



CLA Merit Guidelines for Tenure-Line Faculty Members Approved by the CLA Collegial Assembly (Revised April 2018)

Introduction

The CLA merit committee always faces an intractable problem: The total number of merit units for which departments have nominated faculty members greatly exceed the number of merit units available. In spring 2018, the Dean of CLA asked the Executive Committee to review the CLA Merit Guidelines and suggest any revisions that might improve them. The Committee solicited the views of recent chairs and members of the Merit Committee concerning how well the present Guidelines serve the College. Rather than start from scratch and overhaul the entire document, the Executive Committee has made a limited number of important changes, most of which arise out of the feedback that it received.

General Information and Requirements

Department Guidelines

The College requires each department to craft a clear departmental statement of merit criteria. The CLA Merit Guidelines offer college-wide criteria for evaluating service and teaching, and provide a broad framework within which departments will define discipline-specific measures of quality and significance for research/publication/creative works. Department guidelines must specify and explain departmental criteria for ranking journals, presses, and granting agencies (where applicable), and should include any other discipline-specific information the CLA committee will need to do its work effectively. Departments also establish tiers for research merit unit nominations.

These department guidelines are made available to all departmental faculty and filed with CLA. Departments may update or amend these documents, but the guidelines must remain constant through a merit period (i.e. for faculty preparing merit cases and for department and CLA evaluation of those cases). The dean's office will review department guidelines to ensure that they are sufficiently comprehensive; that they implement the overall standards adopted by the CLA faculty, and that they take into account disciplinary differences in ways that yield cross-departmental equity for similar levels of productivity.

Standardized Form for Submitting Merit Nominations

Department chairs will submit the standard form to the CLA Merit Committee. This form will accompany the chair's merit nomination letter. Department guidelines will be on file for Merit Committee reference.

Professional Obligations

Tenure-line faculty must fulfill obligations in all categories of professional responsibility: Research, Teaching, and Service. Those faculty members who, according to their department, are not meeting teaching obligations (including teaching their classes

adequately and holding regular office hours), or who are not meeting service obligations (including attending department or committee meetings unless excused for professional obligations/conflicts or illness), or who are not “research active,” will not receive the merit awards for which their activities in other categories might otherwise qualify them; departments may reduce the nomination that would be based on activity in the other categories down to and including 0 units. To be considered for full merit awards in areas of teaching and/or service, publication need not be the only evidence of research activity. Departments will define what meets adequate research levels for full merit consideration (as distinct from workload decisions about teaching loads). Departments should specify in their guidelines how they will implement this regulation.

Exceptions to Recommended Awards

Individuals and departments may always make a case that an individual item surpasses the usual CLA limit on number of merit units awarded.

Documentation

Applicants must document their work and, in the case of research/publication, offer evidence of its significance according to the discipline-specific standards adopted by the department. Department guidelines will specify what sorts of documentation faculty members should offer.

- Either the department chair or the department committee that handles merit decisions must verify the accuracy of faculty claims; departments must stipulate in department guidelines who is responsible for verification.
- If no documentation is provided or if documentation is excessively vague the CLA committee is encouraged to award merit at the lower level or not to award merit at all.
- If departments do not distinguish among publications—by quality of work, of journal, of press—in award nominations, the CLA committee is encouraged to award the lower level of merit or not at all.

Merit for Service with Course Release/Stipend

Individuals may be awarded merit even if they receive course releases or stipends for the work in question, but only if their work in that merit cycle exceeds the level of compensation (see “Service” section for details). For example, the claim that serving as chair or graduate/undergraduate director *always* exceeds compensation, while likely true, will not be sufficient. Individuals must document their work and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the CLA committee that it exceeds their compensation.

Publication Date

Publication date is the date of final publication, regardless of whether that is online or in print. Applicants for merit must verify that their publications were published during the period under review (i.e., between July 1 and June 30). For books, use the official publication date that may be found on the publisher’s website or Amazon.

Partial Units

The TAUP contract specifies that no one may be awarded less than a full unit, but departments may combine activities that do not individually justify a full unit. Merit nominations for combined activities will probably be most common in teaching and service categories.

Balance of Research, Teaching, and Service

These guidelines do not attempt to specify how merit units should be distributed among the categories of research, teaching, and service; that balance will probably fluctuate by year, depending on faculty activities. Since research, teaching and service are all vital to the College's success in fulfilling its mission, the CLA Merit Committee and Dean should do their best to distribute merit among the categories according to what they and future study determine to be an appropriate balance.

Allotting Units at CLA Level

Tier System

When recommended merit units exceed available units, the CLA Merit Committee will use a tiered system. These Guidelines establish two tiers for Research and three tiers for Teaching. Instead of reducing units awarded evenly across all items or creating criteria specific to that year alone, the committee will give first priority to items in the top tiers, awarding the full number of units it judges proper based on the guidelines below. Units awarded for "second tier" items/actions may be adjusted downward if necessary:

This document offers cross-departmental guidelines for what falls into each tier for teaching. Service tiers are based on the demands of the individual task, and so are not standardized. Departments will define research tiers based on discipline-specific values. However, significant peer-reviewed publications must be placed in Tier I and departments must use both tiers.

Upper Limits for Merit Awards

As a general principle, the CLA merit committee will not award more than 12-14 units to an individual in any merit cycle. This limit should not be applied in a way that would disadvantage colleagues who author scholarly books.

A Note on Comparability and Equity Across the College

Productivity and Publication

It is difficult to compare productivity across disciplines. This set of guidelines does not attempt to standardize, across the college, the number of merit units awarded for individual items. Instead, it is intended to help departments create internal merit standards that, by recognizing disciplinary differences and seeking some form of comparability across CLA departments, will allow the CLA committee to award roughly equivalent merit units to equally productive faculty members in different fields or disciplines.

Peer-review

Any published work for which merit is recommended, must have gone through a process of peer review. Applicants for merit should supply documentation that verifies this, such as from *Ulrich's Periodical Directory*, the reviews solicited by the editor/publisher of the work, correspondence from a journal or book editor describing the extent of the peer review, or other documentation.

Co-authorship

Disciplinary differences on co-authorship create challenges, as well. Co-authored work is expected—even universal—in some fields, and those who work in such fields should not be penalized. These guidelines recognize that a full co-authorship with two authors is rarely half the work of a single-authored work. At the same time, reading and offering comments on a piece can gain co-authorship in some fields but not in others; graduate-student work conducted in a professor's lab leads to co-authorship for the professor in some fields with no parallel credit in others.

Thus, in their guidelines, each department must explain how its discipline (or subfields) defines and credits co-authorship. A faculty member who applies for merit for a co-authored work must document, in appropriate, department-specified fashion, the type and amount of work he or she contributed to the final product, identifying his contributions and estimating what percentage those contributions are of the whole. This is especially important if there are more than two co-authors or if one of the authors is a graduate student.

If departments do not take cross-college comparability into account in crafting departmental guidelines, the CLA Committee will impose such comparability; in most cases that will work to the detriment of the department's candidates.

External Funding and Course Releases

The availability and importance of external funding in different fields must be taken into account. For example, departments in which faculty members have consistently low teaching loads due to externally funded research commonly have taken that difference into account in their internal merit scales. Sabbaticals, which are equally available to all tenure-line faculty, should not be weighed against merit claims.

Departmental Decisions

Tiers

Departments must place research categories into tiers; those tiers should be based on disciplinary values. For example, one discipline's tier I might include grants and articles in flagship or top journals, with articles in mid-range or lower-level journals in tier II. Another discipline might put single-authored books and top-to-mid-level journal articles in tier I, and grants and edited works in tier II.

Merit Ranges and General Criteria

The unit range (of, for example, 0 – 5) does not signify “poor” to “excellent,” but instead indicates the outer limits for nominations in that category. Department ranges should reflect disciplinary priorities, best rewarding the sort of research accomplishments the discipline deems most important. They should be framed with overall yearly merit limits in mind, and should seek cross-departmental comparability.

If a discipline does not normally define items in a specific category as a significant contribution, the department should specify a lower cap on potential units in its departmental guidelines.

The following list specifies the CLA range of possible merit units per item and offers general recommendations for departments to use in crafting department and discipline-specific merit guidelines. We do not define Tier I and Tier II because that decision will be made by each department for its discipline.

Books

Single authored, peer reviewed

Unit range: 0 – 10

Ten units for a densely researched, substantial book published by a top-tier press in the discipline; three units for brief work that is not based on original research or does not make a significant scholarly contribution and is published by a low-tier press in the discipline. Departments may offer evidence that a specific series at an otherwise mid-level press is of high quality.

Co-authored

Unit range: 0 – 7 for single co-author; adjusted downward for multiple co-authors, who must document contributions as described above.

Same criteria regarding quality as for single-authored book.

Edited Books

Unit range, single editor: 0 – 4

Unit range, co-edited: 0—3

Unit range based on quality of press, quality of contributors, quality of conceptualization, and (for co-edited) evidence of amount of contribution. Departments may make a special case for something unusually significant: a long introductory essay; piece in state-of-the-art collections such as an Oxford Companion or Blackwell volume; major, multi-volume editorial projects). Collections of essays solicited and edited for the volume should receive more credit than collections of existing essays and/or documents.

Trade Press Books

Unit range: 0 – 10, discipline specific

In some disciplines, well-respected trade presses are considered equivalent to very highly ranked university presses. Such presses must be distinguished from vanity presses. In these cases, the candidate and/or department must furnish evidence about how

publications from the press should be evaluated.

Articles

Departments must consider their own disciplinary norms and also attempt to compare expectations across disciplines (see “Comparability and Equity across the College”).

Single authored

Unit range: 0 – 4

In departments for which single-authored articles are the norm that will usually translate into:

- 4 units for a major article published in the flagship journal of a discipline (not simply the major journal in a subfield, but the type of journal that receives large numbers of submissions from the broader field and publishes a very small percentage of them); the sort of publication that, in most fields, would happen once or twice in the career of a very strong scholar.
- 2 - 3 units for substantial, significant, densely researched work published in significant journals;
- 1 unit for brief, less substantially researched work OR for work published in less competitive or lower tier journals.

Co-authored

Unit range: 0 - 4

Units allocated by criteria above; 3 and 4 units will be even more rarely awarded. Judgments here rest heavily on disciplinary norms. Co-authors must offer evidence of role played, and departments must include information about significance of order of authors or other significant criteria in departmental guidelines filed with CLA. Departments in which multiple authors are the norm may combine such articles to yield single units, if they deem it appropriate.

Book Chapters Unit range: 0 – 3

Disciplines vary here; some consider book chapters equivalent to journal articles. Criteria include ranking of press, professional status of editor(s), quality and depth of research/analysis.

Creative Works Unit range: 0 -- 8

Only those in the field of creative writing may receive merit for creative works. Thus a history professor who writes a historical novel may not receive merit for that work, nor may an economist be awarded merit for publishing a poem. The applicant or department must make the case for the significance of the work, explain how the work was professionally evaluated, and furnish information about the ranking of the press or other publication forum.

Films Unit range: 0 -- 5

Films will receive more merit units in fields for which they are the disciplinary norm, but will receive merit credit for other fields if the film is directly tied to the faculty member's

research. The applicant or department must make a case for the significance of the work, explain how the work was professionally evaluated and offer information about the ranking of the production company/forum or other criteria used in evaluation.

Translations Unit range: 0 – 4

Units depend on length of piece and difficulty of translation; applicant or department must explain criteria used.

Suggested ranges:

Books: 0 – 4 (creative work generally awarded higher range);

Articles or short pieces: 0 – 1; partial unit common

Poems: 0 – 1; partial unit common

Poetry collection: 0 – 3

Textbook

First edition, unit range: 0 – 4

Major revision, unit range: 0 – 1

General scheduled revision: 0 – partial unit

Textbooks, here, are works published by major publishing houses (e.g. McGraw-Hill, Houghton Mifflin, Wadsworth) for use in college classrooms throughout the full semester. Scholarly monographs or syntheses adopted for class reading are not textbooks, nor are sets of readings or problems created by a faculty member for use in her class or department.

Course reader

First edition, unit range: 0 – 3

Major revision, unit range: 0 – 1

General scheduled revision: 0 – partial unit

Course readers, here, are not collections of readings put together by a faculty member for use in her class or department. They are collections of primary and/or secondary readings developed for class use and published by a recognized national publishing house (e.g. Oxford, Prentice Hall).

Awards

For publication: 0 – 1

For conference paper: 0 – 1

Professional: 0 – 2

For a significant award from a major recognized professional association; must document significance.

Grants (Newly awarded only)

Unit range 0 – 5

Disciplinary differences are important here. A department may define major grants (e.g. NIH R01) as Tier I and rank them above peer-reviewed articles; departmental merit unit ranges should reflect this trade-off. Departments that emphasize grants must specify their merit standards for grants in departmental guidelines.

Fellowships

Unit range: 0 – 2

For major, external, nationally competitive fellowships only. Recipients of grants not universally assumed to be major (e.g. NEH, Guggenheim) must document competitiveness and significance of the grant.

The following scholarly activities may rise to the level of whole merit units especially if there are several of them:

Paper in published conference proceedings

Review essay

Research notes, comments

Translation of article or (relatively short) poem or brief creative work

Keynote/distinguished lecture

Not Eligible for Merit

The following scholarly activities are not eligible for merit except in truly unusual circumstances, in which case the department may make a case. For example, an NPR interview would not be considered for merit, but a department could argue that testimony before Congress that required substantial preparation did deserve consideration.

Academic conferences (presenting paper, comment, poster, roundtable, participant, workshop)

Book reviews

Creative works (for those not in the field of creative writing)

Interviews

Invited talks

Work in progress, revise and resubmit, accepted for publication, or in press

Teaching

All faculty members are expected to teach well. The CLA merit committee will recommend merit for unusually innovative teaching or for work that is above and beyond the expected levels of performance. For merit purposes, “teaching” requires interaction with students. Thus, for example, curriculum revision falls under service; textbook authoring is recognized as research. The three categories defined in this document’s introduction apply to teaching merit as follows:

Tier I: Top Priority (range 0—3 units; generally 2--3)

- Major teaching awards, including but not limited to awards from national or regional professional organizations and university or college-level awards (the Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching, the Great Teacher award, the Provost’s Award for Innovative Teaching in General Education, or the CLA Distinguished Teacher award).

- Significant innovation in classroom teaching. Examples include creating a jointly taught course that combines Temple students and students outside the US; completely reimagining the delivery method of a course; building a class project in partnership with a non-university institution (e.g., museum, community organization, NGO). Must provide evidence of design (syllabus, written statement of no more than two single-spaced pages describing project, teaching goals, and work involved; letters or documents from other institutions or individuals involved, if appropriate) and of successful implementation (SFFs; other documentation, if appropriate).

Tier II: Second Priority (range 0—2 units; generally 1-2)

- Exceptional teaching, with evidence of rigor, student workload, number and depth of assignments, engagement with students, regular introduction of new material to existing courses and/or successful teaching of department service courses and/or teaching new courses in department (i.e. existing courses that do not require COI process).
- New course, designed, approved by COI, and taught successfully. This item recognizes work that commonly takes more than a single year. Submit COI forms; syllabus; SFFs; brief statement of teaching goals, work involved, and assessment of course following first time taught.

Tier III: Third Priority (range 0—1 units)

- Strong, solid, consistent teaching. Submit portfolio (description of portfolio requirements attached to document as appendix I).
- Heavy graduate teaching load for which faculty member does not receive any course reduction (e.g., faculty member who supervises graduate students working on a funded project for which she receives a course reduction would not qualify; faculty member chairing a large number of graduate committees in addition to teaching 2/2 [or equivalent load with service reductions] could apply).
- Supervising several undergraduate or honors theses without course credit for that work (thus teaching a course in which students complete undergraduate or honors theses does not qualify).

Service

Unit range: 0 – 3

CLA is a research college composed of doctoral granting departments in an R1 university. Faculty self-governance is a cornerstone of CLA’s mission. All faculty members are expected to take appropriate responsibility, through work categorized as “service,” for governing their departments, college, university, and professions/disciplines. Simply serving on a committee at

any level is expected, as is taking leadership roles appropriate to rank. Meritorious service rises above usual expectations in quantity, quality, and documented outcome. The CLA merit committee will recommend merit for service based on the following two considerations:

1. Service portfolio is beyond what is expected for someone of that rank or seniority in quantity, quality, and documented outcome. In order to be considered for service merit, faculty must document adequate performance in all other categories of professional responsibility, namely research and teaching (see page 3).

For merit consideration, it is assumed that untenured assistant professors should be protected from heavy service loads. Nonetheless, basic service such as serving on a committee does not rise to the level of merit. For merit purposes rank and seniority will be treated equivalently: a tenured associate professor more than 14 years past the PhD will be held to the same service expectations as a full professor.

2. And, level of service exceeds the compensation for the functions performed by the faculty member.

If a faculty member who receives a course release and/or stipend in compensation for service can demonstrate that the workload for that position was unusually heavy in a particular merit cycle (e.g. an undergraduate director manages revision of the department's undergraduate curriculum), or document that the work exceeds compensation received, s/he may apply for merit.

Typically, merit will only be considered after the service has been concluded and an outcome documented (e.g., program review has been approved; an editorial term has ended, etc.) Ongoing service (editing a journal or book series, etc.) will typically not be considered in consecutive merit cycles.

Faculty members may request merit for department, college, university, or professionally based community service that exceeds expectations. Depending on rank, some combination of the following is considered expected service: at the department level: 1-2 standing committees; at college and university: 1-2 standing committees; and to profession: active involvement in standing committees of a national flagship organization. In departments with few standing committees, tasks such as advising students, planning cultural events or lectures that take the place of standing committee service are typically not by themselves considered meritorious.

Conducting internal or external promotion and tenure reviews, providing book or journal referee reports are considered professional obligations and will not be considered for service merit.

Examples of meritorious service in addition to the above include:

Department:

- New program development or extensive curricular revision
- Preparing for and concluding an external department or program review

- Preparing for and concluding a departmental or program strategic plan

College/University:

- Service on standing college or university committee(s) charged with critical curricular or policy functions requiring regular meetings and extensive document review or preparation, provided the service is in addition to regular departmental, college, and university service and the request is supported by the committee chair or other administrator. Merit recommendation is typically considered once in the duration of the committee service.

Profession:

- Uncompensated service on fellowship or grant review committees (NEH, NIH, NSF, Fulbright, etc.)
- Book prize committee
- Program committee for national conference
- Executive committee of flagship professional society (as noted above, typically awarded at the end of the term)
- Organizing a national or international scholarly conference
- Editing a professional peer-reviewed journal or peer-reviewed scholarly book series on an ongoing basis (in contrast to a single special issue which would be considered for research merit) may be considered meritorious provided the duties are not otherwise compensated with course reduction or stipend; the venue belongs to the discipline's Tier I; and the candidate can document outcomes (number of submissions; number of published articles per issue; rank in discipline; number of monographs published each cycle, etc.)
- Professional community service may count for merit when it involves extensive pro bono work based on the faculty member's research expertise (e.g., service on a major's or other government council based on a faculty member's expertise in a needed area)
- Media appearances, paid consulting, and public office are typically not considered for service merit.

Documentation:

Applicants must document service as extensively as other meritorious work, detailing the scope and duration of activities, outcomes, and the importance of that work to the department, college, university or profession. A letter from the committee or department chair, college or university administrator, or administrator within the professional organization is expected to accompany the merit recommendation.

Appendix I

Comparison of research standards for tenure and promotion tied to standardized merit points

In order to offer some means for cross-discipline and cross-sub-field comparison, we gathered information that should allow for such comparison: basic research standards for tenure in a strong department. (Because we are not comparing standards for departments at Temple, we avoid claims about which Temple departments are stronger than others.) Not all disciplines are included here.

We assigned a standard number of merit units to the items: for articles, 3 points for the “high” range and 2 points for the “low” range (reflecting different possible ranking of journals); for books, a standard 10 points. The information below suggests that allotting a standard number of merit units to a particular item (an article in a second-tier journal, for example) across all disciplines does not further our goal of rewarding comparably productive scholars in different disciplines in a comparable fashion.

Information about tenure standards was provided by TU department chairs or former chairs.

Basic Research Standards for Tenure

Basic publication standards for tenure in a strong department of History:

a book published by a well-regarded (usually academic) press;
1--2 articles/book chapters in peer-reviewed publications
evidence the candidate has defined a new research project.

Merit point range:

*12 (low—book and one 2-pt article)
to 16 (high—book and two 3-pt articles) points*

Basic publication standards for tenure in a strong department of Political Science:

Either: a book published by a good university press
2—3 articles in at least second-tier peer-reviewed journals one
of which is for a new project beyond the book

Merit point range:

14 (low) to 19 (high) points

OR: 8—10 articles in peer-reviewed journals
mostly single-authored, if many are co-authored 10 minimum
most published in at least second-tier journals

Merit point range:

16 (low) to 24 (high)—assuming 8 articles

Basic publication standards for tenure in a strong department of Sociology:

Either: approximately 2 articles a year in good/well-known though not necessarily top-tier journals (12 articles, at 2 or 3 points each)

Merit point range:

24 (low) to 36 (high)

OR: a book published by a well-regarded university press

And 1-2 journal articles or book chapters

Merit point range:

12 (low—book and one 2-pt article)

to 16 (high—book and two 3-pt articles)

Basic publication standards for tenure in a strong department of Psychology:

At least two articles per year in top journals

Major grant (not necessary but at least likelihood of one)

Merit range:

36 (low) to 41

(a low estimate of high range; 12 articles plus major grant)

Basic publication standards for tenure in a strong department of Economics:

3—4 articles in first-tier journals

OR 5—6 articles in second-tier journals

OR some combination thereof

Merit range:

9 (low) to 15 (high)

Basic publication standards for tenure in a strong department of English:

Book published by a strong academic press

1-2 articles or book chapters

Evidence that the candidate has begun a new research project

Merit point range:

12 (low; book and one 2-pt article)

to 16 (high; book and two 3-pt articles)

Appendix II

Teaching portfolio requirements as previously adopted

Recommendation for creating new Temple University, CLA, Teaching Portfolio for purposes of Merit, Tenure, and Promotion assessment

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Assessment November 18, 2009

Contents of Teaching Portfolio:

1. Copy of Course Syllabi (For Merit consideration: include all courses in academic year being considered for merit. For Tenure/Promotion consideration: include all semesters at Temple University)
2. SFFs (formerly CATE evaluations)
3. A statement that includes the following (no more than two single spaced pages)
 - a. What were your teaching goals for these courses?
 - b. What, specifically, did you do to try to achieve these goals?
 - c. Where there any particular challenges posed by any of these courses that you would like to note?
 - d. How do you evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of your performance in these courses?
 - e. Why do you feel that your teaching, and teaching related service, should be awarded merit?
4. A sample of work done by your students (one paper/assessment that you gave that you then awarded a grade of A, and one paper/assessment that you gave students that you awarded a D or lower). Please make a Xerox of these items for inclusion in the portfolio with the student's name removed.*
5. A statement from the Chair (for instructions on writing this statement, see below)
6. A record of previous teaching awards received (to be provided by CLA)

Chair's Statement:

For any faculty member seeking a merit award for teaching, the department chair shall write a statement for that faculty member's teaching portfolio (above) that addresses the following questions:

1. Provide the SFFs (formerly CATE scores) for question 8 "The instructor taught this course well" for the candidate and all others in the Department teaching the same course (or comparable courses if fewer than four sections of the same course were offered).
2. How would you characterize the particular challenges that any of these courses pose the faculty member who teaches them?
3. Based on the course work that the candidate has provided you, how would you characterize the assessments that this candidate is giving students as well as the candidate's evaluation of student work?
4. How do you (or your department merit committee) rank this candidate vis-à-vis the other faculty members seeking teaching merit awards in this

same merit cycle?

5. If the candidate is applying for merit on the basis of teaching-related service, such as new course development, etc., please specify if course load reductions or any other compensation was provided.

Revisions Approved by the CLA Collegial Assembly, March 2013
Revisions Approved by the CLA Collegial Assembly, April 2017
Revisions Approved by the CLA Collegial Assembly, April 2018