

# **Penn State Berks Senate**

**Monday, November 17, 2014**

**1:00-2:30 PM**

**Room 121, Gaige Building**

**Agenda**

- **Call to Order**
  
- **Additions, Corrections, and Approval of the Minutes of the October 27, 2014 meeting**
  
- **Announcements and Reports by the Chair**
  
- **Reports of Officers and University Senators**
  - Vice Chair Snyder
  - Secretary Zambanini
  - University Faculty Senate Chair-Elect Ansari
  - Senator Aynardi
  - Senator Nasereddin
  - SGA President Devin Heckman
  - Student Senator
  
- **Comments and Announcements by Administrators**
  - Chancellor Hillkirk
  - Associate Dean Esqueda
  
- **Unfinished Business**

- **Motions from Committees**
  - Revisions to the Penn State Berks College Promotion and Tenure Statement, Executive Committee (**Appendix A**)
  
- **Informational Reports**
  
- **New Legislative Business**
  
- **Forensic Business**
  - Scholarsphere, Lionpath, and One Button Studio
  
- **Comments for the Good of the Order**
  
- **Adjournment**

**Penn State Berks Senate**  
**October 27, 2014**  
**1:00-2:30 PM, Gaige, Room 121**

Attendees: Ali Alikhani, Mohamad Ansari, Jennifer Arnold, Martha Aynardi, Mike Bartolacci, David Bender, William Bowers, Tricia Clark, Ruth Daly, Nancy Dewald, Bob Forrey, Leonard Gamberg, Cesar Martinez Garza, Samantha Kavky, Abdullah Konak, Sadan Kulturel, Ada Leung, Joe Mahoney, Lauren Martin, Cliff Maurer, Edwin Murillo, Mahdi Nasereddin, Rungun Nathan, Randall Newnham, David Sanford, John Shank, Alice Shaparenko, Jessica Shocker, Stephen Snyder, Terry Speicher, Bob Zambanini (Faculty); Marie Smith (Staff); Kim Berry, Paul Esqueda, Keith Hillkirk, Janelle Larson, Belen Rodriguez Mourelo, Teri Sabatelli (Administration); Barry Yaya, Ryan Berrick, Andrew Harakel, Devin Heckman, Jessica Hoag, Lindsay Tucker (Students)

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Additions, Corrections, and Approval of Minutes of the September 29, 2014** –The Chair called for corrections and/or additions to the minutes; hearing none, a vote was called to approve the minutes; *the minutes were approved.*

**3. Announcements and Reports by the Chair** –The HRIM degree program with the entrepreneurship option was approved by the Curricular Affairs Committee and will now go before the University Senate for approval.

**4. Reports of Officers and University Senators**

- **Vice-Chair Snyder** – The Faculty Affairs Committee met a few weeks ago; committee members were assigned their charges and are off and running.
- **Secretary Zambanini** – The Senate web page is in the process of being updated and should be concluded by the end of the week.
- **University Faculty Senate Chair-Elect Ansari** – The Board of Trustees will hold a special meeting tomorrow to discuss the Freeh Report with regard to the resolution made by one of the Board members. On November 11, the Board will meet to ratify the inclusion of faculty as a member of the Board of Trustees. The hope is that this motion will be ratified with a full Board vote. The Senate met on Tuesday, October 9; there was much discussion on the floor of the Senate with regard to the Gen Ed Taskforce. A forensic discussion also took place, which may be of interest. There is a policy in place (AD47, *General Standards of Professional Ethics*); the idea is to extend the policy to honor cohorts at the University. There are two parts to the plan: (1) revise the policy to include professional and ethical conduct standards that are common among all faculty, staff, administrators and student employees; and (2) professional and ethical conduct standards that are specific to respective roles of faculty, staff, administrators and student employees. A forensic discussion took place with regard to this topic, led by the compliance administrators, and two questions were raised at the conclusion of the meeting. One colleague suggested the best place for revising the policy is through one of the Standing Committees of the University Faculty Senate. It was agreed that this would go to the Faculty Affairs Committee at University Park and presented to the Senate for consideration.
- **Senator Aynardi** – No report
- **Senator Nasereddin** – No report
- **SGA President Devin Heckman** – No report
- **Student Senator** – Not present

**5. Comments and Announcements by Administrators**

- **Chancellor Hillkirk**
  - Everyone involved with the HRIM degree process should be commended for their efforts. We were successful and are looking forward to seeing the program move forward.

- The recent Homecoming Weekend proved to be a successful event for all who attended. We have turned this event into a family-staff weekend, which also included an Open House for prospective students and families. Also taking place on this day was the dedication of the new turf field. Our housing & food services staff served over 900 meals. A record number of returning alumni were in attendance. Much excitement surrounded the parade as well as the crowning of the homecoming king and queen for Penn State Berks. To all those involved in the planning and implementation of the event, great job!
- We are already in the planning cycle for next fall's enrollment cycle and have another Open House scheduled in November. Our enrollment this fall is up approximately 100 students over a year ago and already we are ahead in paid-accepts for fall 2016, although it is early in the process.
- In recent meetings with the Chancellor's Student and Staff Advisory Council, our SGA leaders posed two very good questions. The first question had to do with the amount of money invested in academic versus athletic facilities compared. In response, the Campus has invested over \$40 million in academics at PS Berks; that amount includes the Gaige building and now the current Luerssen renovation as well as some additional investments and dollars spent on a variety of capital improvement and maintenance projects in our academic facilities. The Luerssen project is underway with an anticipated move-in timeframe of January, 2016. Beyond this amount, Perkins Plaza represented an investment of approximately \$2 and most recently the artificial turf field approximately \$2.8 million. The majority of that funding was made possible by our student facilities fee. The next major project at PS Berks will be the Beaver Community Center. The University has set aside about \$6 million for that project and it is anticipated that project will cost at least as much as the Luerssen renovation. Much money needs to be raised. While the Beaver Community Center is our athletic facility, it is also the home of our kinesiology program. It is important that we all recognize that that project will represent not only an investment in athletic facilities and especially a fitness center, but also some much needed improvements to our research and teaching spaces, as well as faculty office spaces for kinesiology. The other question referenced the naming of the turf field. The University has in place a Facilities Naming Committee. In the past, buildings were often named for prior presidents, academic leaders, etc. Today the University reserves very careful rights over naming opportunities. For the present, the feeling is that the field will be named after somebody who makes a significant gift; however, the hope is to convince the University's naming committee that the field at Berks should be named in honor of the students who contributed the majority of the funding.
- We are nearly into November; before we know, finals will be here, as well as commencement. The keynote speaker fall commencement will be Amity Gaige, who is the daughter of the late Fred Gaige and for whom this building is named. Amity is currently the scholar, writer and residence at Amherst College; she is also an award winning novelist with her most recent novel gaining much notoriety. We are working to have Amity come a bit early so that she may spend time with students and/or join us for the faculty retreat the day of commencement. We are pleased to have Amity be a part of this special day celebrating our students.
- **Associate Dean Esqueda**
  - The hard work provided by all involved with getting the HRIM degree approved is very much appreciated, most especially to the Chair and Chancellor Hillkirk. The Chair did a wonderful job of navigating the political system at University Park, and the Chancellor was instrumental through many of his face-to-face meetings with University Park.
  - The Higher Education Council of Berks County Undergraduate Research Conference will be held on Saturday, April 18, 2015. Please plan accordingly, as in the past, Berks has always been the leading college in presenting papers.
  - Eric Jensen, author of "Teaching with Poverty in Mind" will be speaking at Penn State Berks on Monday, April 6, 2015. This topic is one that the Chancellor has been paying very close attention to due to the proximity of Penn State Berks to the city of Reading. In his book, the author explains on one hand the consequences of living in poverty when you're trying to get an education, and on the other hand, explains how this problem may be solved. Save the date to participate in this important discussion.

**6. Unfinished Business – None**

**7. Informational Reports**

- **Minutes, Academic Affairs Committee (contains information regarding P3: Rehabilitation and Human Services) (Appendix A)**
- **Physical Facilities and Safety Committee Meeting Minutes, October 10, 2014 (Appendix B)**

**8. New Legislative Business – None**

**9. Forensic Business**

- **General Education Information Report (Presented to the University Senate by the General Education Task Force on October 21, 2014) (Appendix C)** – Senator Aynardi (who serves as a member of the Gen Ed Taskforce) provided the presentation. There are a lot of people who feel general education revision is necessary because the program has not been reviewed since 1997. Gen Ed courses consist of approximately one-third of the credits of any undergraduate student's education at Penn State. The purpose of today's presentation is to gather feedback from faculty as well as students. We would like both faculty and students to look at the report, let us know what challenges you have with the current Gen Ed program and the changes you think would be necessary in order to strengthen the program as well as what faculty support would be needed in order to make the program better. The recommendation was made for faculty to have their discussions take place within their divisions at their monthly meeting. One important issue raised was whether or not there should be educational objectives for our general education courses. Students don't understand why they are required to take these courses. It's very hard to access a program that doesn't have accessible objectives, which we have never had as a program. Having accessible objectives for the general education program will make it easier for us to figure out what we need to do in order to make the program even better and more meaningful to the students. Discussions have taken place within the University Park Gen Ed Taskforce about the domains and the silos of the domains and whether or not there isn't some way to allow integration. Three prototypes have been created and are included in this report. It is very important to realize that in order to enact any type of change there needs to be faculty support for whatever is decided. Much discussion took place concerning the faculty's responsibility to the students in that regard. The central question has been what are the strengths and weaknesses of this general education program? University Senate Chair-elect Ansari stated that both he and the Chair had the opportunity to talk with the co-chairs to discuss the survey; however, the co-chairs regrettably have not been amenable to that request, further stating that a 90+ page document unfortunately did not generate a very hot discussion at Tuesday's meeting. In conversations with other colleagues, it is of his opinion and not that of the University Faculty Senate that our colleagues don't feel the input has been integrated into the process; therefore, they were not engaged into the discussion of this very complex and compact document. It was further reminded that this report is not the final product. University Senate Chair-Elect Ansari complimented the tireless work of Senator Aynard in this regard as she has been a part of the process from day one. He further reminded everybody that it is important to determine if the changes are implementable at the Campuses, sharing a previous comment made by Dr. Madlyn Hanes ("if you approve it, we will implement it."). It is important for faculty to share if they feel if any of these three prototypes are workable and if not, to express the reasons. The hope is for a legislative report to be brought forth to University Senate by Spring of 2015. A question was raised with regard to transfer students and whether or not they were part of any discussions when creating this report. Senator Aynardi commented the Committee is very concerned about this aspect due to the importance of transfer students at the campuses. It was reminded that the push to look at the effectiveness of the general education program is not only being done at Penn State but is being looked at throughout all colleges and universities nationwide. The primary reason surrounds the current cost of a college education. A question was raised on goals vs. objectives with regard to the prototypes, and the need for the Gen Ed Taskforce to explicitly show what the objectives are for each prototype, to have more specificity. Each of the three prototypes was presented for additional discussion. After much discussion, the Chair posed the question as to which

of the three prototypes, if any, the faculty were leaning towards. A comment was shared that the prototypes are strategies to implement the goals and we currently do not have a goal for general education at this time, and that the initial discussion should be on what it is we are supposed to accomplish. University Senate Chair-Elect Ansari questioned students attending today's meeting as to their thoughts. The SGA President stated that he recommends that the Senate put together an Ad Hoc Committee or charge the Academic Affairs Committee to look into this report and create some type of summary of its suggestions and prototypes for the Senate to review at the November meeting. The Chair stated he will take this under advisement and noted due to time constraints, this topic will again be reviewed at the November meeting.

**10. Comments for the Good of the Order – None**

**11. Adjournment**

(APPENDIX A)

## **Penn State Berks College Promotion and Tenure Statement**

The promotion and tenure policies of Penn State Berks contribute to academic excellence and are consistent with the College's mission of providing a high quality education for its students; fostering teaching, research, creative activity, and scholarship; providing service to the University; and enhancing the intellectual, cultural, and economic lives of the community. These promotion and tenure guidelines are to be reviewed in light of the mission of Penn State Berks. Innovative responses to the challenges inherent in our mission are encouraged.

The Pennsylvania State University policy governing promotion and tenure (HR-23) states that it is the responsibility of each academic unit within the University to develop its own specific expectations and standards as the operational basis for tenure and promotion recommendations. The purpose of this document is to delineate the expectations and standards for tenure and promotion at Penn State Berks. This document should be read in the context of the broader procedures and standards of the University.

Knowledge concerning the expectations and standards contained in this document should be generally available, especially to newly appointed faculty members. The criteria presented in this document are widely applicable to the variety of disciplines represented by the faculty at Penn State Berks.

### **Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

Faculty members of Penn State Berks become eligible for tenure and/or promotion when they fulfill the expectations specified in The Pennsylvania State University policy (HR-23). With the exception of University Library faculty at Penn State Berks, the criteria for this evaluation embrace three areas: the scholarship of teaching and learning; the scholarship of research and creative accomplishments; and service and the scholarship of service to the University, society, and the profession. Evaluation of librarians includes a fourth criterion: scholarship of librarianship as detailed in Promotion and Tenure criteria for University Libraries.

Promotion and tenure decisions for faculty 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. The College values independent activity in each of these areas, but also recognizes them as interrelated and supports faculty initiatives to integrate them.

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.

Promotion decisions for librarians are based on recognized performance and achievement in each of the criteria. Tenure decisions are based on the potential for further achievement in the criteria as indicated by performance during the provisional appointment. The presumption is that a positive tenure decision for an Assistant Librarian is sufficient to warrant promotion to Associate Librarian.

For tenure and promotion to Associate professor, candidates must present evidence of a sustained record of quality research and creative accomplishments, demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and a commitment to ongoing instructional improvement, and demonstrate a sustained record of service to the University, society, and the profession.

For tenure and promotion to associate librarian, the candidate should possess the same qualifications as the assistant librarian (should possess a graduate degree in library or information studies or other appropriate degree; must have demonstrated potential ability as a librarian; and must have shown promise of growth in research and service), demonstrate excellence in librarianship, show evidence of an established reputation in research, and have a strong record of service to the University and the profession.

For promotion to Professor, candidates must demonstrate accomplishments significantly beyond those presented at the time of promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate must present evidence of a sustained record of research and creative accomplishments at a level sufficient to earn a national or international reputation for excellence from leaders of the profession, demonstrate continuing effectiveness as a teacher and a commitment to ongoing instructional improvement; and demonstrate substantial service to the University, society, and the profession.

For promotion to Librarian, in addition to the qualifications for Associate Librarian, the Librarian should demonstrate sustained excellence in librarianship, give evidence of creativity in his/her field of specialization (including a continuing capacity for significant contributions in research and creative accomplishments), and show evidence of leadership in the profession. The rank of Librarian should be reserved for persons of proven stature in librarianship, research, and service.

### **Elaboration of the Three Basic Criteria for Tenure and Promotion**

1. The scholarship of teaching and learning. In accordance with our mission, Penn State Berks values highly the teaching and advising roles of its faculty. Faculty members must demonstrate an ongoing commitment to promote student learning. Effectiveness in this area will be measured primarily by input from students and from faculty colleagues in the form of course, advising, and



peer evaluations, as well as by evidence of a faculty member's commitment to achieving instructional excellence. Student interviews, letters from former students, evaluation of course syllabi and other course materials, and any other means that will attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness may be considered.

2. The scholarship of research and creative accomplishments. In accordance with our mission, we recognize that the vitality of the faculty, both collectively and individually, depends upon ongoing research and creative accomplishments. Penn State Berks equally values all forms of research and creative accomplishment. Such accomplishments are to be demonstrated in part through publication, exhibition, or performance. Additional demonstrations of achievement in this area may include presentations at professional meetings, obtaining grants, outreach activities utilizing the candidate's expertise, the development of new courses and academic programs, or other activities considered significant in the candidate's discipline. Penn State Berks encourages innovative, interdisciplinary ways for faculty to realize professional growth and achievement in these areas. Any demonstration of achievement in these areas should ultimately produce or enhance recognition of a faculty member's expertise by members of the profession outside of Penn State University.

3. Service and the scholarship of service to the University, society, and the profession. In accordance with our mission, we recognize that Penn State Berks views a record of active service as evidence of the candidate's commitment to furthering the missions of the College and the University. This service may include but is not limited to committee work, participation in governance bodies, administrative support work, service to student groups, and professionally related service to the public or the profession.

## **THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

### **Penn State Berks**

#### **Promotion and Tenure Peer Review Procedures**

##### **A. PURPOSE**

The purpose of these procedures is to implement Policy HR-23: Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations of The Pennsylvania State University.

##### **B. LEVELS OF REVIEW**

Each faculty member at Penn State Berks holds an appointment in one of the academic divisions of the College. Librarians will continue to seek and hold tenure and promotion in the University Libraries. The initial review of a candidate for tenure and/or promotion takes place at the academic division level. (For faculty retaining appointments in their departments at University Park, see HR-23.) It is at the academic division level that specific criteria are presented and evaluated. Each academic division may therefore further define the specific criteria for tenure and promotion in a manner compatible with the general standards set by the University and Penn State Berks. The college level of review will bring broader faculty and administrative judgment to bear and will also monitor general standards of quality and equity of academic division policies and procedures. The review at the University level applies to promotion and tenure decisions dossiers. At each level there is administrative review and consultation with preceding levels of review.

### **B-1. Divisional Level of Review**

Purpose. The divisional Promotion and Tenure (P & T) Committees are constituted in accordance with the policy, HR-23, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations to review candidates for promotion and tenure within their divisions. The review is based on dossiers submitted by the Office of Academic Affairs.

#### **B-1a. Initiation of Review Process Cycle**

Peer Review of Teaching Effectiveness. The Division Head will assign three full-time faculty members to review the teaching effectiveness of each candidate for tenure and/or promotion in January of the previous academic year. At least one reviewer should be in the same division as the candidate. Peer reviewers need not all be from within the division or the college. In view of the high value placed upon teaching by this college, a careful evaluation of each candidate's teaching effectiveness is appropriate. If the candidate is being considered for promotion, at least two of the reviewers must be of a rank higher than the candidate.

Each reviewer will make no fewer than two visits to the candidate's classroom, on-line discussion, and/or laboratory and may request any teaching materials that are made available to students. Peer reviewers are expected to review syllabi and assignments and may meet with students.

By September 15 for 6th-year reviews and by December 15 for 2nd-year and 4th-year reviews, for each candidate visited, the reviewer will complete a summary of his/her review. All peer summaries will be submitted to the Associate Dean's office. Each peer summary will be included unedited in the dossier and will indicate the reviewer's college, division, rank and name, and carry the reviewer's signature.

A description of the Peer Review Goals and Processes along the Peer Review Format is found on the college's P drive.

External Letters of Review (6th-year and /or tenure and promotion review only) 6th-Year Tenure Review. The Division Head in consultation with appropriate department chairs at University Park and other Penn State locations will seek external letters of review for all promotion and tenure reviews. Candidates will be asked to submit names, addresses, and positions of possible external reviewers. The Division Head will, in compliance with HR-23, select external reviewers and solicit letters from them, ensuring that a majority of the external letters of review shall not be from the list of names submitted by the candidate. Letters for 6th-year review will address all University criteria.

Promotion. The Division Head in consultation with appropriate department chairs at University Park and other Penn State locations will seek external letters of review for all promotion and tenure reviews. Candidates will be asked to submit names, addresses, and positions of possible external reviewers. The Division Head will, in compliance with HR-23, select external reviewers and solicit letters from them. Letters for promotion review will address all University criteria. Performance in all of the University criteria will be evaluated when considering a faculty member for promotion. Promotion is granted as a reward for academic achievement.

Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness. The Office of Academic Affairs is responsible for providing evidence for the dossier of student evaluations of teaching effectiveness in accordance with the provisions specified in HR-23. The Division Head will be responsible for summarizing the students' comments.

### **B-1b. Promotion and Tenure Committee**

Committee Composition. Each division will elect three faculty members tenured at the rank of associate professor, professor and/or equivalent rank to serve as the P & T Committee. No member may serve on more than one level of review in any given year of any given candidate. The term of service shall be two years or the time served in fulfillment of a committee vacancy. Terms shall be staggered to ensure continuity of membership.

If a division does not have at least three faculty members who are eligible to serve on a review committee, the college's academic officer can appoint members from other campuses to the college committee, and the division head can appoint members from outside the division and the college/campus to the division committee. **If the academic administrator must go beyond the college to constitute a review committee, approval is required from the Executive Vice President and Provost.** Such appointments to division committees shall be from "related fields" or "similar disciplines."

Selection. The Faculty Affairs Committee of the College Senate will administer the selection process. All tenured members of each division's faculty will be eligible for election unless the member will be on leave of absence or is ineligible because of recent committee service or is otherwise unable to serve. A member may not serve two consecutive terms on the division committee. Additionally, a member may not serve more than two successive terms on the division and college committees unless there is insufficient number of tenured faculty members; a faculty member who has served two successive terms on the division and college committees may not stand for election in the following academic year. All tenured and tenure eligible members of the division who hold full-time continuing appointments will be eligible to vote. Final decisions on inability to serve on the committee shall be made by the Faculty Affairs Committee in consultation with the Division Head.

Election. Elections for the divisional P & T Committees will take place only after the election for the College P & T Committee (see below) is completed. By mid-September, the Faculty Affairs Committee will prepare and distribute a ballot to all faculty eligible to vote in each division listing the names of faculty members who are eligible to serve, with the number to be elected for each divisional committee specified. The Faculty Affairs Committee will conduct an election in accordance with P & T review procedures.

Results of the Election. Winners of the election will be determined as follows: Associate professors, professors, or candidates of equivalent rank who receive the most votes will be elected to the committee. These individuals will serve two-year terms.

In the event that a committee member(s) is (are) unable to serve the first year of the term, a replacement(s) will be chosen to complete that year. The first-year replacement will be the individual(s) who received the highest number of votes in the remaining pool of nominees. The committee member who won the election will complete the second year of the term.

In the event that a committee member(s) elected the previous year is (are) unable to complete the second year of a term, (a) replacement(s) will be chosen to complete the remaining year of the term. The replacement will be the individual who received the highest number of votes in the remaining pool of nominees for the most recent election.

In the event of a tie for the final two-year term position or a final replacement position on the committee, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, after consulting with the candidates who are tied, will determine the selection.

Filling Committee Vacancies. Results of the election will be kept on file by the Associate Dean. In the event that a vacancy occurs during the year of a review cycle, the individual with the highest number of votes in the election will be selected from the remaining pool of eligible faculty to complete the review year with the provision that the rank requirement be met.

Notification of Committee Membership. As soon as is practical after the election, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee will announce the election winners. In September, the Faculty Affairs Committee will send a memo to all college faculty that lists the members of the P & T Committee and indicates the Chair of the committee.

Convening the Committee and Selecting a Chair. The Associate Dean shall call the initial meeting to charge the Committee, to outline procedures to be followed, and to arrange a schedule so that the College review process can be followed and completed in time to meet administrative requirements for the next review level. The Associate Dean will provide each division P&T Committee with a list of all faculty members who are to be reviewed that year for tenure with the review year designated for each, and a list of faculty members to be reviewed for promotion, with the promotion level designated for each. The newly constituted Committee will elect a Chair at its first meeting.

Responsibilities of the P&T Committee. The divisional P & T Committee will be responsible for assessing candidates within their divisions for consideration for tenure and/or promotion and preparing letters of evaluation based on candidates' completed dossiers. The divisional committee is expected to assess the review process and pass on any recommendations to the Penn State Berks Senate and Associate Dean.

Evaluation of the Dossier by the Committee. The Associate Dean will make the completed dossier available to the Committee in accordance with the agreed-upon schedule. The committee will write a letter of evaluation for each candidate based on the dossier and the vote of the Committee.

(a) For Tenure. The Committee will meet as a whole to discuss the performance of each tenure candidate. Additional information may be requested. At the conclusion of the discussion each Committee member will cast a ballot for or against the candidacy.

(b) For Promotion to Associate and Professor or Equivalent Rank. Only faculty members of a rank equivalent to or higher than the rank a promotion candidate is being considered for may vote on that promotion. In the event that there are Committee members of the same or a lower rank than a promotion candidate, an additional member (s) with the required rank will be appointed by the Associate Dean from the college faculty to assist in the reviewing and voting process for that promotion. If a faculty member(s) with the required rank is not available at Penn State Berks, the Associate Dean will appoint (a) faculty member(s) with the appropriate rank from another Penn State college. Additional information may be requested. At the conclusion of the evaluation each member will cast a ballot for or against each candidacy.

Letter of Recommendation. The letter of evaluation will address each criterion based on the evidence in the dossier. Each member who voted on a candidate will sign the letter of

recommendation. All signed letters of evaluation must be addressed to the Division Head in accordance with the schedule developed earlier.

When there is dissenting opinion among the Committee, the reasons for the dissent must be addressed in the letter.

(a) 2nd-Year Tenure Review. Letters of evaluation for 2nd-year tenure reviews will be developmental in order to provide advice to candidates to assist them in earning tenure and promotion.

(b) 4th-Year Tenure Review. Letters for the 4th-year review should evaluate progress to date on all of the University criteria and continue to be developmental in preparation for the 6th-year review.

Confidentiality of the Process. Individual evaluations of teaching effectiveness are considered confidential information. Deliberations and votes of the Committee are confidential activities. Committee members should respect the confidentiality of the peer review process as mandated by HR-23.

### **B-1c. Completion of the Review Cycle**

At the completion of the Division review process, the Division Head prepares a letter of evaluation addressed to the Chancellor to be added to the dossier, which the Associate Dean's Office will forward for review by the College P & T Committee.

### **B-2. College Level of Review**

Purpose. The College Promotion and Tenure (P& T) Committee is constituted in accordance with the policy, HR-23, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations, to review candidates for promotion and tenure within the college. The review is based on dossiers submitted by the Associate Dean's Office and evaluations conducted sequentially by divisional P & T Committees and Division Heads.

### **B-2a. Promotion and Tenure Committee**

Committee Composition. The College Committee will be comprised of five (5) tenured faculty members holding the rank of associate professor, professor and/or equivalent rank. Four will be elected by faculty. The Associate Dean will nominate the fifth member after the election takes place. This nominee must be approved by the Berks Faculty Affairs Committee prior to his/her appointment to the College P&T Committee. Each of the three divisions must be represented by at least one member of the committee, although this requirement may be waived on an exceptional basis when there are too few faculty members at the appropriate ranks eligible for

election. No member may serve on more than one level of review of any given candidate. The term of service shall be two years or the time served in fulfillment of a committee vacancy. Terms shall be staggered to ensure continuity of membership.

Selection. The Faculty Affairs Committee of the College Senate will administer the selection process. All tenured members of the College faculty holding the rank of associate professor, professor, or equivalent rank will be eligible for election unless the member will be on leave of absence or is ineligible because of recent committee service or is otherwise unable to serve. A member may not serve two consecutive terms on the college committee. Additionally, a member may not serve more than two successive terms on the division and college committees unless there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty members; a faculty member who has served two successive terms on the division and college committees may not stand for election in the following academic year. All tenured and tenure-eligible members of the faculty who hold full-time continuing appointments will be eligible to vote. Final decisions on inability to serve on the committee shall be made by the Faculty Affairs Committee in consultation with the Division Head. Each division will elect one representative to the College P & T Committee. After the representatives of the divisions have been elected, a college-wide election will be held to elect the at-large members of the committee. The at-large members will be elected from all the eligible faculty members of the college.

Election. By mid-March, the Faculty Affairs Committee will prepare and distribute a ballot to faculty eligible to vote in each division to select a divisional representative to the College P & T Committee. Following that selection, the Faculty Affairs Committee will distribute a ballot to all faculty eligible to vote to elect the two at-large members of the College P & T Committee. One full week will be allowed for return of the ballot. (Elections for the divisional P & T Committees (see above) will follow the completion of the elections for the College P & T Committee.)

Results of the Election. Winners of the election will be determined as follows: The candidate(s) who hold(s) the rank of associate professor, professor or equivalent rank who receives the highest number of votes will be declared (a) winner(s). This (these) individual(s) will serve (a) two year term(s).

In the event that a committee member(s) is (are) unable to serve the first year of the term, a replacement(s) will be chosen to complete that year. The first-year replacement will be the individual(s) who received the highest number of votes in the remaining pool of nominees. The committee member who won the election will complete the second year of the term.

In the event that a committee member(s) elected the previous year is (are) unable to complete the second year of a term, (a) replacement(s) will be chosen to complete the remaining year of the term. The replacement will be the individual who received the highest number of votes in the remaining pool of nominees for the most recent election.

In the event of a tie for the final two-year term position or a final replacement position on the committee, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, after consulting with the candidates who are tied, determines the selection.

Filling Committee Vacancies. Results of the election will be kept on file by the Associate Dean. In the event that a vacancy occurs during the year of a review cycle, the individual with the highest number of votes in the election will be selected from the remaining pool of eligible faculty to complete the review year with the provision that the rank requirement be met.

Notification of Committee Membership. As soon as is practical after the election, the Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee will announce the election winners. In September, the Faculty Affairs Committee will send a memo to all college faculty that lists the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and indicates the chair of the committee.

Convening the Committee and Selecting a Chair. The Associate Dean shall call the initial meeting to charge the Committee, to outline procedures to be followed, and to arrange a schedule so that the College review process can be followed and completed in time to meet administrative requirements for the next review level. The Associate Dean will provide the College P&T Committee with a list of all faculty members who are to be reviewed that year for tenure with the review year designated for each, and a list of faculty members to be reviewed for promotion, with the promotion level designated for each. The newly constituted Committee will elect a Chair at its first meeting.

Responsibilities of the P&T Committee. The Committee will be responsible for assessing candidates for consideration for tenure and/or promotion and preparing letters of evaluation based on candidates' completed dossiers. The committee is expected to assess the review process and pass on any recommendations to the Penn State Berks Senate and Associate Dean.

Evaluation of the Dossier by the Committee. The Associate Dean will make the completed dossier available to the Committee in accordance with the agreed-upon schedule. The committee will write a letter of evaluation for each candidate based on the dossier and the vote of the Committee.

(a) For Tenure. The Committee will meet as a whole to discuss the performance of each tenure candidate. Additional information may be requested. At the conclusion of the discussion each Committee member will cast a ballot for or against the candidacy.

(b) For Promotion to Associate and Professor or Equivalent Rank. Only faculty members of a rank equivalent to or higher than the rank a promotion candidate is being considered for may vote on that promotion. In the event that there are Committee members of the same or lower rank than a promotion candidate, an additional member (s) with the required rank will be appointed by the Associate Dean from the college faculty to assist in the reviewing and voting process for that



promotion. If a faculty member(s) with the required rank is not available at Penn State Berks, the Associate Dean will appoint (a) faculty member(s) with the appropriate rank from another Penn State college, **in such a case approval is required from the Executive Vice President and Provost.** Additional information may be requested. At the conclusion of the evaluation each member will cast a ballot for or against each candidacy.

Letter of Recommendation. The letter of evaluation will address each criterion based on the evidence in the dossier. Each member who voted on a candidate will sign the letter of recommendation. All signed letters of evaluation must be addressed to the Dean in accordance with the schedule developed earlier. When there is dissenting opinion among the Committee, the reasons for the dissent must be addressed in the letter.

(a) 2nd-Year Tenure Review. Letters of evaluation for 2nd-year tenure reviews will be developmental in order to provide advice to candidates to assist them in earning tenure and promotion.

(b) 4th-Year Tenure Review. Letters for the 4th-year review should evaluate progress to date on all of the University criteria and continue to be developmental in preparation for the 6th year review.

Confidentiality of the Process. Individual evaluations of teaching effectiveness are considered confidential information. Deliberations and votes of the Committee are confidential activities. Committee members should respect the confidentiality of the peer review process as mandated by HR-23.

### **B-2c. Completion of the Review Cycle**

At the completion of the College review process, during the 2nd- and 4th-year reviews, the Chancellor prepares a letter of evaluation addressed to the candidate to be added to the dossier. During the 6th-year review, the Chancellor's letter is addressed to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University.

### **B-3. College and University Libraries Review Levels**

The College P & T Committee shall review each dossier for promotion and tenure in light of college and University Libraries criteria, as well as the quality of documentation, equity, and procedural fairness, and shall forward its recommendations to the College Chancellor, who shall forward his or her recommendations to the University Libraries Dean. If the decision is made at the College or University Libraries level of review not to award tenure, the College or University Libraries Dean shall notify the faculty member accordingly in writing (see Section IV.4).

### **B-4. 6th-Year Review**

All candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be informed by the Chancellor promptly whether or not their dossiers have been forwarded by the Chancellor to the University P & T Committee. In all cases where a Chancellor intends to make a negative tenure or promotion recommendation, and where all recommendations prior to the Chancellor's level have been positive, that Chancellor is required to meet with the college committee for consultation. The intent is to require full and candid discussion when such divergent recommendations occur.

## **Conclusion**

The University Promotion and Tenure Review Policy is intended to assist faculty members in improving their performance as well as to reward them for past performance. To assist faculty members still on the tenure track with performance development, the candidate needs feedback from the review process. Within a reasonable time after the dossiers have been returned to the College, the Chancellor should inform the Division Head of the action taken. The Division Head is responsible for providing feedback from the results of the entire review process to the candidate. Dossiers are retained in the Office of Academic Affairs and are accessible for candidate review.

DRAFT