review of the Department will provide the College and Penn State academic leadership with a realistic assessment of its current status and future ambitions, and will enable the dean’s team to assist the Department to review and refocus its strategy and implementation plan. I therefore ask you to provide me with a critical assessment of the Department and specifically to address the following topics:

1. **Research:** Is the current research portfolio of the Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics appropriate in scope and depth for a top-tier department? How does the quality and quantity of the research products of the faculty compare with other top-tier engineering science and mechanics departments in terms of publications, funding, and impact? Is the research portfolio in tune with national and world trends and priorities? Are there areas of significant opportunity that are not addressed currently? Does the Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics make a difference to the technical and civil society through its research contributions? What is the degree of overlap between the department and other Penn State Engineering departments? Is this an optimum overlap?

2. **Faculty:** How do the quality and outlook of the faculty compare with those of other top-tier engineering science and mechanics departments (and sub-departments where there are no stand-alone departments)? Is there a reasonable balance between traditional and emerging areas? Are the current faculty sufficiently engaged in external technical activities?
(editorships, professional organizations, and other activities with broader social objectives) nationally and internationally? Is this engagement visible and recognized? Are the faculty engaged in the management of the department and invested in its mission?

3. **Students:** How does the composition of the student body, at both undergraduate and graduate levels, compare with those at other top-tier engineering science and mechanics departments? (Comparisons should be based on test scores, job placement, professional performance, and any additional criteria you deem appropriate). Does the Department have a plan to improve the quality and diversity of the student body? Is this plan appropriate and sufficient, or are critical components missing? Are the students satisfied with their educational experience?

4. **Curricula:** How does the content, rigor, and quality of the undergraduate and graduate curricula compare with those at other top-tier engineering science and mechanics departments (and sub-departments)? Are we preparing our students to become successful professionals and leaders in their chosen profession? What opportunities are there for further improvements in curriculum design, development and delivery? Is the department engaged in this effort at the national level? Are the faculty engaged in curriculum enhancement? Does the curriculum reflect modern and innovative pedagogical practices?

5. **Overall reputation:** What is your assessment of the reputation of the Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics on the national and international levels? Has this reputation changed in recent years? What opportunities exist for improving the reputation of the department?

6. **Uniqueness:** What are the unique aspects of our Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics, and are they effectively maintained, improved and publicized?

I look forward to welcoming you to Penn State Engineering, and thank you once more for accepting the responsibility of conducting a comprehensive review of our Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics.
ESM External Review Panel Contact Information

Jan Achenbach
Northwestern University
2145 Sheridan Road
Catalysis 324
Evanston, IL 60208-3109
847-491-5527
achenbach@northwestern.edu

Diran Apelian
Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Washburn Shops, 326
Worcester, MA 01609
508-831-5992
dapelian@wpi.edu

Christina Giannopapa
22 Rue Emeriau,
75015 Paris Cedex 15, France
+33684656826 (Mobile FR)
christina.giannopapa@gmail.com

Carol Jantzen
Savannah River National Laboratory
Bldg. 773-A
Aiken, SC 29808
803-725-2374
carol.jantzen@srnl.doe.gov

Ranu Jung
Florida International University
EC 2602
10555 West Flagler St., EC 2600
Miami, Florida 33174
305-348-3722
RJung@fiu.edu

Ishwar Puri
John Hodgins Engineering Building
JHE-261
McMaster University
1280 Main St. West
Hamilton, Ontario
Canada L8S 4L7
905-525-9140 Ext. 24900
ikpuri@mcmaster.ca

David Spencer
wTe Corporation
7 Alfred Circle
Bedford, Massachusetts 01730
781-275-6400 ext. 10
DBSWTE@aol.com

David Williams
142 Hitchcock Hall
2070 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210
614-292-2836
williams.4219@osu.edu
Jan D. Achenbach is an expert on solid mechanics, with a major emphasis on the theory and applications of ultrasonic methods to quantitative non-destructive evaluation, particularly the measurement of elastic properties of thin films by acoustic microscopy, and the detection of cracks and corrosion in safety-critical structures. In recent years he has contributed to the development of probabilistic methods for structural health monitoring of fatigue damage in structural components for the purposes of Diagnostics and Prognostics. For the last three years he has worked on a comprehensive model for the rate of stress corrosion cracking. He is the author of a well-known book entitled Wave Propagation in Elastic Solids (Elsevier Science, 1973, still available in paperback), and a recent book entitled Reciprocity in Elastodynamics (Cambridge University Press, 2004), as well as numerous papers in technical journals.

Amongst a number of prestigious awards, Dr. Achenbach was named to the National Academy of Engineering in 1982, the National Academy of Sciences in 1992, and elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1994. He was awarded the 2003 National Medal of Technology, and in 2005 the National Medal of Science.
## ESM Department Review Panel Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Diran Apelian (Worcester Polytech. Inst.)</th>
<th>Christina Giannopapa (Eindhoven Univ. - France)</th>
<th>Carol Jantzen (Savannah Nat’l Rvr. Lab)</th>
<th>Ranu Jung (Florida Internat’l Univ.)</th>
<th>Ishwar Puri (McMaster Univ.-Canada)</th>
<th>David Spencer (wTe Corp. - MA)</th>
<th>David Williams (Ohio State Univ.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TRAVEL

- **Airfare**
- **Bus/Train**
- **Rental Car**
- **Fuel (Rental car only)**
- **Mileage (Personal car only)**
- **Tolls**
- **Parking**
- **Taxi/Shuttle**

### LODGING & MEALS

- **Hotel**
- **Per diem (Meals & Incidentals)**
- **Group Meals**

### MISC. EXPENSES

- **Conference Room Rental**
- **Technology Rental**
- **Other (Specify: ___________)**

### PANEL MEMBER TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Diran</th>
<th>Christina</th>
<th>Carol</th>
<th>Ranu</th>
<th>Ishwar</th>
<th>David</th>
<th>David</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL TOTAL:** 0

### Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Budget &amp; Fund</th>
<th>Cost Center</th>
<th>Obj. Code</th>
<th>Sub Obj. Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoE Dean’s Office Budget (Up to $5,000)</td>
<td>02-015-01 UP 1001</td>
<td>DeansOffice</td>
<td>Depends on expense</td>
<td>Depends on expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Budget (Remaining expenses)</td>
<td>XX-XXX-XX UP XXXX</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Depends on expense</td>
<td>Depends on expense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engineering Faculty Council

The Faculty Council is charged with considering all recommendations made for new majors; for the introduction of new courses and the dropping of old ones; to study the majors and offerings of the College as related to the needs of the students and the global engineering community, and to make recommendations on these matters to the Dean of the College of Engineering.

Committees

There are four standing committees of the Faculty Council appointed annually by the Faculty Council and the Dean of the College of Engineering:

- **Undergraduate Studies**: This committee will be responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and recommending action on all undergraduate course and curriculum proposals submitted by departments in the College. The committee may also consider and recommend action on other matters pertaining to the undergraduate program in the College, whether such matters are referred to the committee or the committee initiates the consideration.

- **Graduate Studies and Research**: This committee will be responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and recommending action on all graduate course and curriculum proposals submitted by departments in the College. The committee may also consider and recommend action on other matters pertaining to the graduate program and research in the College, whether such matters are referred to the committee or the committee initiates the consideration.

- **Engineering Technology**: This committee will be responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and recommending action on all engineering technology degree programs and curriculum proposals submitted by the School of Engineering Technology and Commonwealth Engineering. The committee may also consider and recommend action on other matters pertaining to the engineering technology degree programs in the College, whether such matters are referred to the committee or the committee initiates the consideration.

- **General Planning**: This committee will be responsible for faculty input into the long-range planning of the College of Engineering, including: (1) identifying timely and pertinent issues which warrant consideration by the faculty and Faculty Council and, (2) assisting the Faculty Council Chair in the development of a College-wide Faculty Council activities. (3) input to the development of a College-wide strategic plan.

Duties

- **Engineering Faculty Council Duties**:
  - Initiate, prepare, investigate, and coordinate College activities within the responsibility of the faculty, and advise the dean, appropriate staff officers, and faculty of the College of such matters; it shall also act on matters delegated to it by the faculty or the dean.
  - Consider all recommendations made for new majors, for the introduction of new courses and the dropping of old ones, to study the majors and offerings of the College with reference to the needs of the students and of the Commonwealth and nation, and to make recommendations on these matters to the Dean of the College of Engineering.
• **Officers' Duties:**
  o Chair shall work with the dean and his/her staff to prepare the agenda and shall serve as Parliamentarian for faculty meetings.
  o Secretary shall prepare, reproduce, and distribute notes, agenda, and minutes of the individual faculty meetings, and shall publish and distribute the current membership of Faculty Council, all standing committees, standing subcommittees, and special committees of the College in the fall of each year. The Secretary shall keep the official roll and prepare and publish minutes of the Faculty Council meetings with assistance from the Dean's Office.
  o Vice-chair shall be responsible for coordinating the activities of the standing committees, encouraging the timely completion of committee tasks, and, in consultation with committee chairs, determining those activities that should be brought before the Faculty Council. The Vice-chair also serves as the Chair of the Nomination Committee.

• **Standing Committee Duties:**
  o Undergrad Studies, Engineering Technology and Graduate Studies and Research Committees will be responsible for reviewing, evaluating, and recommending action on all course and curriculum proposals submitted by departments and programs within the College. The committee may also consider and recommend action on other matters pertaining to the program in the College, whether such matters are referred to the committee or the committee initiates the consideration. Decisions of the committees are only advisory to the Faculty Council. See the attached flowchart.
  o General Planning Committee will be responsible for faculty input into the long-range planning of the College of Engineering, including: (1) identifying timely and pertinent issues which warrant consideration by the faculty and Faculty Council, (2) assisting the Faculty Council Chair in the development of an annual agenda for faculty Council activities, and (3) input to the development of a College-wide strategic plan.
  o Nomination Committee shall be responsible for preparing a slate of nominations for University Faculty Senators, Graduate Council members, and Ombudsman in accordance with the standing rules.
Human Resources
Background Check Process

Policy HR99 Background Check Process

PURPOSE:
This policy establishes a process for ensuring background checks are completed for any individuals, age 18 and over, (paid or unpaid) who are engaged by Penn State in any work capacity effective on or after the date of this policy. This includes, but is not limited to, employees; volunteers working with minors; adjunct faculty; consultants and contractors who conduct their work on Penn State premises or who represent Penn State at non-Penn State locations; visiting scholars; graduate assistants; or other similar positions. In addition, it establishes a process requiring individuals engaged by the University, including those engaged prior to, as of, or after, the effective date of this policy, to self-disclose criminal arrests and/or convictions as outlined in the Penn State Arrest and Conviction self-disclosure form within a 72-hour period of their occurrence.

Background checks will be used solely to evaluate candidates' eligibility to be engaged in any work capacity by the University, and will not be used to discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, ancestry, religious creed, gender, disability or handicap, age, genetic information, veteran's status, gender identity or sexual orientation.

Criminal convictions will be reviewed with respect to the nature and gravity of the offense(s); time since conviction; completion of sentence or any other remediation; relevance to the position for which the candidate is being considered/employee is performing; and discrepancies between the background check and what the candidate/employee self-reported. When a finding adversely impacts eligibility to be engaged by the University in a specific position, the candidate will be notified of the decision and given associated information required by law.

OVERVIEW:
Penn State strives to provide the safest possible environment for its students, faculty, staff and visitors; to preserve University resources; and to uphold the reputation and integrity of the University. This policy supports the University's efforts to minimize institutional risk, provide a safe environment, and assist hiring authorities in making sound hiring decisions.

INDIVIDUALS COVERED BY THIS POLICY:
Individuals engaged by Penn State in any work capacity beginning on or after the date of this policy including, but not limited to, the following positions:

- Staff
- Faculty (including Adjunct Faculty)
- Technical Service
- Temporary Employees not sponsored by a staffing agency (wage payroll)
- Administrators and Academic Administrators
- Executives
- Volunteers (if working with minors or in sensitive/critical positions)
- Graduate Assistants
- Graduate and undergraduate student employees
- Work study students
- Interns (paid or unpaid)
- Visiting Scholars (as defined within Definitions section shown below)
- Third-party employees such as consultants, contractors and temporary staffing agency employees who conduct their work on Penn State premises or who represent Penn State at non-Penn State locations (such as training professionals)
- Any individual not previously described who is either paid directly by the University (unless specifically excluded from the policy) or who is working in a sensitive/critical position (defined below)
Clery Act: Required for CSA’s only

Campus Security Authority (CSA) — Individuals at the University who, because of their function for the University, have an obligation under the Clery Act to notify the University of alleged Clery Crimes that are reported to them in good faith, or alleged Clery Crimes that they may personally witness.

- Examples: police and security personnel, an administrator of students, athletic directors or coaches, faculty advisers to student organizations, resident assistants or advisers;
- Pertinent training: Penn State Clery Act Training;
- Training requirements: Required annually for CSAs only.

Reporting Child Abuse Training:

All Penn State employees, volunteers, and/or independent contractors are required to complete Reporting Child Abuse training (See Penn State Policies AD72 and AD39) in 2015.

Those who are working with minors, known as PA Mandated Reporters, must take the training prior to working with children and annually thereafter.

Those who do not work with minors must take the training within the first 30 days of employment or volunteerism and every three years thereafter.

PA Mandated Reporter (formerly Authorized Adult) — University employees, volunteers and/or independent contractors who are directly responsible for the care, supervision, guidance or training of minors in a youth program, activity or service.

- Governed by: Policy AD72, 23 Pa. C.S. § 6303(a);
- Examples: camp counselors, youth program directors;
- Pertinent training: Building a Safe Penn State: Reporting Child Abuse;
- Training requirements: Required annually for Pennsylvania mandated reporters and every three years for all others.


For more information, please go to http://police.psu.edu/clery
Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) Request and Communication Process
Updated: 10/23/15

Administrative Coordinator for each department and/or the employee needing leave contacts HR Manager when medical leave under FMLA is thought to be needed. This can be for the employee or for a family member of the employee who requires care.

HR Manager completes the employer information on the DOL Certification of Health Care Provider Form and provides either a separate JRW (job description) or essential job functions on the form. These are sent to the employee requesting leave for completion by their health care provider. A cover sheet with HR contact information and fax number is provided for return of these items.

Once the paperwork is received, the HR Manager reviews it. Additional follow up will be done by the HR Manager with the health care provider or employee as necessary.

If the leave is approved, a DOL Designation Notice is completed and emailed to the employee, typically with the Administrative Coordinator or appropriate manager copied so they will be aware of the approval and leave period contained in the notice. The email will also provide instructions on how to mark time off in the attendance system to designate FMLA.

If an employee has minimal or no time off to use, HR will try to notify them of this in case leave without pay is required at some point during the leave. The departments are responsible for submitting the leave forms in the system timely to ensure that overpayment is not incurred. If overpayment occurs, the department should immediately notify HR and Finance to determine the repayment amount. HR will be responsible for contacting the employee in these situations and sending a formal letter outlining the specifics for repayment.

Employee is asked to provide a written return to work authorization from their health care provider to HR in advance or upon return to work.

HR Manager retains all FMLA paperwork/files, and keeps a log of FMLA requests noting when forms are sent/received, leave dates & return from leave. Copies should not be kept in departments if any exist.

HR Manager is the primary point of contact for any FMLA leave questions.

Administrative Coordinators or an appropriate manager can communicate with the employee about any scheduling for the leave, return date, and other work-related issues related to the leave. They should not ask about or discuss the specifics of the medical condition or treatment with the employee. The employee should discuss any of these questions or concerns with the HR Manager directly.
**SABBATICAL LEAVE APPLICATION PROCESS – Human Resources**

**Updated: 9/29/15**

**DEADLINES:**
- Applications are due by September 30 to the College HR office to ensure time for review by the College Sabbatical Leave Committee and the Dean.
- Applications for sabbatical leaves should be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University by the weekday coincident with or immediately preceding November 1 of each year for action by the following January 1.

**RESOURCES:**
- HR17 – Sabbatical Leave: [http://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr17.html](http://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hr17.html)
- Faculty Guidelines at: [http://www.engr.psu.edu/hr/fac.html](http://www.engr.psu.edu/hr/fac.html)

**SUBMISSION PROCESS:**
1. Faculty must submit for sabbatical leave electronically in the COE Sabbatical Management System: [https://www.engr.psu.edu/sabbatical/](https://www.engr.psu.edu/sabbatical/).
2. Faculty should complete the application information, including a brief description of the project and its purpose.
3. Faculty should attach the following files in either Word or PDF in the appropriate section of the system:
   a. Vita file
   b. Purpose file containing the statement of purpose, work to be accomplished, projected results, and justification.
   c. Letters of invitation and letters granting access, space and/or support should also be attached as part of the Purpose File.
4. Once the application is complete, faculty should print out the Application to sign and submit to HR by the September 30 deadline.
5. At the time the faculty member submits the completed application in the system, the Department Head receives a system-generated email notifying them of completion. The application is automatically viewable by the Department Head at that time.
6. Faculty should notify their Department Head once this is done to ensure that they are aware of the submission. The Department Head must also print their recommendation letter to sign and submit to HR by the September 30 deadline.

**REVIEW PROCESS:**
1. Faculty applications for sabbatical leave will be submitted with the recommendation of the department head to the Dean.
   - For an academic administrator, there will normally be no review by a department head prior to the sabbatical application being considered by the College Committee.
   - For executives and administrators, the application will be reviewed by the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University, and the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business/Treasurer, who jointly make a recommendation to the President of the University.
2. The College Sabbatical Leave Committee will review the application, consult as deemed appropriate, and submit its recommendation to the dean.
3. The Dean will review the applications, taking into consideration the recommendations of the department and the college sabbatical leave committee as well as other criteria, and determine whether he approves or not.
4) Sabbatical applications approved by the Dean shall be forwarded with appropriate documentation to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University, who adds appropriate recommendations.

5) The Executive Vice President and Provost of the University will forward approved applications to the President of the University for final review and approval.

LENGTH OF LEAVE:
A sabbatical leave will not be granted for a period in excess of the full contract year of the individual (36 weeks, 48 weeks, or a number of weeks between those two limits, or twelve months, depending on the type of appointment).

SALARY PAYMENT WHILE ON LEAVE:
Three sabbatical leave options are available:

- Sabbatical leave for the full contract year at 67% salary;
- Sabbatical leave for one-half of the contract year at 100%

RETURN TO ACTIVE SERVICE:

- As stated in HR99 Background Check Process, individuals on sabbatical leaves of six months or longer are required to complete a Penn State Arrest and Conviction self-disclosure form before returning to work.
- Faculty are required to submit a Sabbatical Leave Report to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University, via the Department Head and the Dean, within two months of the return from leave. The report should indicate how the experience improved the recipient's capacity to serve the University.
- Faculty who are granted sabbatical leaves are required to return for a full contract year of service following the sabbatical leave. Any person who does not return, or does not remain for the full contract year following the sabbatical leave, will be required to refund the salary received from the University during the sabbatical leave.

HR STEPS IN PROCESS

1) Mid-August Dean’s office sends out reminder to Department Heads/Unit Directors about sabbatical leave application deadline.

2) HR reminds departments to set own internal deadline for Department Head review to ensure both faculty member application and Department Head approval with signatures is submitted by September 30.

3) Faculty member submits request for sabbatical leave electronically in the COE Sabbatical Management system and attaches supporting documents as required. Letters of invitation are part of Purpose File.

4) Once candidate submits application in system, a system-generated email is sent to Department Head requesting review of application and application is visible to him/her.

5) Likewise, once Department Head signs off, a system-generated email is sent to the Sabbatical Review Committee and the application and Department Head comments are visible to the committee.

6) Same for email to Dean requesting review of application along with comments from Department Head and committee review.

7) Dean’s office prepares letter of support including brief summary of sabbatical purpose.
8) After all reviews are complete, the following items needed to be printed from the system (under Printable Letters or Supporting Documents) and submitted to COE HR office by the faculty member and Department Head:
   a. Application signed by faculty member
   b. Recommendation signed by Department Head

9) The HR office will prepare the documents for submission to the Provost’s office for review and prepare tracking sheet. A cover memo listing all applicants by department is done.
   a. Signed application
   b. Vita with complete publication list and list of professional activities and accomplishments
   c. Purpose file: Narrative statement and letters of invitation/access
   d. Signed recommendation forms from the Department Head, Sabbatical Leave Review Committee, and the Dean.

10) The Provost’s office will send the Dean an email with notification of approval.
11) The Dean’s office will prepare memo to go to the employee informing them of the leave approval and stipulations of the leave. Copy to the Department Head/Unit Director.

12) Official documents are retained in University Records.

13) Send a copy of the sabbatical list to manager in Research area for their information.

14) HR will send reminder to those returning from sabbatical to submit reports within 2 months of return from leave as well as their completed Penn State Arrest and Conviction Self-disclosure Form before returning to work.

15) Reports are submitted to Provost upon receipt along with a cover memo from Dean’s Office with leave summary.
Hiring
Faculty Courtesy Appointments
Items required for appointment to be processed are:

1. Department requests appointment
   - Reason for the appointment
   - Include CV
2. Department completes the courtesy appointment template
3. Dean approves appointment
   - Sends letter to appointee

Courtesy Appointment Guidelines
The courtesy appointment is used in the College of Engineering for a given department to acknowledge a faculty member whose tenure home is in another department. There is no salary obligation from the department in which the courtesy appointment is held. This distinguishes it from a “joint appointment”, for which there is a salary obligation from both departments.

Consideration for courtesy appointments will be given to individuals who contribute to teaching, research or service of the hosting department in at least one of the following ways: a) teach a course in the hosting department or one in their home department that is cross listed; b) engage in research activities with faculty members in the hosting department; c) serve on thesis committees; d) co-author publications with faculty and/or students in the hosting department; e) actively participate on committees that contribute to the research, training or administrative activities of the hosting department.

Application for a courtesy appointment is made by letter from the head of the hosting department to the Dean of Engineering. The letter should give reasons for considering the appointment and expected benefits for the faculty member and the department. Prior to this letter, the head of the hosting department should have appropriate consultation with members of his/her faculty, which may include the department’s promotion and tenure committee. Upon the Dean’s approval, the title of the faculty member will be officially changed to represent both departments.

Neither the head or P&T committee of the hosting department is expected to be involved in the tenure or promotion process for the faculty member with a courtesy appointment, although the faculty member may request that the home department solicit letters describing his/her contribution from the head or appropriate faculty of the hosting department.*

Courtesy appointments will be conferred for a period of three years and will be reviewed prior to the end of that period for consideration of renewal.

* University Guidelines for Policy HR23, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations, sec. V.F
Faculty Hiring Process

1. Dean requests yearly hiring plan via memo to departments
2. Department makes hiring request with number of hires, intended rank, space, salary source and start up source
3. With Dean’s approval Committee should be formed and advertisement drafted
4. Once advertisement is final send to COE HR to be submitted to OHR for review, approval and posting on Penn State Job site (should include title & number of vacancies being filled)
5. Posting will generate a job number and direct link to be added to external ads
6. Affirmative Action Office will send Academic Recruitment Form and Short List approval forms to be completed and returned by department
7. Department sends request for external advertisement to COE HR with budget information (quotes can be requested)
8. Advertisements will be placed by COE HR through Job Elephant (contracted for Penn State job advertising)
9. Department provides access id’s for search committee members to COE HR
10. Candidates will apply online and can be viewed at https://app3.ohr.psu.edu/jobs/home_EJMS/
11. by search committee
12. Department requests Dean’s approval to make an offer
13. Department drafts offer letter from templates and submit to COE HR for processing
14. COE HR will contact department when letter is signed and ready for pick-up
15. Departments inform HR of accepted or declined offers
16. Department requests background check
17. Department provides information to COE HR to close position (candidates interviewed, reasons not selected, and PSU ID of candidate hired)
Fixed Term/PostDoc/WagePayroll Hiring Process

1. Department drafts a job posting
2. Once finalized department submits posting to COE HR office (include title, number of vacancies and length of posting)
3. COE HR will post position to Penn State Job site which will generate a job number to be given to department (minimum of 7 day posting required)
4. Department provides COE HR with Access ID’s for committee members that need access to view the candidates
5. Search committee reviews candidates and sets up interviews
6. Check a minimum of 2-3 professional references for final candidate
7. Generate offer using templates on gen_info drive
8. Fixed Term appointment letters should be sent to COE HR for processing
9. PostDoc letters should be signed by department head and then sent to HR Director for signature
10. Wage Payroll letters can be signed in the department (rate of $22/hr needs to be approved by HR Director)
11. Department submits background check request once candidate accepts
12. Department notifies candidates interviewed but not selected
13. Department provides information to COE HR to close off position – job number, candidates interviewed, reasons interviewed candidates were not selected, selected candidate with PSU ID and start date
## College of Engineering
### Faculty Hiring Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Request for yearly hiring plans</td>
<td>Memo requesting information as described in step 2 for hiring during the current academic year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Faculty hiring request</td>
<td>- Number of hires and intended rank</td>
<td>- Location and size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Office and laboratory space</td>
<td>- Departmental budget analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Source of salary(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Source of startup(^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Location and size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Domestic budget analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Estimate cost of all items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Approval/Disapproval/Questions</td>
<td>Approval with dates and rank, or Reasons for disapproval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Draft advertisement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Approval/Modifications</td>
<td>Search starts after approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Request to hire (^b,d)</td>
<td>- Draft offer letter</td>
<td>No offers to be made in writing without Dean approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- College format startup breakdown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Approval/Questions</td>
<td>Approval with startup commitment, or further questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Inform of Accepted/Declined offers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>Close out position</td>
<td>Inform HR of candidates interviewed &amp; reasons not selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- Departments should approach the College about Institute co-funded positions prior to approaching the Institute.
- The departments should assume that for equipment costing $5,000 or greater, the cost will be shared 50/50 with the Dean’s office. All other costs including summer salary, graduate students, discretionary funds, renovation, and other items are to be borne by the departments. In cases where the College makes a request for support from the Provost and this request is approved, the Provost’s contribution will be shared 50/50 with the department.
- After step 5, departments conduct the search. It is highly recommended that telephone or video interviews are conducted prior to on-campus.
- It is recommended that at least three letters of reference be obtained prior to candidates being invited to campus for interviews. However, department heads may use their discretion on when to obtain letters.
Staff Hiring Process

Creating a New Position

1. Department requests approval from the Sr. Associate Dean if creating a new standing appointment (not required for Fixed Term)
2. Department submits a Job Responsibilities Worksheet (JRW) to COE HR Office for evaluation and creation of the position
3. Follow steps 1-15 below

Posting a Vacant Position

1. Department reviews current Job Responsibilities Worksheet (JRW) and make changes as needed
2. If changes are significant request job be evaluated (over 30% higher level)
3. Create a search committee as needed
4. Department creates a job posting and submits it to COE HR with Access ID’s of search committee
5. Job must be posted for a minimum of 7 days before candidates should be evaluated for interviewing
6. Department informs COE HR of candidates that you plan to interview
7. Department sets up interviews
8. Search Committee conducts interviews and reference checks (minimum 2-3 professional)
9. Once top candidate is selected request a salary form COE HR
10. Once salary is approved department creates an offer letter using the offer letter templates
11. Department provides COE HR with a copy of the offer letter
12. Department makes formal offer
13. Once there is an acceptance Department informs other candidates that were interviewed
14. Department informs COE HR of acceptance and start date
15. Department requests a background check if hiring a new employee
Promotion & Tenure
P&T Process Instructions for Tenure-track Faculty
Updated: 9/23/15

Communications & Planning

July:
- Receive email from Provost regarding University P&T Workshop. Notify Department Heads.
- Schedule College P&T Workshop for late Sept/early October in coordination with Dean and Sr. Associate Dean schedules. Will need to locate room. Contact a Department Head and recent P&T candidate to attend for questions/presentation.
- Update P&T timetables and put them on COE website. Communicate updates to Department Heads.

August:
- Request list of faculty being considered for promotion from Department Head for planning purposes. Notify Dean and Sr. Associate Dean of number being considered.

August/Early Sept:
- Receive P&T list from OHR. Send out to Department Heads to confirm.
- Notify them of College P&T Workshop and University P&T Workshop to communicate with their faculty and others.
- Prepare P&T tracking sheet for the upcoming year and provide to Dean and Sr. Associate Dean.

Dossier Preparation and Flow – use P&T Timetable to determine timing of events

1) Dossiers must be done in Activity Insight effective Fall 2014. Department Head Assistants or designated administrative assistant collect, prepares and submits dossiers to HR along with letters of recommendation from Department Head and Department P&T Committee.

2) Dossiers are submitted to College Committee for review and recommendation memo. This can be done via hard copy electronically using BOX.

3) College Committee submits recommendation memos to HR to provide to the Dean. Dean prepares recommendation memo to Provost if required (6th year and promotions). Otherwise, Dean prepares notification memo to candidate informing them of tenure progress.

4) HR ensures that cover page P&T form is signed by all parties with recommendation marked.

5) 6th year and promotions go to University Committee and Provost by deadline. Must box hard copy of dossier to go to them. Keep scanned copy of each in file_cab for year.

6) Notify candidates via Dean’s memo that dossiers are forwarded to Provost. Can send via email.

7) Once letters from President received, notify Department Head and Dean. Dean will send scanned copy of letter to candidate with congratulatory email.

8) Enter P&T in IBIS using information from tracking sheet. Must enter those recommended and those not recommended.

9) http://www.engr.psu.edu/hr/facultyresources/
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................................... 1
   A. Purpose................................................................................................................................ 1
   B. Applicability of Policy and Guidelines............................................................................... 1
   C. Exceptions to the Guidelines .............................................................................................. 1
   D. Terminology........................................................................................................................ 1
   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 ......................... 6
   E. Role of the Executive Vice President and Provost ............................................................. 6
   F. Dissemination of Criteria Statements ................................................................................. 6

III. THE DOSSIER ................................................................................................................................ 6
   A. Forms for the Dossier ......................................................................................................... 6
   B. Responsibility for Preparation of the Dossier ..................................................................... 6
   C. Content and Organization of Information in the Dossier .................................................... 7
   D. Dissemination of Information about Dossier Preparation ................................................... 10
   E. Role of the Faculty Member in Preparation of the Dossier .............................................. 11
   F. Changes or New Information in the Informational Sections of the Dossier after the Review Process Has Begun ................................................................. 11
   G. External Letters of Assessment ......................................................................................... 12

IV. REVIEW COMMITTEES ............................................................................................................. 13
   A. Review Committees to Be Established ............................................................................. 13
   B. Composition and Size of Review Committees ................................................................. 14
   C. Procedures for Establishing Review Committees ............................................................. 14
   D. Notification of the Establishment of Review Committees ................................................ 15
   E. Independent Judgments of Review Committees ............................................................... 15

V. REVIEW PROCEDURES ............................................................................................................ 16
   A. Review Schedule............................................................................................................... 16
   B. Participants in the Review Process ................................................................................... 16
   C. Nomination Process for Promotion ................................................................................. 18
   D. Withdrawal of a Promotion Dossier After a Negative Department Review ..................... 18
   E. Promotion Procedures for Fixed-Term Faculty ................................................................. 19
   F. Faculty on Joint Appointments ......................................................................................... 19
   G. Consultation in the Review Process.................................................................................. 20
   H. Role of Review Committees and Administrators ............................................................. 20
   I. Information to Faculty Members about Evaluations of Performance ............................... 23
   J. Reports to Be Submitted Regarding the Review Process ................................................. 24

VI. STAYING OF THE PROVISIONAL TENURE PERIOD ........................................................... 25
I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose

The Administrative Guidelines are provided to implement the University’s policy on promotion and tenure, HR-23, “Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations.” The Guidelines supplement but do not alter basic policies set forth in HR-23.

B. Applicability of Policy and Guidelines

1. The revised University promotion and tenure policy, HR-23, 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.

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 HR-23.

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, 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, 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; interdisciplinary and defense-related research units; the College of Medicine; the four-year colleges at other locations: Abington College, Altoona College, Berks College, 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, the Vice President for Research, Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, and chancellors of the four-year colleges at other locations: Abington College, Altoona College, Berks College, Capital College, and Erie, The Behrend College.

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 HR-23 (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. 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

1. 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 information 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 by a narrative statement (see III.C.2.e) in which the faculty member reflects on his or her teaching philosophy or goals, and/or by the submission of teaching portfolios that provide faculty with the forum to place 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 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 (teachinglearning@psu.edu or 814-865-8659).
(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.
D. Assessing The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments

It is expected that units will devise ways to assess scholarly substance and the quality of the research.

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. For University College and Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies faculty members, the director of academic affairs of the candidate’s campus has the responsibility for preparing the dossier.

2. For colleges at University Park and other locations, the department head has the responsibility for preparing the dossier.

3. It is ultimately the responsibility of the college dean to ensure that each dossier follows the proper format and is accurate and complete.

4. Insofar as a faculty member under review may need to supply materials for the dossier, there is a sense in which there is some shared
responsibility between the faculty member and the administrator for the timely preparation of the dossier. (See III.E.1.)

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. Budget assignment form (optional);
   d. College criteria statement; department criteria statement where applicable;
   e. 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 give candidates the opportunity to place their work and activities in the context of their overall goals and agendas. The statement should be no longer than one or two pages (in 10 point font), with three pages being the optimal outer limit.

   f. Candidate signature statement (to be used for provisional reviews as well as promotion and final tenure reviews).
   g. The scholarship of teaching and learning (paginate A-1, A-2, etc.);
   h. The scholarship of research and creative accomplishments (paginate B-1, B-2, etc.);
   i. Service and the scholarship of service to the University, society, and the profession (paginate C-1, C-2, etc.);
   j. 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.);
k. 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.);

l. 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.);

m. 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 l. 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 and teaching portfolios) 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.
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 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 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.

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. Departments and colleges 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, promotion and tenure style sheets (prepared by the colleges), and sample or “mock” dossiers should be made available to all candidates. 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 shall assist in supplying relevant information for his or her dossier. (See III.B.4.)

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 information in the original materials in the dossier subsequent to their review.

2. All review committees and administrators who are informed about factual changes, as described above, shall have the opportunity to reconsider their recommendation.
3. The deadline for submission of factual changes or new information is the weekday coincident with or immediately following February 15.

G. External Letters of Assessment

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

2. Dossiers shall include a minimum of four letters from external evaluators.

3. The college dean 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:
   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 his or her 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 his or her 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, interdisciplinary and defense-related research units, 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 HR-23. (See III: Review Procedures, Composition of University Review Committee in HR-23.)

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 or provisional tenure status 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.

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. The Office of Human Resources shall be responsible for providing 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. Fourth-year provisional tenure review;
   c. Sixth-year (final) tenure review.

4. Promotion and tenure reviews should begin immediately following the actions described in section 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 tenure review.

B. Participants in the Review Process

1. For provisional year (second- and fourth-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 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.

4. For final (sixth-year) and early tenure reviews and promotion of tenure-line faculty, the following committees and administrators shall conduct reviews:

   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);

---

Promotions 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.
i. The Executive Vice President and Provost, for those candidates reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee;

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.

5. The Vice President for Research shall be responsible for coordinating promotion reviews for personnel in interdisciplinary and defense-related research units. The Vice President shall forward positive recommendations for promotion for faculty not holding joint appointments in a college to the Executive Vice President and Provost through the Office of Human Resources for transmittal to the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee.

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 support 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 his or her candidacy.

E. Promotion Procedures for Fixed-Term Faculty

1. In some units, perhaps by college policy, fixed-term faculty all serve under a single title, such as instructor or lecturer (perhaps with the possibility of the title of senior lecturer).

2. Other units offer fixed-term faculty professorial titles. In such instances, advancement from one title to the next must involve recommendations by the department peer committee and department head or other appropriate administrator before the dean takes final action.

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.

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 his or her letter for any promotion or tenure review.

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 may differ from that of the dean’s recommendation and 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.

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 HR-23. 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 should abstain only when there is a legitimate conflict of interest, such as a relative being considered for promotion or tenure, or when there may have been an earlier vote on the candidate in the same review year. If there is an abstention, the reason might be noted in the evaluative statement. A committee member who is abstaining 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. Campus reviews of University College faculty, or tenure-track faculty at a University Park college but residing at a non-University Park location: All three criteria should be evaluated.

   b. Department: All three criteria should be evaluated.

   c. College: Review campus and/or department recommendations in light of:

      (1) College criteria and expectations;

      (2) Equity among departments; and

      (3) Procedural fairness.

   d. 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 HR-23, 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. (See Appendix K.)

5. For provisional tenure reviews prior to the final (sixth-year) 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 Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses and should include a report of the reviews at the campus level.

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 will be given written notice that University employment will terminate at the end of the seventh and final year of their provisional period.

b. Copies of the letters shall be provided to the appropriate deans, the Vice President for Research, 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 Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, who may share them with appropriate campus chancellors.

8. All faculty members who are not being reviewed for promotion and/or tenure in a given year shall have an evaluation of performance. (See HR-40, “Evaluation of Faculty Performance.”)

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.

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 HR-60, “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 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, 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, 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. Guidelines for requests for a staying of the provisional tenure period are given in Appendix G.
APPENDIX A

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

I. Introduction

Policy HR-23 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. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

   a. 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.

   b. 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.
c. Individual faculty members may add up to five additional items from the pool to supplement the two global questions and the departmental core.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. A set of demographic questions and information was developed to facilitate the proper interpretation of survey results. The survey includes items about percentage of students in the class completing the survey, whether the course is required or an elective, and expected grade.

7. 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.

8. 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 his/her survey results.

9. 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) Mean for each item.

c. Appropriate controls for confidentiality of information shall be implemented by all units in distributing and storing the survey results.

10. 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.

11. 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 fixed-term 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

1. 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 overinterpret 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 2015-16 PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

On or Before

**July 1, 2015**
Administrative Guidelines distributed.

**August 10, 2015**
Office of Human Resources provides 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 tenure reviews in 2015-16.

**October 2, 2015**
All promotion and tenure review committees and procedures 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 prior to this date.

Membership lists, including rank and title, for all promotion and tenure review committees 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.

**November 2, 2015**
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.

**January 2, 2016**
All department and division level reviews, except for second-year, completed and forwarded to the college dean.

**February 15, 2016**
All factual changes or new information must be submitted by this date.

**March 1, 2016**
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 31, 2016**
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 26, 2016**
All reviews completed by the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee; all recommendations forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

**May 6, 2016**
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 13, 2016**
For all faculty not having a promotion or tenure review in 2015-16, annual personnel evaluations completed and faculty informed of results of these evaluations, in writing.

**June 13, 2016**
All reports required in HR-23 and the Administrative Guidelines submitted.

**June 30, 2016**
All final decisions must be entered into IBIS through UTNA and UPRM functions.
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE LETTERS TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

SAMPLE 1:

Dear __________:

Prior to recommending promotion and the granting of tenure, our college seeks the opinions of recognized scholars in the candidate’s field outside our institution. Dr. _____ is being considered for promotion to the rank of _____ and for permanent academic tenure, and I would like to ask for your confidential assessment regarding the appropriateness of these actions.

Enclosed you will find a summary of Dr. _____’s professional qualifications, along with copies of publications selected by the candidate. Also enclosed is an excerpt from our college’s “Statement of Expectations and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.” We would find it most helpful to receive your reactions to the following:

1. In what capacity, if any, do you know Dr. _____? If you have had interactions with him/her, please briefly describe the context of these interactions.

2. Do the quality and quantity of Dr. _____’s published work justify the personnel actions being considered by our Department of _______? Would you recommend him/her for promotion and tenure in your own department?

3. What is Dr. _____’s ranking in his/her area of specialization? (It would be especially helpful if you were to identify some of the best individuals in Dr. _____’s field and compare Dr. _____’s reputation with theirs.)

4. How significant an impact has Dr. _____ made upon his/her field of specialization? Can you identify any genuinely major contributions Dr. _____ has made to _____?

5. If tenure is granted to Dr. _____ and he/she remains on our faculty for the duration of his/her professional career, is it likely that his/her presence will significantly elevate the quality and reputation of our department or will his/her presence be more likely to maintain the department at its present level of excellence?

While activities such as teaching, advising, university and public service also enter into the valuation of candidates, we do not assume that you will have had the opportunity to judge these, and we therefore seek your comments only on research competence and reputation.
It is Penn State policy to keep your letter confidential and to share it only with the committees (departmental, college, and university) and administrators (normally the department head, dean, provost, and president) responsible for making recommendations on promotion and tenure.

While I fully realize the burden of time and effort my request imposes, a response by ________ would be deeply appreciated (although we will also welcome a later response). My e-mail address is _______ and office fax number is ________, and you may use either method of transmittal for your response with assurance of confidentiality. I will be grateful to have your opinions in this important matter, and would like to thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

SAMPLE 2: (University College example)

Dear ______:

Dr. _______, [rank and title], will be considered for tenure and/or promotion to ______ at The Pennsylvania State University during the ____ academic year. Prior to recommending promotion and/or tenure, our college seeks the opinions of recognized scholars in the candidate’s field outside our institution and I am requesting your confidential letter of assessment based on the research and scholarship of the candidate.

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 vita, along with copies of publications to help you with this review. Also enclosed is an excerpt from the “Statement of Expectations and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure” in the University College.

We will find it most helpful to receive your responses to the following questions.

1. In what capacity, if any, do you know Dr. ______? If you have had interactions with him/her, please briefly describe the context of these interactions.

2. Do the quality and quantity of Dr. ______’s published works and scholarly contributions justify the personnel actions being considered by our college?
3. How significant an impact has Dr. _____ made upon his/her fields of specialization? Can you identify any major contributions Dr. _____ has made to the field of _______ and compare his/her work to that of other scholars in the field?

4. What other insights can you provide on the quality of Dr. _____’s research and scholarship?

While I fully realize the burden of time and effort my request imposes, a response by ______ would be deeply appreciated. Your response will be treated in a confidential manner, subject to the procedures governing promotion and tenure review at this institution.

Please enclose with your letter of evaluation a copy of your latest vita, a short biographical statement summarizing your major professional accomplishments, or both. This statement also should include your faculty rank, college or university, and discipline. This will assist us in writing a brief description of the professional accomplishments of the people who write external letters for candidates.

My office fax number is ________. You may use this method of transmittal for your response with assurances of confidentiality.

Thank you in advance for your help with this important activity.

Sincerely,
APPENDIX D
LEVELS OF REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

I
All colleges except the University College

II
University College

III
Non-University Park faculty with tenure status at a University Park college

IV
Penn State Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies faculty
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 HR-23 Guidelines.

____________________  ____________________
Candidate Signature            Date
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 (07-01-15)**
- Biographical Data for Promotion/Tenure Review (07-01-14)
- Budget Assignment (07-01-13)
- The Scholarship of Librarianship (07-01-13)
- **The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (07-01-15)**
- Patient Care Activities (07-01-13)
- **The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments (07-01-15)**
- Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession (07-01-13)
- External Letters of Assessment (For Promotion and Final Tenure Reviews) (07-01-14)
- Log of External Letters (3-27-96)
- Statements of Evaluation of the Candidate by Review Committees and Administrators (07-01-14)
**PROMOTION AND TENURE FORM**

**Purpose:** This recommendation form is used for (1) awarding tenure to the ranks of professor, librarian, associate professor, associate librarian, and assistant professor; and (2) for promotion to the ranks of professor, librarian, senior scientist, associate professor, associate librarian, and senior research associate.

**Instructions:** See the following link on GURU for details: http://guru.psu.edu/forms/4-21PromotionandTenureForms.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PSU-ID</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Early Tenure</th>
<th>6th Year Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Rank and Title</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Rank and Date of Initial Appointment to the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Faculty Status</th>
<th>Rank and Date of Appointment to Tenure-Eligible Position</th>
<th>Years of Credit Granted Toward Tenure at Appointment to Tenure-Eligible Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmember</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and Date of Previous Promotions</th>
<th>Date of Stay of Provisional Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Rank and Title (For Promotion Only)</th>
<th>Tenure Status as of Effective Date of Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Not Recommended</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus (If Applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department (If Applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair - Campus Review Committee</th>
<th>Chair - Department Review Committee</th>
<th>Chair - College Review Committee</th>
<th>Chair - University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee</th>
<th>Executive Vice President and Provost of the University</th>
<th>President of the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7-1-15)
# PENNSTATE

## BIOGRAPHICAL DATA FOR PROMOTION/TENURE REVIEW

### I. Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name and Initial</th>
<th>Exact Rank and Title of Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Academic Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and address of Institution</th>
<th>Major Subjects</th>
<th>Minor Subjects</th>
<th>Degrees - Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Status: Law, CPA, Other Degrees or Licenses Held
Honorary Degree(s): Institution

### III. Occupational Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Employers With Addresses Including U.S. Military (Most Recent First)</th>
<th>Work Performed: If Teacher, List Subjects Taught</th>
<th>Rank or Title</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Previous Sabbaticals at the Pennsylvania State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity or Project</th>
<th>Results: Publications, Reports, etc.</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BUDGET ASSIGNMENT

**PERCENT OF ALLOTTED SUPPORT BY BUDGET CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Series Category</th>
<th>Summer Session Yr.</th>
<th>Fall Semester Yr.</th>
<th>Spring Semester Yr.</th>
<th>Summer Session Yr.</th>
<th>Fall Semester Yr.</th>
<th>Spring Semester Yr.</th>
<th>Summer Session Yr.</th>
<th>Fall Semester Yr.</th>
<th>Spring Semester Yr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 200 Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 300 *Organized Activities (instruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 400 Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 500 Public Service and Continuing Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other Work (Identify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 300 Series examples are field trips and farm-related work in the College of Agricultural Sciences.
This section contains:

- Statement of core responsibilities

- A description of accomplishments which illustrate unique contributions and abilities in librarianship, emphasizing their nature and significance

- Letters from peers and colleagues providing faculty comment on the scholarship of librarianship (required only for reviews for promotion to the ranks of associate librarian or librarian or for final tenure)

- Summary performance evaluation

(07-01-13)
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 evaluation 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 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 his or her 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

(07-01-15)
PATIENT CARE ACTIVITIES

This section contains:

- Summary of the candidate’s clinical assignments at the Penn State 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 5 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 comment 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.

(07-01-13)
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.)

- **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)
  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 repertories 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, sponsor, etc.); indication of role in seminar or workshop, e.g., student, invited participant, etc.

- **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.)

*(07-01-15)*
• Projects, grants, commissions, and contracts (date, title, where submitted, amount):
  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])

• Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (patents, new product development, new art forms, citation index analysis, etc.)

• 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 or professional activity

• List of grants and contracts for improvement of instruction, with an indication of the candidate’s role in preparing and administering the grants and contracts

• 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

• Other evidence of impact in society of research scholarship and creative accomplishments

• 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.

(07-01-15)
This section contains the following in reverse chronological order with the most recent date listed first:

- **Service to the University**
  1. Record of committee work at campus, college, department, and University levels
  2. Participation in campus and/or University-wide governance bodies and related activities
  3. Record of administrative support work (college representative, faculty mentoring, assessment activities, etc.)
  4. Record of contributions to the University’s programs to enhance equal opportunity and cultural diversity
  5. Assistance to student organizations
  6. 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. 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)

(07-01-13)
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 his/her 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.

(07-01-14)
# LOG OF EXTERNAL LETTERS

**Candidate:** Name ___________________________ Title ___________________________

**Candidate For:**  □ Tenure  □ Associate Professor  or  □ Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title of Writer</th>
<th>Writer's Employer</th>
<th>Date Letter Requested</th>
<th>Date Letter Received</th>
<th>Date of Entry Into Dossier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(03-27-96)
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 should include a discussion of the reasons for the divergent opinions.

All committee reports should list the entire membership, 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).

(07-01-14)
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, he/she 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 him/her 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 his/her academic record upheld during the tenure review, he/she 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 his/her 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. Requests that are granted will be for one academic year. Normally, such requests will be granted only once during the provisional period.

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 with the decision being made as a part of the sixth-year 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 Academic 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 should be included from the department head.

3. The Vice Provost for Academic 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.

Requests for out-of-sequence promotion and tenure reviews will not be handled by the immediate tenure review process. (See Appendix J.)

College and Department 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 reconvened to make recommendations in cases of immediate tenure.

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.

Documentation

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, such as student and peer evaluations. 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.
An original, single-sided, of the following documentation must be submitted for a candidate who is being reviewed for immediate tenure:

1. The most current vita of the candidate.

2. Letters of reference that were used in the search process are acceptable.

3. Statements of evaluation and recommendations from:
   a. The department review committee and the department head.
   
   b. The college, Dickinson Law, Penn State Law, or the University Libraries review committee, and the dean. For immediate tenure reviews at Great Valley School of Professional Studies, the campus chancellor and the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses.

   c. The campus review committee and the campus chancellor, if the individual is being considered for a faculty or administrative appointment in the University College or at Great Valley School of Graduate Professional Studies.

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. It is not necessary for the materials to be organized by using the usual dossier dividers and forms.

In general, reviews for immediate tenure parallel closely the policies and procedures of HR-23, 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.

**Time Frame for Reviews**

In most cases, University-level review of candidates for immediate tenure are completed in two weeks. To expedite the review at the University level, it is helpful for the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to be alerted to a forthcoming case.
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 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 and one copy 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 HR-23, 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

Human Resources policies and guidelines are located at http://guru.psu.edu/policies.

Pertinent Human Resources Policies

- HR-7  University Appointments without Remuneration
- HR-11 Affirmative Action in Employment at The Pennsylvania State University
- HR-16 Leave of Absence without Salary (Other Than for Active Military Service or Training)
- HR-18 Graduate Study Leave of Absence
- HR-19 Leave of Absence for Active Military Service or Training
- HR-23 Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations
- HR-40 Evaluation of Faculty Performance
- HR-60 Access to Personnel Files
- HR-61 Faculty Contracts
- HR-76 Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

Pertinent Human Resources Guidelines

- HRG-11 Family and Medical Leave
- HRG-18 Paid Parental Leave for Faculty

Note: The Administrative Guidelines are located at http://www.psu.edu/vpaa. All of the policies and guidelines listed above are linked at this site.
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FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT
PROMOTION AND TENURE
2014-15

CONFIDENTIALITY

1. What is confidentiality in relation to the promotion and tenure process?

Confidentiality of the promotion and tenure process is to be respected forever, not just during that particular year of review. 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. (Pages 2-3, I.E.)

THE DOSSIER

2. As Colleges are in different phases of implementation of Activity Insight by Digital Measures to store faculty data, including information used to generate the dossier, how will the use of Activity Insight impact the dossier and review process?

There is no difference as producing a dossier via the functionality of Activity Insight as it is merely a tool for generating the dossier. While the format may look a bit different when producing a document through this platform, the output is compliant with expectations contained in the traditional dividers as well as the Administrative Guidelines.

3. Who is responsible for the preparation of the dossier?

That responsibility is assigned to the department head (or director of academic affairs or division head), but the faculty member must cooperate by assembling whatever materials are in his or her possession by the timeline given by the department head and insuring that the parts of the vita that are used in each section of the dossier are up-to-date and accurate before they are reviewed by the department head. (Pages 6-7, III.B; page 11, III.E.1)

4. Can there be material included in the dossier, besides letters from external reviewers, that is not made available to the candidate for review when he or she signs the signature statement?

Only the material identified in the Administrative Guidelines on page 8, III.C.2.k. (external letters of assessment), is listed as confidential and excluded from the candidate’s review or inspection. Before the dossier goes to the committee, the candidate signs a statement that he or she has reviewed all materials in the dossier, with the exception of that section. If material is added to the dossier afterwards, excluding the committee and administrative letters, the candidate should be so informed and be able to review it. (Page 8, III.C.2.l., .m.; page 11, III.F.; page 51, Appendix F.)

5. Can there be internal letters, outside of the required committee and administrative letters, added to the dossier, and can these be confidential?

If the unit feels that important information can be added to the dossier by seeking an occasional letter internal to the unit, the entire letter (not a summary or selective sections from it) should be included in the dossier, in the section which it addresses most significantly, and it should therefore be reviewed by
the candidate with the rest of the contents of the dossier preceding section 1. (Page 8, III.C.2.1.; page 9, III.C.9)

6. *If candidates disagree with statements by peer or internal reviewers, may they ask that they be removed or write a rebuttal?*

If statements are factually inaccurate, candidates should discuss their concerns with the department head who should do what is possible to correct factual errors. However, if the disagreement is with the evaluation itself, there should be no change, and no rebuttal. Candidates sign they have reviewed the dossier, not that they agree with any assessments made in it. If they feel that something about their intentions or methodology needs to be clarified, they may address that in their narrative statement. (Page 7, III.C.2.e, .f)

7. *Can information be added to the dossier after the department committee has reviewed it, and if so, must the committee meet again to review the dossier and write a new letter?*

It is not appropriate to add information to the dossier after it has been reviewed if that information was available at the time the dossier was assembled and reviewed, unless a significant error had been made. However, until February 15, if there are new achievements that might have an impact on the record—a judgment will need to be made by the appropriate administrator—then that information must be sent back to all who have already acted on the dossier. If the new information has no impact on the recommendation, then that is all that need be indicated. (Pages 11, III.F.)

8. *Can a dossier be withdrawn after it has been sent forward for review?*

Once a dossier has been completed and the candidate has signed that he or she has reviewed it, and the peer review committee begins its review, the formal process has begun. However, if it is a promotion review only, and if the peer review committee does not recommend promotion and the department head agrees, the head should discuss with the candidate the advisability of withdrawing the dossier from further consultation. (Pages 18-19, V.D.)

9. *Section II.D says that “It is expected that units will devise ways to assess scholarly substance and the quality of research.” How are such measures to be presented in the dossier?*

The unit should address what potential measures could or should be used in its criteria statement/guidelines. If, for example, publications in the major journals in the field are an indication of quality, then those journals should be listed in the guidelines. In the dossier itself, those achievements should be itemized in section II.D. If, for example, citation indices are being used, the results should be presented in objective form in this section. (Page 6, II.D.)

10. *Are there other places where unit-specific criteria might result in a listing that does not appear in the bullets on the dividers? For example, there seems to be no place listed for conference proceedings, which have a particular value in certain disciplines. Might such a category be added as an additional bullet by a unit?*

The simple answer is yes, if done selectively and with care, and if the new bullet is put in the most appropriate place in the dossier. In the example above, the University assumption is that an article that appeared in conference proceedings would be listed as a refereed or non-refereed article, depending on where it is most appropriate, in the already existing lists, but if a unit feels that it would be best to separate conference proceedings out as a separate category, or as a sub-category, it should feel free to do that. (Similarly, a unit might want to separate out what it considers to be notes, rather than articles, into a separate listing or subcategory.) (Page 6, II.D.; pages 8-9, III.C.7.)
11. Can peer review letters be written by academic administrators?

This is acceptable according to our Guidelines, and is most often seen in teaching evaluations. (Page 44, bulleted item, “The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,” Appendix F)

12. Do refereed publications need to be verified?

Regardless of the outlet for articles published (electronically or print), the assumption is that the status of the category used for the listing (refereed status, editorial board, etc.) are authenticated and verified before including in the listing. Articles posted electronically by the individual faculty member without a formal review are not to be listed in the dossier. (Pages 8-9, III.C.7)

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TENURE AND PROMOTION

13. What is the current thinking about the relationship between tenure and promotion?

While a faculty member could be promoted without being tenured, the presumption is that a faculty member whose achievements and promise make him or her tenurable should also be promoted out of the assistant professor rank. If a committee or administrator would recommend that an assistant professor be tenured but not promoted, the burden would be on them to make the argument for the special circumstance that merits such separation. (Page 10, III.C.12.c.; page 18, C.1; page 21, V.H.3.)

PEER REVIEW COMMITTEES

14. When is it appropriate for a committee member to abstain from voting on a candidate who is under review for promotion and/or tenure?

Committee members should abstain only when there is a legitimate conflict of interest, such as a relative being considered for promotion or tenure, or when there may have been an earlier vote on the candidate in the same review year, or if there was significant collaboration with the candidate. (Page 21, V.H.3.e.)

15. How should a tie vote at a committee level review be treated?

It is recommended in the Administrative Guidelines that in order to avoid tie votes, committees should have an odd number of members. However, on a rare occasion when a tie vote occurs at a committee level of review (most likely due to an abstention), that tie vote is treated as a negative recommendation under both HR-23 and the Administrative Guidelines. Therefore, in such circumstance, the committee chair should mark the “Not Recommended” block on the Promotion and Tenure Form. (Page 14, IV.B.2)

16. Who has responsibility for writing the committee letter, and what should it include?

The chair of the committee has responsibility for writing the letter with input from the committee. If there is disagreement on the decision reached for a particular candidate, the minority opinion must be included in the committee’s letter. Only one letter is written and it should contain the committee’s singular overall vote count. The letter should not contain separate vote counts for each of the three evaluative criteria. If there are abstentions, the general reasons for the abstentions might also be included. These same procedures should be followed for second- and fourth-year reviews. (Page 20-22, V.H.)
17. **Is it appropriate for a faculty member to serve on a peer review committee when that faculty member is also being reviewed for promotion to professor?**

There is nothing in HR-23 or the *Administrative Guidelines* that prohibits this although it is not a practice that we encourage. It is possible to allow the faculty member to serve on the committee and then to step out when his or her case is being considered. However, individual units might have their own guidelines or practices to avoid the potential awkwardness of this situation. (See page 1, I.B., for a discussion of applicability of guidelines and improvements to the effectiveness and efficiency of the review process.)

18. **Should there be separate committees for tenure and promotion at the various levels?**

No, we assume that single committees decide all tenure and promotion cases in a given year at each level, and that both decisions are addressed in a single letter from each committee. The exception would be when additional senior faculty need to be added to the senior faculty on a promotion and tenure committee in order to consider a candidate for promotion to senior rank. Members below the rank to which a faculty member is being recommended should be excluded from deliberations and are ineligible to vote on such promotion cases. (Pages 13-15, IV.)

19. **Are there policy restrictions on committee members serving while on sabbatical leaves?**

Although a faculty member may serve on a peer review committee while on a sabbatical leave, as long as it is still possible to participate fully in the deliberations, the department should respect the purposes of the sabbatical, and there should be no expectation that faculty on sabbatical leave donate their research time for department service of any kind. (See pages 14-15, IV.C. for a discussion of selection and appointment of review committees.)

20. **Are college committees informed of the dean’s recommendations on cases going forward for University-level review?**

The disposition of a candidate’s case is a confidential matter. Therefore, there is no duty for a dean to inform the college committee on whether a case is proceeding to the University-level of review. However, should a confidential consultation occur between the dean and the college committee, the natural flow of dialogue often includes a sense of what the dean’s decision(s) will likely be. (Page 20, V.G.)

21. **What is the thinking on allowing academic administrators, or individuals who report directly to the dean, to serve on peer review committees?**

This is prohibited by our *Guidelines*. The problem is that an individual who reports directly to the administrator (one who does have line responsibility) is that he or she may well bring that administrator’s point of view into the committee room. Moreover, his or her presence on the committee might make some committee members feel that they do not have the necessary independence they need to say things and to act in ways that might displease the administrator. (Page 15, IV.E.)

**CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS**

22. **How are entries in the dossier to be weighted?**

Neither HR-23 nor the *Administrative Guidelines* assign weights to any item in the dossier. It is expected that each administrator and committee will weigh the evidence presented in the dossier,
Can collegiality be a factor in tenure reviews?

If collegiality is to be considered as a factor, it should be according to its impact on the candidate’s contributions to one or more of the three cells evaluated in the dossier. For example, a candidate’s lack of collegiality, defined as the ability to collaborate and cooperate constructively, can be addressed in the teaching cell when it impinges on his or her ability to work with colleagues in advising students or in preparing them for prerequisites for more advanced courses, or in preparing them for group activities required of the academic discipline; or in the research cell when it impinges on the candidate’s ability to work collaboratively with colleagues in developing research or creative activities, or in creating grant proposals or organizing conferences; or in service when it prevents departmental committees or programs from functioning as they should.

At the same time, we need to heed the warning from the 1999 AAUP report, that “invoking collegiality as a separate element can insure homogeneity and threaten academic freedom. Moreover, it can be confused with the expectation that a faculty member exhibit enthusiasm, dedication, a constructive attitude, and a willingness to defer to the judgments of superiors.” (Chronicle for Higher Education, September 22, 1999)

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES FOR TEACHING

24. What is appropriate to include in the dossier in the way of peer reviews of teaching?

Full peer review reports of teaching should be included in their entirety in the dossier—not just a summary of the evaluation. (Pages 4-5, II.C.)

25. Who can conduct peer reviews of teaching?

Unless determined by the unit’s governance procedures, peer reviews of teaching are arranged by the department head or the director of academic affairs or the division head, who can ask that they be conducted by any faculty member in the department. (Page 5, II.C.c.)

26. Are peer reviews of teaching accessible for review by the candidate at the time when the candidate signs that he or she has reviewed the dossier?

Yes, peer reviews of teaching are accessible for review by the candidate. (Page 8, III.C.2.m.; III.C.3.)

27. What is appropriate to include in the dossier in the way of student reviews of teaching?

The overall SRTE scores for instructor and course for each course reviewed must be presented. For provisional faculty, SRTE results from all sections of all courses should be included; courses taught at other institutions or at Penn State during non-tenure-eligible appointments should not be included. In addition, there must be at least one other method (such as summary of student comments) for presenting student evaluations of teaching. (Page 4-5, II.C.1; pages 26-31, Appendix A.)
28. *Where can the candidate address the issue of his or her teaching?*

According to legislation of the University Faculty Senate, the issue may be addressed in the narrative statement, and/or in supplementary material provided, such as a teaching portfolio. (Pages 4-5, II.C.1.b; page 7, III.C.2.e; page 8, III.C.5.)

29. *When a previous promotion occurred five or more years ago, how far back must one go in regard to including teaching information?*

Our Guidelines don’t mandate a requirement but normally teaching assessments or evaluations since the last promotion review are included. However, if that formal review was more than five years ago, the benchmark would be to provide evaluation for only the most recent five years. (Page 10, III.C.12.b)

30. *What is appropriate to include in the dossier in the way of student narrative comments?*

If including student narrative comments in the dossier, these should be summarized rather than inserting all or a selection of the narrative comments. This summary can be prepared by the department head, division head, director of academic affairs or a department head’s administrative or faculty delegate. Sometimes this may be done in consultation with the chair of the department’s promotion and tenure committee in order to ensure consistency in presentation. A candidate should not be involved in preparing the summary of student comments. (Page 4, II.C.1.a.1.)

**PROVISIONAL REVIEWS (Prior to sixth-year and early)**

31. *Can a candidate be terminated as a result of a second- or fourth-year review (or special third- or fifth-year review)? Don’t we guarantee our candidates a sixth-year review?*

There is no such guarantee–only that for candidates who are on the tenure track a tenure decision will be made by the end of the sixth-year. However, a decision not to continue a faculty member on the tenure track can be made during an earlier review. (Pages 16-24, V.)

32. *Must second- and fourth-year reviews (and special third- and fifth-year reviews) be reviewed by the college committee?*

The use of the college committee in second- and fourth-year reviews is at the discretion of the dean, but the dean should seek the advice of the college committee before terminating as a result of a provisional review. (Pages 17, V.B.2.)

33. *What is the timing of a decision to terminate in provisional years in regard to the candidate having an additional year of employment?*

Any notice after March 1 of the first year requires the additional year. (Page 23, V.I.3.)

34. *When is it appropriate to call for a third- or fifth-year review?*

A dean may require a third- or fifth-year review when, as a result of the second- or fourth-year review, the record is judged to be strong enough to merit continuation but weak enough to suggest that without measurable progress by the following academic year termination from the tenure-track would be an appropriate action. Deans may call for such a review as a result of a recommendation from the department head or the department or college committees, but they need not accept such recommendations and may decide to terminate or continue without such a review. At the same time,
there is no requirement that a provisional candidate be given a special third- or fifth-year review before termination, and the call for a special review should not be a substitute for making a negative decision when a candidate has not been making satisfactory progress. Third- and fifth-year reviews for candidates who continue on the tenure-track become part of the permanent dossier that builds towards the final, sixth-year decision. (Pages 17, V.B.2.)

CONSULTATION

35. When do the department head and the dean need to consult with their committees? Can the department head, dean, or the committees redo their letters as a result of this consultation?

Actually all reviewing agents, administrators, or committees must consult with the unit that made the prior recommendation if they seek clarification or if they render a contrary recommendation or decision. They must call for that consultation only after they have received the review letters from the previous reviewers, but before they write theirs, and those letters cannot be changed as a result of the consultation. The purpose of the review is to insure that the current reviewer fully understands the reasons that the previous one used to reach a decision that may be divergent before rendering final judgment, but there is no opportunity for the current reviewer to influence or pressure the previous one into changing the already considered and written recommendation. In addition, for candidates holding joint appointments, prior to writing the evaluative letter, the dean of the primary college must consult with the dean of the secondary college. (Page 20, V.G.3.)

THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE

36. Are all sixth-year and promotion decisions reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee?

A positive tenure or promotion recommendation from the dean must be reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee, as well as by the Provost and President. A negative decision by the dean is final, unless all other committees and administrators prior to the dean have been positive. (Pages 17-18, V.B.4.g-j.)

EARLY TENURE, TIME TOWARD TENURE, AND IMMEDIATE TENURE

37. I have heard that bringing faculty members up for early tenure is discouraged. Is it still possible, and if so under what circumstances?

There is a sense in which it is discouraged, since the normal provisional period is seven years, over which time we have an opportunity to measure candidates’ abilities to develop and sustain a tenurable record before investing a multi-million dollar commitment over the rest of their working lives at Penn State. At the same time, we should be willing to recognize special excellence or a circumstance when we see it, and our policies allow for early tenure decisions in those situations. Deans must make requests of the Provost’s Office before undertaking early tenure reviews. (Page 53, Appendix H)
38. If a candidate is reviewed for early tenure and the decision is negative, can that individual be reviewed again in the sixth-year or earlier? Is the candidate damaged for having had an earlier negative decision?

The candidate is not penalized in any way and may be reviewed again up through the sixth-year without jeopardy to his or her case. Earlier external letters should be excluded from subsequent tenure reviews. (Page 53, Appendix H)

39. If a faculty member had been granted time towards tenure when hired, would he or she then have to pass the “exceptional” criteria before coming up for tenure at what would be early had she not been granted such time?

A faculty member who had time granted towards tenure upon hiring, presumably because he or she has already spent some time in provisional status in a previous institution, normally should not be coming up for “early tenure” at Penn State, but rather according to a normal timetable with the time granted towards tenure being listed as time earned towards tenure just as if such time were spent at Penn State. (See Policy HR23, “Promotion and Tenure Regulations,” Provisional or Pre-tenure Period, 5.)

40. Is it better to grant a faculty member with time on the tenure clock elsewhere time towards tenure or rather have them take no years towards tenure and then bring them up for early tenure?

That should be decided on a case-by-case basis, but units should not make it policy to refuse time towards tenure so that they have the most flexibility. This is not fair to a candidate who should have a clear sense of what the tenure clock would be, and who should not be in a position of being evaluated by the standard of an exceptionally strong case that early tenure decisions require. Nor is it fair to the unit, which should want to see a tenurable record built in what is close to a normal combined provisional period. Circumstances and the strength of a candidate’s record should dictate how much time is granted towards tenure. (See reference above.)

41. What then are the expectations for immediate tenure?

Immediate tenure may be granted to new faculty appointments, almost always when they have a tenured appointment at the institution they are leaving. Since we assume that they are being hired because they increase the excellence of the department, and that they are being recruited in a competitive market, we do not ask departments to slow the negotiation process by asking such faculty to develop full Penn State dossiers. They must, however, go through the full Penn State process, with the usual letters from the usual committees and administrators. Letters that address their research expertise that were written for the search may be used in lieu of external letters solicited by the department, but there needs to be evidence of good teaching before any new faculty member is granted tenure. Normally, what is presented for review is the candidate’s vitae, the letters of reference on file, and evidence of good teaching, to which will be added in the review process the normal administrative and committee letters. The formal signatory page and dividers used in the standard promotion and tenure dossiers should not be used for immediate tenure cases. (Appendix I, pages 54-55)

NOMINATION FOR PROMOTION

42. Can a candidate nominate himself for a review? If not, what has to happen before a candidate is considered for promotion?

A candidate can request to be considered for review, but that request does not by itself begin the review process. To begin the process, a candidate must be nominated by an appropriate academic
administrator who would be in the review process, or by a peer review committee, in consultation with the department head. (Page 18, V.C.)

EXTERNAL LETTERS

43. **How are external reviewers chosen?**

External reviewers are chosen from a list of possibilities submitted by the candidate and another list compiled by the department head, usually in consultation with senior faculty in the field. It is best if the preponderance of external evaluators not be names that appeared solely on the list compiled by the faculty member. At no point should the candidate be informed of the final list of evaluators who will be asked to contribute letters. (Page 8, III.C.3.; pages 12-13, III.G.; page 49, dossier divider, “External Letters of Assessment,” Appendix F)

44. *The Guidelines say, in addition to former mentors and students, significant collaborators should not be external evaluators. What is meant by ‘significant?’*

Disciplines will have to make that judgment, but clearly external evaluators should not be in the position of evaluating their own work in writing a letter about the quality of the candidate’s publications, nor should they be such close collaborators that their objectivity will be questioned by those who read the dossier. (Letters of appreciation of the skill and achievement of a candidate by a collaborator, who might also comment on the particular nature of the candidate’s contribution, may be solicited, but such letters would belong in the research section of the dossier, rather than in the section on external evaluations.) Collaborators are not meant to include editors of books or journals in which candidates have published, or co-researchers on a very large project, or one of a number of people who are listed as contributors to a book of conference proceedings. (Page 13, III.G.10.)

45. **Can external letters be requested for provisional reviews prior to the sixth-year review?**

We advise against this practice. Administrators who go back to fourth-year reviewers for sixth-year letters might be able to choose referees according to letters that were received previously. In addition, external referees might be confused by being asked to write letters in response to a tenure review after they had already written assessments in the fourth-year, or else they simply might refuse to write again. Departments are expected to make assessments of their provisional faculty on their own in accord with the criteria and guidelines established by the University, colleges, and departments. (See pages 16-17, V.B.1-3., for a discussion of participants in provisional tenure reviews.)

46. **What is the process for logging in external letters, even when a response is not received or in the case of a letter that is non-responsive?**

The dossier divider, “External Letters of Assessment,” specifies that requested letters should be logged in, even if the referees do not agree to write. The log should indicate when official requests are made in writing, and need not include preliminary requests made by telephone or by a brief e-mail in which potential referees are asked if they would be responsive to a formal written request. (Page 49, dossier divider, “External Letters of Assessment,” bullet 1; Page 50, dossier divider, “Log of External Letters,” Appendix F)
47. Is it appropriate for candidates to contact external reviewers who may be asked by the department head to write a letter of assessment for them?

It is inappropriate for candidates to initiate any contact with external reviewers concerning their potential roles in the review process. Those units that feel it is a matter of courtesy for potential reviewers to be called in advance of receiving a letter requesting an assessment should make such calls through the dean or department head. Of course, any such preliminary contact with a potential reviewer should not give any indication of whether a positive or negative evaluation is desired. (Pages 12-13, III.G.)

47. Is it appropriate for peer review and administrator letters to quote directly from external letters?

Peer review and administrator letters may excerpt quotes from external letters as long as there is no reference to the referee’s institution or other information that would violate the anonymity of the referee. (See page 8, III.C.3. for a discussion of confidentiality of external letters.)

48. If we cannot get the required minimum of external letters, is it all right to have fewer letters?

Every effort should be made to receive the minimum of four letters required by the University. If an evaluator who has promised to write a letter fails to deliver one, a substitute should be sought. It is therefore best to give yourself some leeway between when you are asking letters to be sent to you and when they are actually needed. (Page 12, III.G.4.)

49. Must external references come only from academe?

If there is a person of stature who is appropriate to write an external evaluation, even if he or she is not in the academy, that is acceptable. That should be the exception, though, and the preponderance of letters should be from people with the appropriate academic rank. (See pages 12-13, III.G. for a discussion of expectations of external evaluators.)

50. If a candidate had been reviewed two years ago, for example, is one required to solicit new external letters?

Yes. All letters should be fresh and newly solicited. The assumption is that something has happened in the past two years to require an updated assessment. (Page 12, III.G.1.)

TIMETABLE

51. What is the appropriate timetable of reviews?

The University timetable is printed annually in the Administrative Guidelines. Departments and colleges may set their own schedules in conjunction with the University timetable. Once a dossier has been reviewed and signed by the candidate, it is considered to be in the sequence for formal review. (Appendix B, pages 32-33)

52. When are candidates informed about decisions?

Deans must send forward to the University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee all dossiers that are still under consideration for positive decisions by March 1, and at that time they should tell candidates whether or not their dossiers have been sent forward. The only recommendation that they need share concerning the dossiers they are sending forward is the one that they themselves are making.
Candidates who are reviewed by the University Committee and the Provost and President can expect to receive a letter from the President in mid-May. (Pages 23-24, V.I.2, 3 and 6.)

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

53. Are there any limitations of what is to be included in the supplemental file?

We do not say what should be in the supplemental file, and leave that up to individual units, with the assumption that there should be consistency as to what is allowed from candidate to candidate. Units might want to make some suggestions as to what might be put on file (including any items that they want to mandate, such as copies of publications), and to say what may not be included (such as certain kinds of notes or e-mail messages), with the understanding that the administrator has the right and responsibility to make other decisions on a case-by-case basis concerning whether submitted items are appropriate. (Page 8, III.C.5.)

STAYING OF THE PROVISIONAL TENURE PERIOD

54. What is appropriate to include in the dossier regarding staying of the provisional tenure period?

A staying of the provisional tenure period should not, in any way, penalize or adversely affect the faculty member during a tenure review and is intended to ensure equity in the tenure system. The signatory page of the dossier contains an area to indicate, as appropriate, the academic year of any granted staying of the provisional tenure period. This is the only place in the dossier in which this should be referenced. No reference to the reason or rationale for the stay should appear anywhere in the dossier (including on the promotion and tenure form). (Page 25, VI; Page 52, Appendix G.)

55. Are department promotion and tenure review committees involved in reviewing requests for staying of the provisional tenure period?

No. The reason or rationale for a stay is often quite personal and should be kept confidential. It would also be a conflict of interest for the department promotion and tenure review committee to have knowledge of the basis of such individual requests. (Page 25, VI; Page 52, Appendix G.)
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Annual Planning Retreat (Spring)

Dean identifies:
- Focus of retreat
- Key participants
- Selects breakout group topics
- Assigns participants, co-chairs, and co-reporters
- Meets with co-chairs to discuss their assignments

Executive Assistant identifies:
- Possible dates
- Venue, technical needs and catering
- Collects RSVPs
- Assists with developing supporting materials
- Collects slide presentations
- Assembles handouts for distribution

Post retreat
- Dean and Executive Assistant gather and edit breakout group reports
- Executive Assistant distributes to retreat participants
# Draft Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Rapporteur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00–08:30</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30–09:00</td>
<td>Introduction, Overview and Orientation</td>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>Amr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00–10:30</td>
<td>Faculty Hiring Workshop – Part I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 10</td>
<td>Update on 2015 hiring campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 30</td>
<td>1. Preparing for an effective search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 20</td>
<td>2. Interviewing for impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30–10:50</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Summary Slides</td>
<td>Anthony, Karen, George</td>
<td>Cheng, Raj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50–12:00</td>
<td>Faculty Hiring Workshop – Part II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 30</td>
<td>3. The negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 20</td>
<td>4. Dual career management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00–12:30</td>
<td>Break and Presenters’ Preparation</td>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>Chimay/Amr, Peggy</td>
<td>Phil, Kultegin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30–14:00</td>
<td>Lunch and Group Photo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00–15:10</td>
<td>Faculty Hiring Workshop – Part III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 30</td>
<td>5. Effective startups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 + 20</td>
<td>6. Post-search closeout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10–15:45</td>
<td>Break and Presenter’s Preparation</td>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>Judy, Paul/Anthony</td>
<td>Sven, Harriet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45–16:15</td>
<td>Presentation of Recommendations</td>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>Rapporteurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preparing for an effective search**: setting and managing the timeline; who manages what; hiring priorities; faculty participation; search committees; spreading the word prior to the search; when to advertise, why; contents of the ad to maximize a diverse applicant pool; dos and don'ts.

**Interviewing for impact**: selection, phone interviews, campus interviews, follow-up, communicating with candidates, assembling people and facilities lists, hospitality, accommodating needs, personal touches, expectations on communications, timing.

**The negotiation**: who handles what to make an offer to; how to start the conversation; gathering and presenting information; benchmarks; managing expectations; internal negotiations of co-funding, start-up from Provost and institutes; opportunity funds, etc.; when to send a formal offer; second visits; decision deadlines.

**Dual career management**: allowable questions, managing the expectations, whom to engage, communicating back-and-forth, creative solutions, funding spousal hires.

**Effective startups**: items to offer or consider, knowing the rules, monetizing everything, feel-good measures, shared facilities, opportunities for startup co-funding.

**Post-search closeout**: how and when to close the loop with applicants and finalists, Affirmative Action forms, press releases, post-search assessment of process, preparing for the next search.

**Duties of Presenters**
- Research the topic and sub-topics
- Prepare slides that may be used to steer the discussions, and present them in the time allotted (10 minutes)
- Manage the discussions in the time allotted (20-30 minutes) to cover all issues

**Duties of Rapporteurs**
- Take notes during the discussions
- Delineate between agreements and disagreements, and include options
- Prepare slides on the above and present them in the time allotted (5 minutes)
Reviews
PURPOSE:
To describe the organization and functioning of an academic administrative office, and to provide for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the leadership in carrying out the functions of the office, in light of the organization and other factors which may impinge on the office.

To provide assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the operations of that office and its incumbent leadership for the purpose of improving the functioning of the office.

To make recommendations, as deemed appropriate, to the next highest academic administrative officer based on the information developed on the organization and functioning of an academic administrative office and the resulting evaluation of the effectiveness of the leadership of that office. The recommendations are to be directed at the improvement of the office and its leadership. If there are instances where a change in leadership is proposed, this information is to be included. However, it is the prerogative of the next highest administrative officer to make decisions regarding a possible change in leadership.

DEFINITION:
For the purpose of this policy, an academic administrative office is one which reports directly or indirectly to either the Executive Vice President and Provost or the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine. In addition to Vice Presidents', Academic Deans, and Chancellors, such offices shall include the following: offices of Assistant and Associate Vice Presidents; Assistant and Associate Deans; Department or Division Heads; Directors of Research Units; and Directors of Academic Affairs at the non-University Park locations.

PROCESS:
Because of the diversity of the University, the specific process for periodic review of academic administrative officers and their offices is not prescribed for each unit.

Each academic administrative officer directly responsible to either the Executive Vice President and Provost or the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine shall, in consultation with either the Executive Vice President and Provost or the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the College of Medicine and the appropriate administrative and faculty groups for this office, develop a process for the review of those academic administrative officers and their offices reporting to him or her within guidelines listed below.

The processes shall without exception include mechanisms whereby a central office at the provost’s level, as well as faculty of the pertinent unit shall be informed when the review is started, when the review is completed, and that the next highest academic administrative officer has been informed of the results of the review and has prepared and distributed a summary to faculty and staff in the academic unit.

GUIDELINES:
Academic administrative officers and their offices ordinarily shall be reviewed at regular intervals. The offices of Deans and their Associate or Assistant Deans, as well as Chancellors and the Directors of Academic Affairs, may be scheduled for simultaneous or separate reviews. Such reviews, however, shall
be conducted in addition to conventional annual evaluations. The typical period between reviews shall be five years; however, some flexibility is afforded depending upon circumstances. It is always desirable to initiate an exit review when a principal academic office is vacated, e.g., by resignation or retirement, or when significant changes are proposed.

Responsibility for initiating and implementing the periodic review of academic administrative officers and their offices rests with the administrator at the next highest level.

Academic members of the unit being reviewed shall be significantly involved in the review process. Appropriate academic members from other related units, and academic administrative peers, are recommended to be included in the review process.

The general results of the review shall be made known to the responsible academic administrative officer by the next highest academic administrative officer. Within 30 days, the administrator under review shall submit a response concerning actions taken, underway, and planned. In general terms that do not violate the confidentiality of the review or the incumbent’s response, the administrator supervising the review shall prepare a summary of the major findings and the incumbent’s objectives and goals for the next five years. This summary shall be distributed to faculty and staff in the academic unit. Confidentiality of personnel evaluations shall be maintained.

As part of the conventional annual review referenced above, each administrator shall submit to his or her supervisor a progress report based on the five-year goals enumerated in his or her most recent AD14 review or if prior to the administrator’s first AD14 review, goals outlined in consultation with his or her supervisor.

FURTHER INFORMATION:
For questions, additional detail, or to request changes to this policy, please contact the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

Effective Date:  November 14, 2014
Date Approved:  October 21, 2014
Date Published:  November 14, 2014

Most recent changes:
- November 14, 2014 - Both the 'PROCESS' and 'GUIDELINES' sections were updated to reflect recommendations for improvement to the academic administrative evaluation process, as recommended by the University Faculty Senate. Also, policy steward information has been added, in the event that there are questions or requests for changes to the policy.

Revision History (and effective dates):
- September 4, 2007 - Editorial changes; changed 'Campus Executive Officer' to 'Chancellor.'
- June 15, 2006 - Revision History added.
- March 15, 1999 - Both the 'DEFINITION' and 'PROCESS' sections were changed to state that an academic administrative office(r) reports/is responsible to EITHER the Executive Vice President and Provost OR The Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and the Dean of the College of Medicine, as applicable, in carrying out this evaluation process.
- March 17, 1997 - Position Titles updated. Revisions to "Requesting An Exceptional Use" section.
- August 1, 1994 - Academic Administrative Evaluation - The title of Dr. Brighton was corrected from "Executive Vice Provost," to "Executive Vice President and Provost." Also, reference to Directors of Academic Affairs at the "campuses" was revised to "Non-University Park locations."
- February 26, 1988 - Major Revisions.
- November 9, 1983 - Position title changes.
DATE: February 22, 2017

FROM: Amr Elnashai, Harold and Inge Marcus Dean

TO: Department Heads, School Directors

SUBJECT: Annual Activities Report

As per our discussion and agreement, I ask you to send me a report (3 pages maximum) on your activities over the past year (July 2016 to June 2017) and your goals for the next year (July 2017 to June 2018). The schedule of annual activities reporting has been compressed slightly because of my planned departure in July. Please include responses to the following points:

1. Accomplishments as a department/school head, or school director, and main goals for next year in terms of education, research, service and departmental management. Include alignment of next year’s goals with the college strategy, and specific actions taken/will be taken to increase the diversity of students, staff and faculty, and initiatives in interdisciplinary education and research. Please include brief comments on your plans for fundraising, if relevant.

2. Accomplishments as a professor and main goals for next year in terms of education, research, and service. Include any aspects of innovation in education, student mentoring, and interdisciplinary research.

3. Additional activities undertaken this year that are not covered above, and associated goals for next year.

4. Any other issue that you would like to share with me.

I ask that you send me your annual activities report by Wednesday, May 31, 2017. We will schedule individual meetings to review the main points in your report. I look forward to our discussion.

cc: Anthony Atchley
REVIEW PROCEDURES
DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORSHIPS

I. PURPOSE
University Policy HR-10 dictates that “appointments as Distinguished Professor will be made for a period of five (5) years; renewal of the appointment is dependent upon the Distinguished Professor continuing the same high level of performance evident at the time of initial appointment.” These guidelines describe the College of Engineering procedures for reviewing the appointments.

II. PROCEDURE
• Prior to the expiration of the appointment, the Dean of Engineering will appoint an advisory committee to access the performance of the holder during the term of appointment.
• The committee will meet with the Department Head as part of the review process.
• The committee will meet with the holder of the distinguished professorship as part of the review process.
• The committee will provide its assessment to the Dean including an evaluation of the holder’s activities and accomplishments and a recommendation regarding reappointment.
• After reviewing the committee’s assessment and discussing it with the holder’s Department Head, the Dean will make a decision regarding reappointment.

III. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP
The advisory committee will consist of four (4) members:
• an Associate Dean
• two tenured full professors, at least one of whom is tenured in the College of Engineering
• a Department Head
Members will be appointed for two-year terms which are staggered so that the terms of two members expire each year. Terms are renewable. The Dean will appoint the chair of the committee from the above members.

IV. EVALUATION FACTORS
In evaluating the performance of the holder, the committee will consider the following:

a. brief narrative statement (2 page max) of major activities during the past five years and plans for the future
b. list of research projects including title, sponsor, funding level and period of performance
c. list of instructional activities including enrollment and SRTE scores
d. list of undergraduate and graduate student supervision
e. list of publications, presentations and other scholarly works
f. list of internal and external leadership and professional service activities
g. other indicators of national/international visibility and reputation you may wish to provide
h. such other factors as the Dean or Department Head may identify as being appropriate
I. PURPOSE
During the last year or for a time period no greater than five (5) years of the appointment of a faculty member holding an endowed professorship or chair in the College of Engineering, a review will be conducted of the holder’s activities during the period of appointment. These guidelines describe the College of Engineering procedures for reviewing the appointments.

II. PROCEDURE
• Prior to the expiration of the appointment, the Dean of Engineering will appoint an advisory committee to access the performance of the holder during the term of appointment.
• The committee will meet with the Department Head as part of the review process.
• The committee will meet with the holder of the endowed chair or professorship as part of the review process.
• The committee will provide its assessment to the Dean including an evaluation of the holder’s activities and accomplishments and a recommendation regarding reappointment.
• After reviewing the committee’s assessment and discussing it with the holder’s Department Head, the Dean will make a decision regarding reappointment.

III. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP
The advisory committee will consist of four (4) members:
• an Associate Dean
• two tenured full professors, at least one of whom is tenured in the College of Engineering
• a Department Head

Members will be appointed for two-year terms which are staggered so that the terms of two members expire each year. Terms are renewable. The Dean will appoint the chair of the committee from the above members.

IV. EVALUATION FACTORS
In evaluating the performance of the holder, the committee will consider the following:
1. Terms and conditions specified in the formal University guidelines for the particular professorship or chair.
2. Performance record of the holder during the period of the current appointment, including but not limited to:
   a. brief narrative statement (2 page max) of major activities during the past five years, how the chair or professorship funds were used, and plans for the future
   b. list of research projects including title, sponsor, funding level and period of performance
   c. list of instructional activities including enrollment and SRTE scores
   d. list of undergraduate and graduate student supervision
   e. list of publications, presentations and other scholarly works
   f. list of internal and external leadership and professional service activities
   g. other indicators of national/international visibility and reputation you may wish to provide
3. Other
   a. interaction with the donor of the professorship or chair
   b. such other factors as the Dean or Department Head may identify as being appropriate
Engineering Staff Advisory Council Mission Statement

The mission of the College of Engineering Staff Advisory Council is to foster an ideal workplace while enhancing the stature of the College of Engineering by serving as an advocate to the Dean and the College Administration for staff welfare and applicable issues or concerns. The Staff Advisory Council facilitates communication, nurtures a spirit of community unity, increases recognition opportunities, and promotes personal and professional growth.

Goals:
- Facilitate recommendations to the Dean and College Administration
- Provide supportive network opportunities
- Disseminate information
- Provide educational opportunities
- Provide recognition
- Develop strategic goals
- Establish sub-committees as necessary
MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Formally Documenting the College of Engineering Staff Service Award

1. **NAME:** The College of Engineering Staff Service Award
2. **PURPOSE:** The purpose of this award shall be to honor and recognize continuous service longevity markers for full-time staff members in the College of Engineering.
3. **CRITERIA:** Consideration for this award shall be given to all full-time staff members who meet a longevity marker of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, and 35 years of continuous service to Pennsylvania State University. The College of Engineering Human Resources Department will identify eligible staff members annually and provide the College of Engineering Staff Advisory Committee a listing of recipients.
4. **Number of Recipients:** The number of recipients will be identified annually by the College of Engineering Human Resources Department.
5. **Frequency of Award:** Annually
6. **Determination of the type of Award:** The award for each year grouping will be a non-monetary gift selected by the College of Engineering Staff Advisory Award Subcommittee and approved by the Staff Advisory Committee. The cost of an individual memento will not exceed an amount of $200.00.
7. **Guidelines for Presentation of the Award:** Awards shall be presented annually at the Staff Advisory Awards Reception.

Rebecca Mason  
Director of Human Resources  

Lisa Sharkey  
Assistant Financial Officer  

Anthony Atchley  
Senior Associate Dean  

Date