



College of Liberal Arts

Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures

Revision Passed by the CLA Collegial Assembly March 2017

PREAMBLE

The College of Liberal Arts, in its hiring, tenure, and promotion of faculty, is committed to the production of knowledge and creative achievement in concert with high-quality teaching. In keeping with a liberal arts tradition, the college values the development of undergraduate and graduate students in concert with promoting the production of scholarship. The college also recognizes the importance of service to supporting and promoting these goals.

Incorporating a range of fields and disciplinary approaches, the college also recognizes the distinctions between fields and sub-disciplines while maintaining the level of excellence in scholarship/creative achievement, teaching, and service that unifies us as a faculty.

This document will outline collegial procedures and standards for tenure and promotion, and will be utilized in concert with departmental guidelines. The standards, rules, and procedures that follow further define the rules established by the President's guidelines and the contractual regulations governed by the TAUP contract.

Where relevant, these standards will be cited. If college standards, rules, or procedures are in conflict with the Presidential guidelines or the TAUP contract, these other documents will supersede this document.

Individual departments will issue their own guidelines to define and specify disciplinary standards and expectations. In these documents, the weight of each category, delineated in section 3A below, will guide the manner in which a candidate is to be evaluated. Such documents produced at the departmental level will conform with the current document. If departmental and college rules and procedures are found to be in conflict, the college document will supersede departmental practices.

I. General Considerations Regarding Tenure and Promotion

- A. All individuals who are appointed to a tenure-track faculty position are eligible to apply for tenure at any time, regardless of rank as long as nominations are received by the Dean's office by the April deadline each year for consideration in the following academic year. A candidate should consult with their Department Chair to help determine whether the quality of the candidate's teaching and scholarship/creative achievement constitutes "outstanding."
- B. Tenured faculty are eligible for promotion at any time, as long as nominations are received by the Dean's office by the April deadline each year for consideration in the following academic year. Promotion depends

only on their record of accomplishment rather than on number of years in rank.

- C. A faculty member on the tenure track is required to be reviewed for tenure no later than the sixth year of his/her tenure track probationary period, unless a shorter period is stated otherwise in the appointment letter.
- D. If an individual has not been formally informed of being considered for tenure during the year in which such consideration is mandatory, it shall be the responsibility of the individual to inform, in writing, by December 1 of that year, the department chairperson, Dean, Provost, and the TAUP that such tenure consideration is necessary.
- E. All individuals who are appointed to a tenure-track faculty position are eligible to apply for tenure at any time, regardless of rank. Excluded, in addition to part-time personnel, are all individuals serving on an agreed upon limited period of service such as visiting faculty, non-tenure track faculty or faculty serving limited terms related to the consummation of specific research programs.
- F. Within the College, recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate or full professor shall include tenure.
- G. The Tenure Review Committee shall evaluate all tenure recommendations, including all promotions of untenured faculty.
- H. The Promotion Review Committee shall consider all recommendations to promote tenured faculty.
- I. Both tenure and promotion shall be based on the quality of teaching, research, and service. However, tenure decisions also shall take into account the individual's promise for his or her discipline and the long-term structural needs of the department and College.
- J. The University's affirmative action goals shall be served primarily by giving the fullest possible consideration to women and minority candidates in hiring decisions and by adhering strictly to a policy of non-discrimination towards all faculty in hiring, tenure and promotion decisions, on grounds of race, sex, age, religion, national origin, physical disability, sexual orientation or marital status.

II. Evaluation Standards for Tenure and Promotion

The standards for tenure are stated in the TAUP and Law Professors Collective Bargaining Association contracts, and restated here for clarity:

With due consideration to the academic needs of the department and/or College or School, consideration for tenure shall be based primarily on outstanding performance and continuing promise of outstanding

performance as a faculty member. Teaching/instruction and research/scholarship/creative activity shall be primary in this evaluation.

University service, service to the profession/discipline, and discipline-based community service will be secondary. The standard of outstanding performance in research/scholarship/creative activity for tenure will be informed by the standards for tenure at other national research universities appropriate to the discipline under consideration. The award of tenure, thus, is a recognition of the candidate's performance throughout his or her career and an assessment that the faculty member is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments throughout the period of his/her service as a member of the University faculty. Personal and professional integrity are assumed. The ultimate goal of all tenured appointments is to build the best possible faculty for the University.

The TAUP guidelines state that research/creative achievement and teaching will be primary in the evaluation of promotion to any rank while service is secondary. In the case of the promotion of an associate professor to a full professor, candidates' research/creative achievement will be expected to have made an impact on their field. Such an impact can be assessed by the quality and range of publications, reviews which indicate the significance of the candidate's body of work, and other indicators of the field's recognition of the candidate's work.

Nonetheless, a candidate for promotion to Full Professor is expected to have shown significant leadership within some combination of service to the department, college, University, or to the candidate's field.

III. Evidence of Quality in Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service

A. Research

In the College of Liberal Arts, candidates for tenure and for promotion will have their entire body of scholarship and/or creative achievement considered in the course of a tenure and/or promotion review. In the case of a tenure decision, work produced in a six-year probationary period will be emphasized; this may include time, experience, and accomplishments accumulated at other institutions. Officially sanctioned stops of the tenure clock may lengthen the six-year period, but scholarship published while the clock is stopped will not be excluded from consideration. The six-year period does not preclude consideration of prior achievement when relevant to a full consideration of the candidate's career. In the case of a promotion review, the review will emphasize the period since tenure. This will not preclude consideration of achievement prior to tenure when relevant to a full consideration of the candidate's career. In both cases, continuing scholarly production should be demonstrated for a vote as "outstanding" in research and/or creative achievement, as should a coherent program of research likely to lead to future production within the field. While modes of assessing "outstanding" achievement in research and/or creative work vary, the work should be evaluated in terms of the quality and originality of thought, intellectual rigor, methodological rigor, contribution to the field, and creativity.

Work in press or in published form will be the primary sites of evaluation for internal and external evaluators. Work in progress or work submitted for publication but not yet accepted can help guide internal and external committees in their assessment of a candidate's likely continued scholarly production in his/her field. Candidates should carefully consider including such work in their dossier in order to provide evidence of future scholarly production.

In assessing a candidate's body of research and/or creative achievement, the standards of the field should direct internal and external reviews of the candidate's file. For example, an important distinction exists between fields and subfields in which books are the primary mode of producing and disseminating knowledge and fields where article production is the most important. The expectation of scholarly rate of production should also be determined by disciplinary norms.

Candidates are required to include in their CV all of the information necessary for the proper evaluation of their research. Required information and format can be found in the illustrative CV appended to this document.

Books

In certain fields, books are the primary index of scholarly achievement. Outstanding contributions in the field can be ascertained by a range of factors, all of which should be weighed in determining the quality of a book or book-in-progress. The quality of the press with which the book has been placed is important. Various factors can help determine the quality of a press, including the reputation of the press as noted by internal and external reviewers. In certain emergent fields, presses may have a strong reputation in certain fields or sub-fields. Evidence of the status of the press can be determined by its editorial board as well as notable books previously published by the press. Books should have received peer review as part of the publication process, and if there is any question of the peer-reviewed process, the candidate should clarify the press' review process. Self-published books and books from vanity presses will rarely be given favorable weight in making an evaluation of faculty research and/or creative activity.

An individual book's contribution can be assessed by a range of factors. External evaluators are essential for evaluating the significance of the scholarship. When a book has been in press long enough for published reviews, these are helpful in assessing the impact on the field. This is particularly important in cases of promotion to full professor. Prizes or awards for books are a strong indication of the field's recognition of a book's significance. The number of libraries that own the book can provide some sense of its distribution, but again must be weighed carefully, especially when evaluating smaller fields and emergent disciplines. For books in press, which can be considered in a tenure or promotion case, reviews of the manuscript acquired by the press are also useful indicators of the likely impact a book will have in a field.

Journal Articles

Articles are the main venue for publishing in certain fields within the College of Liberal Arts, and an important complementary arena of publication in others. The mechanisms by which articles' contributions to the field can be measured include the stature of the

journal, the selectivity of the journal, the role of peer-review in the publication process, and the impact the article will make on the field.

The stature of the journals in which the candidate has published should be assessed. In certain fields, journal impact numbers can aid in this evaluation, while in other fields, rankings of journals have not been translated into quantifiable rankings. Departmental guidelines should delineate the significance of such quantifiable factors in evaluating journals within the field, with careful attention to sub-fields and emerging disciplines. Where such rankings are not available, the stature of a journal can be evaluated through the reputation of a publication in the field or rankings of journals by professional organizations in fields or sub-disciplines. The publications produced by the discipline's professional organization, for example, often carry significant weight within the field. The peer-reviewed status of a journal is a significant determiner of the importance of a journal in contributing to new knowledge within a field. Other forms of measurement may include the percentage of submitted articles published by the journal, and the composition of the editorial board. Judgments of external evaluators should be considered in weighing the significance of the journal.

In certain fields, citation indexes and journal impact ratings may provide useful information on the contribution an article has made within the field. In other fields, these mechanisms do not provide useful information, and impact on the field will be measured through external reviewers' review of the work and other qualitative evaluations. Where relevant, the candidate will provide citations by other scholars (self-citations should not be included) and impact factors. Candidates should always indicate the peer-reviewed status of published work.

Citations, impact factors and the peer review status of journals can be confirmed through Thompson Web Knowledge ISI Journal Citation Reports, Ulrich's Periodical Directory and other sources. Library holdings may be determined by using the RLG Union Catalog or WorldCAT. Assistance with appropriate resources can be obtained from the University's professional librarians.

Book Chapters

Book chapters within essay collections also make a very important contribution to knowledge production in a field. Assessing the caliber of that contribution should consider the quality of the press producing the volume, the status of peer-review in the selection of and production of the volume, the editor of the volume, and, where relevant, editorial boards for the volumes or the venue which might have resulted in the collected volume, such as the proceedings of a significant conference.

Creative Work

For creative works, the standing of the forum in which the creative work is presented, the scope of the audience, the method for selecting participants, and the subsequent published reviews should be taken into account. Commissions for creative works are indicators of works' importance. Internal and external evaluators should identify the importance of such commissions. Prizes and awards should be given significant weight.

Co-, Joint- or Multi-Authored Research or Creative Work

In some fields, co-authored work is the norm, while in others sole-authored work is to be expected. In all publications that are co-written, the candidate's role should be clearly established, and the publication weighed accordingly. This information should be included in the candidate's CV.

Evidence of other forms of publication

Other forms of publication, such as encyclopedias and annotated bibliographies, are not typically accorded the same status as peer-reviewed journals or monographs. They may, where the publication has a high degree of visibility, serve as additional evidence of a candidate's stature in his or her field. Further, they can illustrate a candidate's coherent program of research in his or her field.

Papers and Presentations

Papers and presentations presented in any format at professional meetings make a contribution to research/scholarship/creative activity. Invited lectures may contribute to scholarship, and often represent recognition of a candidate's achievement in the field by those inviting the candidate to lecture. Internal and external evaluators should consider the prominence of the meeting at which a presentation was made, its review process, and the scope of the meeting (e.g. local, national), and the make-up of the audience. While integral to a candidate's scholarly record, papers and presentations will be less significant than published work. These documents may be included in the candidate's dossier.

External funding

In some fields represented within the College of Liberal Arts, external funding is a key measure of success within the field and provides the groundwork for research and scholarship. In other fields, external funding is rare, and its absence should not be weighed when reviewing a candidate's dossier. In fields in which external grant support is important to conducting research, successful grant proposals are indicative of scholars' efforts to secure external funding in support of their work. Evidence of strong proposals, both funded and those not funded, can be included as evidence of a track record of seeking external funding. Readers' reports as well as notices of awards can be included within a candidate's file.

B. Teaching

In general, evidence of "outstanding" teaching will be addressed in the internal reviews of the candidate. In assessing a candidate's record of teaching, the range of teaching experiences of a candidate will be considered, taking account of the differing levels of instruction assigned to the faculty member (introductory to graduate) and the different forms of instructional delivery required by these assignments (e.g. lecture course, laboratory section, individual or group tutorial, individualized instruction, such as independent studies and the direction of master's or doctoral theses). "Outstanding" teachers are effective in a variety of teaching situations, though their contribution should be considered as a whole.

Teaching embraces classroom instruction and a range of faculty-student interactions. Outstanding teachers have a profound knowledge of their subject. They continually refresh their teaching by incorporating advances in their fields. They care for their students as individuals and thus make class objectives and deadlines clear, set high standards and hold students to them. They also provide extensive and useful feedback to students' work. In all interactions with students, outstanding teachers are open-minded, fair, and accessible. They maintain civility in and out of the classroom.

Outstanding teaching should be marked by rigor in terms both of the effective communication of the candidate's field of expertise as well as the expectations set for students within the classroom or other educational settings. Such evidence of rigor can be assessed through a statement of teaching philosophy, course materials, student evaluations, peer reviews, level of and usefulness of feedback provided to students (reviewers should look here for constructive feedback and challenging standards established by the faculty member), and grade distributions.

In addition to a focus on high standards and rigorous review of student work, outstanding teachers can also contribute to student welfare through advising and career guidance. The extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance and advising of students and his or her contribution to student welfare are relevant in the appraisal of the teacher's value to the University.

Evaluation of teaching should consider student evaluations, which play an important role in evaluating the effectiveness of teaching. The review of course evaluations should be conducted holistically; evaluators should consider the entire range of teaching reports as well as the valuable information provided by questions on an instructor's promptness in returning written assignments, fairness in grading, amount of effort required in class, and the range of grades students expect to receive in the course. SFF forms can also be supplemented by departmental or program evaluation forms: the goal is to provide the committee with as full a picture of a candidate's teaching as possible with the goal of assessing intellectual challenge and/or rigor as well as student enthusiasm within the teaching evaluations.

If a candidate's range of teaching experiences has included service at another university or college, student evaluation forms from other institutions can be considered in a tenure or promotion case. In tenure on appointment cases, such evaluations will necessarily weigh heavily in internal evaluations of the candidate's teaching.

Classroom visits by peers are a very useful complement to quantitative data from SFFs and discursive comments from student evaluation forms. Peer reviews will be most effective when they occur throughout the candidate's probationary period. The most effective peer reviews combine classroom visits with an examination of the syllabus and readings and consider the grading practices in the class. The reviews of the classroom experience should evaluate student learning and the effective delivery of information. Where appropriate, in order to provide the fullest portrait of the candidate's teaching abilities, subsequent class visits may be recorded in the peer evaluation.

Course development and the course materials that speak to a candidate's development as a teacher allow internal evaluators to evaluate the growth of and the successes of candidate for tenure. The range of material that can testify to the quality of a faculty member's performance as a teacher should include examples of instructional materials, including syllabi, exams, supplementary course readings, and the development of learning technologies. Innovations in teaching methods or instructional methodology, including technological advances, should be documented and evaluated. Student products, evidence of student learning, including later successes of students are also helpful in illuminating the effectiveness of teaching. These can include examples of graded student work, which can help the committee assess the quality of the feedback students receive from faculty members.

In departments with graduate programs and in cases of promotion to full professor, work with graduate students--including advising on dissertation committees, directing dissertations, mentoring, and other forms of work with graduate students, such as joint publication, relevant to field, should be considered. The material to document this may include a record of dissertation advising, graduate examination activities, letters from graduate students, and information about student placement.

Prizes, awards, and other formal recognition of outstanding performance in teaching/instruction should be given substantial weight. The character of such formal recognition should be described in the evaluative statements submitted by the appropriate faculty committee or administrator.

Teaching/instruction skills may also be demonstrated through public lectures or other presentations to professional conferences, faculty and/or student groups, or community groups. External evaluators may be able to comment on the teaching skills of a candidate through professional presentations.

Textbooks, pedagogical articles, and similar studies of instruction should usually be considered as evidence of teaching/instruction and should be evaluated based on their quality, the character of the journal or other forum, citation of the work by others, and other indicators of the impact on teaching/instruction and learning. In certain disciplines, studies of teaching will constitute and will be evaluated as research.

C. Service

Outstanding discipline-related service to the department, college, University, and to a candidate's field more generally should be valued in promotion and tenure decisions; such service complements the important role that faculty play in University governance.

A candidate's involvement in student organizations, membership on committees, chairing committees, or leadership positions as the head of a program, department or unit are all considered forms of service to Temple University. An evaluation of service should consider the quality of, and not just the performance of, service to the department, college, or University. Thus, distinctions should also be made between very important and nominal service assignments, between brief and extended service, between regular and sporadic participation, and between effective and ineffectual involvement.

As a norm, departments should shield untenured faculty from onerous or time-consuming committee assignments, including excessive service on dissertation committees.

Service to an academic discipline or profession may involve responsibilities in academic and professional associations, such as serving as editor of a journal, reviewing manuscripts for journals or publishers, serving on accreditation panels or program review committees at other institutions, or serving as an officer or committee member of professional organizations.

Public services by members of the faculty to the community, the state, and the nation are likewise valued insofar as these services involve the faculty member's professional, disciplinarily-based skills.

Internal and external reviews should evaluate both the evidence of the faculty member's service and the quality and importance of these contributions. The means by which assessment was undertaken should be clear, and independent evaluation of the scope and effectiveness of a candidate's service should be obtained whenever possible.

IV. Departmental Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenure

- A. Tenure consideration shall start at the department level and operate according to standing written procedures defined and approved by the tenured members of the department and by the Dean. The procedures shall prescribe the selection method for and composition of the committee that makes tenure decisions. In departments of fewer than three tenured faculty, the Dean and the tenured faculty will together establish tenure procedures.
- B. Departmental deliberations shall adhere to the following guidelines.
 - 1. Departmental policies and procedures shall clarify the means used to evaluate research, teaching, and service and norms and assumptions relevant to the field about the evaluation of "outstanding."
 - 2. On some of these matters there may be continuing, clearly-marked differences among the tenured members of a department, and hence there may be more than one set of commonly-held assumptions or norms. So far as possible, untenured faculty members should be made aware of these disciplinary divisions when they may affect a future tenure decision on the candidate.
 - 3. When possible, changes in a department's assessment of its long-term structural needs should be communicated promptly to any faculty members who may be directly affected.
 - 4. Departments shall have the same committee evaluate candidates for tenure and for promotion to Associate. Only full professors can review cases for promotion to full professor.

5. The chair of the department and/or the chair of the departmental review committee will aid the candidate in the preparation of the review file, though it is the candidate's responsibility to document his/her scholarship, teaching, and service.
6. The file must be submitted in compliance with College and University guidelines.
7. Systematic procedures (comparable for all candidates) should be employed in gathering and assessing research, teaching, and service.
8. In order to allow for the evaluation of scholarly or creative activities, the candidate may supply the department with a list of individuals competent to judge his or her work; the list shall contain a brief description of each person and his or her relationship to the candidate. Individuals with a conflict of interest – such as former faculty mentors, collaborators, family or close friends – should not be asked to write an external evaluation. The department will compile their own list which, in keeping with university rules, shall be submitted to the Dean. The Dean, who has the right to add and/or subtract names to those suggested by the candidate and the department, will then finalize this list of independent outside reviewers for the candidate. In accordance with University guidelines, of the required seven (7) external reviewers, no more than two may come from the candidate's recommendation, no more than two may come from outside academia, and no more than two may come from non-US institutions.
9. No external letters will be excised in the course of gathering letters for a candidate's tenure and/or promotion file. The department chairperson or committee chairperson is responsible for all contacts with independent outside reviewers, who should be asked to describe the terms of their professional relationship, if any, with the candidate. The chairperson shall retain records of all contacts with external reviewers.
10. Departmental procedures should require that the committee, which makes the final departmental recommendation, meet at least twice to consider each case. The preliminary meeting or meetings of such committee should make certain that the committee has all of the information needed for a recommendation, defines the issues raised by the candidate's credentials, and begins discussion of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in research, teaching, and service.

11. Departmental procedures should define eligibility with regard to voting on tenure recommendations. Please see the attached side letter agreement between TU and TAUP on the role of the department chair in the tenure and promotion process at the departmental level. Each member of a tenure committee should, before voting, review all the materials that the committee, after discussion with the candidate, defines as relevant. College rules stipulate that faculty members who do not read the materials and do not participate in the deliberations may not vote. While untenured faculty members are excluded from voting on tenure cases, they may submit confidential letters of evaluation, if they wish, for inclusion in the candidate's file.
12. Any vote that is not unanimous needs to be explained by the departmental review committee in its report.

C. Following action by the department, the department chairperson has these responsibilities, in keeping with the TAUP contact:

1. To make an independent recommendation on each tenure case and to communicate this recommendation to the appropriate committee of the department.
2. To inform the candidate of the departmental and his or her recommendation. The department chair must confer with the candidate to inform him/her of the basis for any negative recommendations.
3. To inform the candidate of his/her right to prepare a response to all materials that go forward. The chair must give the candidate 10 days to prepare his/her response to the next level of review. Access to independent outside evaluations must be obtained through the Vice-Provost's office, in keeping with University guidelines.
4. To transmit all of the recommendations of the departmental committee and the chairperson to the College level for consideration.

V. **Promotion Procedures at the Departmental Level**

A. Recommendations for promotion in rank may originate with

1. The chairperson (or director) after consultation with those of the highest rank in the department or with the appropriate faculty vehicle of the department.
2. The individual faculty member, by nominating him or herself directly to the Dean.

3. The Dean.
 4. Any faculty member of the highest rank in the department who chooses to nominate the candidate to the Dean.
- B. In the case of all nominations, including those by or to the Dean, the department shall fully evaluate the candidate. Each department should have standing written procedures for the selection and membership of the department committee for making promotion recommendations that have been reviewed and approved by the Dean. Procedures for selection of the promotion committee should be approved by the faculty of highest rank in the department. In cases of promotion to Full Professor where there are fewer than three Full Professors in the department, the Dean and the department will together establish a committee.
- C. Department procedures should, otherwise, follow the rules for the gathering of independent outside reviewers, the deliberation procedures, and the responsibilities of the department chair as detailed in section IV.B. and section IV.C.

VI. Status and Composition of College Review Committees

A. Status

The Tenure Review Committee and Promotion Review Committee shall be standing committees of the College. Their recommendations shall be forwarded to the Dean. Both committees shall be guided in their deliberations by College and University policies. Insofar as possible, they should apply rather than make policy.

B. Composition

The Tenure and Promotions Review Committees shall each consist of six faculty appointed to overlapping, three-year terms by the Dean.

Membership shall come equally from the two divisions of the College and is limited to tenured faculty; membership on the Promotions Review Committee is further limited to Full Professors.

VII. Tenure and Promotion Procedures at the College Level

- A. The Tenure Review Committee shall review recommendations for tenure made in the departments. The Promotion Review Committee shall review departmental recommendations for promotion for already tenured faculty. The reviews will inquire into both the substance of the recommendations and into procedures.
- B. In reviewing departmental recommendations, both college review committees will rely primarily on a candidate's file as forwarded to the College by the department.

1. The department will aid the candidate to compose his/her file for consideration, but the candidate bears the primary responsibility to see that the file is adequate and complete.
 2. College review committees may request from departments or from candidates that additional material be submitted for inclusion in the file through the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.
 3. If new information concerning materials in the file comes to light during the review process, the candidate may make that information available. For example, a candidate may notify reviewers of the acceptance of an article, or the publication of a work in press or a decision on a grant application. New information should be given to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs who shall forward the information to all previous levels of review and for inclusion in the file for subsequent review levels.
 4. The college P&T review committees shall maintain oversight over the promotion and tenure policies and procedures of departments to ensure that files sent to the College for review are adequate and complete. Departments shall submit copies of their tenure and promotion policies and procedures to the relevant college committee for its approval. When departments desire to modify their approved procedures, they must submit proposed changes, in writing, to the Dean. When a department is changing its policies, however, neither the College nor the department may change the policies and procedures applied to any individual candidate once a review has been initiated.
- C. Normally, candidates, departmental chairpersons, and other department members will initiate communication with the chairpersons of the college review committees only through the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.
- D. Once college review committees have completed an initial review of a candidate's file, the chairpersons of those committees may consult with the candidate, department chairperson, or other department members to clarify or corroborate documents or letters in the file or to explore disagreements or divergences in assessments through the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. Candidates shall be provided with a summary of the evaluations shall have the opportunity to respond to such material. A candidate has the right to request a meeting with the appropriate college review committee.
- E. A college review committee may ask to discuss aspects of a case with a department chair, a department review committee, or a tenure/promotion candidate in order to clarify any ambiguities or questions about materials in the file. These requests should be made through the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs by the chairs of the college review committees.
- F. The college review committees shall each prepare for each case a statement summarizing the evidence considered and setting forth the reasons for the decisions reached. Within their report, the college review committee will observe

the confidentiality of the independent external reviewers. A candidate shall have the right to obtain a copy of the statement regarding his or her case and be given a ten calendar days to write a response to the next level of review.

At each level, candidates may respond in writing to the transmittal document(s), directing their responses as follows:

- Responses to the department committee are directed to the department chair;
- Responses to the department chair are directed to the college or school committee;
- Responses to the college or school committee are directed to the dean;
- Responses to the dean are directed to the Council of Deans and/or the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee;
- Responses to the Council of Deans or the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee are directed to the provost;
- Responses to the provost are directed to the president.

G. Following consideration by the college review committees, the Dean has these responsibilities:

1. To make an independent recommendation on each tenure and promotion case and to communicate these recommendations to the faculty members under review.
2. In preparing the Dean's recommendation regarding tenure, the Dean should explicitly state any understandings that may have been agreed to at the time of hiring regarding the timing of the tenure decision and the number of years, if any, to be credited to the faculty person regarding time in rank as Assistant Professor.
3. To transmit all recommendations to the Provost as chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee.

VIII. Tenure on Hire

With the approval of the Provost, individual cases of tenure on hire may be handled by an expedited procedure while still adhering to the same standards require for tenure. The expedited procedures will be governed by the Temple-TAUP contract).

IX. Procedural Timetable

N.B.: The dates listed below represent the normal timetable but are not fixed absolutely. Candidates and departments should also consult the Faculty Affairs calendar available on the CLA website for updated information. The candidate, department, and College will cooperate in a good faith effort to meet these deadlines. Dates may be shifted forward or backward if deadlines are changed at a level above the College or if exceptional

circumstances warrant such changes. Departments are encouraged to adopt a departmental calendar to accommodate this schedule.

February/March

- Mandatory tenure review notices sent.
- Notice to all faculty members requesting nominations for promotion outside of the routine departmental process.

April

- Chair's list of departmental promotion and tenure cases is due in the Dean's Office. Any candidate who wishes to be considered for tenure before their mandatory tenure date must inform the department chair and the Dean's office of their intention to be considered for tenure in the coming year.
- All faculty who wish to be considered for promotion in the coming academic year must inform their chair and the Dean's office of their intention to be considered for promotion by the deadline set by the Dean's office, typically the first week of April.
- Departments begin drawing up a list of external evaluators and send those lists to the Dean's office for approval. The Dean may add names to and/or subtract names from the list of reviewers. Candidates supply books, reprints, and other documentation of their scholarship to be sent to external reviewers. Departmental committees begin the work of planning for tenure or promotion reviews.

May

Chairs inform the department as a whole of the names of faculty who have applied for tenure and/or promotion.

June

Dossiers should be sent to the external reviewers no later than early June.

September

Department chair reviews candidate's file to assure completeness. Departments continue their tenure and promotion review processes.

Early November

Departments submit all materials for Promotion and Tenure cases to the Dean's Office.

Early December

CLA Tenure and CLA Promotions Committees submit their recommendations to the Dean.

Mid December

College Promotion and Tenure Committees notify the departments and candidates of recommendations.

**January/
Early Feb**

Dean notifies departments and candidates of recommendations to the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee.

NOTE: Please consult the CLA Faculty Affairs calendar (updated yearly) on the CLA website (www.temple.edu/cla) for exact due dates for promotion and tenure materials.

X. Candidates' Rights

A. Access to Information.

1. All tenure and promotion procedures, including department-college-University review schedules, must be in writing and made available to the candidate; included must be items such as criteria, documentation required, the use of external reviewers, size and composition of committees, voting rights, appeals procedures, role of department chairperson, role of the Dean, access to files.
2. Department-College-University review committee rosters, noting the chairpersons, must be made available to the candidate, upon request, for purposes of communication at appropriate time points in tenure/promotion decision process.
3. A tenure and/or promotion candidate shall be informed of the decision of departmental and college committees immediately following a positive or negative recommendation. After a recommendation has been made at the departmental level, (a) the candidate shall be informed by the department chairperson, during a conference, of the basis for the decision, and (b) all evaluations from internal and external sources shall be made available to the candidate upon request, provided that all identifying information of evaluators be deleted from such documents. This will allow the candidate to prepare a rebuttal document answering the judgments of department and college committees, if he or she so chooses, and forward it to the college review committee or the Dean, as appropriate. If a negative recommendation has been made at the Dean's level, (a) the candidate shall be informed by the Dean, and (b) all evaluations from internal and external sources, used during the review, shall be made available to the candidate, together with a copy of the statement prepared by the college review committee, provided that all identifying information of evaluators be deleted from such documents by the appropriate body. This will allow the candidate to prepare a rebuttal statement answering the judgments, if he or she so chooses, and forward it to the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee. The candidate has the right to confer with the Dean about the Dean's recommendation.

B. To Request Removal from Consideration.

1. Candidates may request in writing that they be removed from consideration for tenure prior to review by the Board of Trustees.

2. In mandatory tenure cases, the candidate may request removal from consideration by submitting a letter of resignation; in such cases, a terminal year contract may be granted.
3. The candidate's removal from consideration, in non-mandatory tenure cases, shall not affect a future tenure consideration.

College of Liberal Arts
Organizational Outline for Promotion and Tenure Files

Materials Submitted by the Candidate: consistent with college/school guidelines

1. Updated C.V. in the Illustrative Format.
2. Personal Statement and/or Statement of Research, Teaching, and Service.
3. Teaching Assignment Form and SFFs Summary Report completed for all years since receiving a tenure track appointment at Temple, including course number and name, enrollment, and the number of TAs supervised or assigned to the course for fall, spring, and summer sessions over the course of tenure track service at Temple.
4. Students being supervised in thesis and dissertation work - indicate your role (chair, member, external reader) and dates of involvement as well as whether the student has completed his/her degree(s).
5. Student advisees (who are not thesis or dissertation candidates) - list students and their level (lower division, upper division, graduate).
6. University Student Feedback Forms and Teaching Evaluation Summaries with both qualitative and quantitative data for all courses taught.
7. Supplemental internal and/or external teaching evaluations such as peer evaluations, teaching portfolios.
8. Representative course syllabi - for courses developed and/or revised by the candidate.
9. Published textbooks or instructional materials and information on their use.
10. Pedagogical articles/reports of formal studies of instruction, if any.
11. Student products -- List of master's theses, doctoral dissertations, students' presentations of scholarly/creative work supervised by the Candidate both within and outside the University including any student publications, awards, and other accomplishments.
12. Awards and prizes - Award letters or other evidence of awards or prizes to the faculty member received for teaching.
13. Indicators of Impact of the Candidate's Work – Disciplinary-specific indicators of the impact of the candidate's work. In some fields this may take the form of a citation report whereas in others, it may take the form of published reviews of books, performances, exhibits, installations, library holdings and/or other scholarly/creative work.

14. Copies of All Creative Published Scholarly Work - each book, article, book chapter, book review or commentary that has been published at Temple or is currently in review for publication should be included. Appropriate documentation of creative work should also be included. A candidate may also include copies of scholarly presentations and/or any work currently in progress. Different disciplines may define “accepted for publication and/or in press” differently and should refer to their specific school/college and/or departmental guidelines for clarification.
15. Scholarly Works in Progress – include only Works in Progress in this folder. Works that are “in progress” are generally projects that one is actively researching or writing up but that have not yet been submitted for review and publication. If the works in progress is co-authored, please include author contribution state for co-authored publications. Indicate how each author contributed to the initial conception and design of the work, data collection, data analysis and interpretation, various drafts of the publication, if available.
16. External Support Form - List only external support for scholarly or creative work or research, including Grants, Contracts, Fellowships, Summer Grants, Artist in Residencies, or other awards in support of research, scholarship or creative work. Include the source of support, the type of support, duration of the award, dollar amount of support (direct costs) for the faculty member's research, role in carrying out grant/contract project (principal investigator or some other role), and percent effort. Copies of Award Letters should be included when the faculty member is PI.
17. Internal Support Reporting Form – List internal support for scholarly or creative work or research.
18. Documentation of Service Activities. Evaluations of Service Contributions, Service Awards, or Other Recognition.

Materials to be added by the Department Committee or the Department Chair:

19. External Evaluators Folder (must include):
 - External Evaluators Form - List of external evaluators, with individual or group who selected each evaluator indicated.
 - Brief biographical sketch (**please no CVs**) for each external evaluator.
 - Letters from external reviewers, **7 external letters** are required - **on letterhead and signed. *The University and College will not accept letters that are not on letterhead and not signed by external reviewer.***
 - A copy (sample) of the letter sent to external reviewers requesting their participation.

20. Department Committee Transmittal Form and Recommendation (combined Tenure and Promotion, Tenure only, and/or Promotion). **Please include confidentiality statements signed by the Departmental Committee members.**
21. Department Chair Transmittal Form and Recommendation (combined Tenure and Promotion, Tenure only, and/or Promotion). **Please include confidentiality statement signed by Department Chair.**
22. Departmental T&P Guidelines.
23. Candidate's written responses – (if any) to Departmental Committee and/or Department Chair recommendations.

Attachment: Side letter agreement between TU and TAUP on the role of the department chair in tenure and promotion deliberations at the departmental committee level.

Attachment to CLA Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and Procedures

Side Letter to Article 11 - Role of Chairs in Tenure and Promotion Process

This will confirm the understanding between TAUP and Temple University of Article 11 of the 2014-2018 collective bargaining agreement as it pertains to the role of Chairs in the Tenure and Promotion Process.

TAUP and Temple University agree that the language "A faculty member is only eligible to be present, participate in deliberations or vote" (from Article 11, C3a and G2a) does not preclude the Chair from introducing the candidate's dossier to the department committee, the school or college committee, or to the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (UTPAC) and/or asking or answering questions about the candidate for promotion or tenure and/or discussing the selection of the candidates outside evaluators. Except for these purposes the Chair may not be present or otherwise participate in deliberations or voting. The chair cannot make or announce his/her recommendation with respect to tenure and/or promotion for a candidate until after receiving the department's committee memorandum of transmittal.

TAUP and Temple University agree that a Chair may sit on a department committee only for the purposes given above. When a Chair sits on a school or college promotion and tenure committee or on the UTPAC and a candidate from the Chair's department for tenure or promotion is to be evaluated by that committee, the Chair must recuse him/herself for that case, i.e., may not act in an official role, be present when the committee(s) discusses the candidate's qualifications for tenure or promotion, except to answer questions as above, or otherwise vote on the committee's recommendation regarding the candidate from the Chair's department.

Appendix 1
Illustrative Curriculum Vita
(Merit-Pre-Tenure-Tenure-Promotion)

Date:

Name:

EDUCATION, UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE:

Give name of colleges, location, major, years attended, dates of degree, and degree.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION;

Give title, date, and sponsor.

POSITIONS HELD:

Give all positions related to your professional status, with name of institution, title, and years of service.

YEAR APPOINTED AT TEMPLE AND RANK AT APPOINTMENT:

YEAR TENURED IF APPOINTED UNTENURED:

YEAR PROMOTED TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IF APPOINTED BELOW THAT RANK:

YEAR PROMOTED TO FULL PROFESSOR IF APPOINTED BELOW THAT RANK:

PUBLICATIONS:

For all publications, give information as follows: you must list all authors in sequence as they appear in published work; title of work; publisher or journal; date published or anticipated date; for chapters in books, specify clearly the chapter(s) you wrote and all authors. To be listed *in press*, there must be a formal unconditional acceptance to publish. All co-authored work must include the percentage-based author contribution per publication; an author contribution statement may also be attached.

BOOKS PUBLISHED OR IN PRESS:

PEER-REVIEWED RESEARCH ARTICLES PUBLISHED OR IN PRESS:

EDITED BOOKS PUBLISHED OR IN PRESS:

TEXTBOOKS PUBLISHED OR IN PRESS:

OTHER WORKS PUBLISHED OR IN PRESS:

WORKS SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION:

Give all authors in sequence, title, publisher or journal, and date submitted.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS:

Give title or tentative title, indicate stage of progress, and plans for publications of manuscripts in progress.

ABSTRACTS:

PAPERS PRESENTED AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS:

Give title of paper, name of meeting, indicate if it is an international, national, regional, or local meeting, city where meeting was held, and date. List names of all persons shown on program as authors of the paper.

PUBLISHED RESEARCH REPORTS:

For funded research projects **only**. Show all authors in sequence as they appear on published report, title, date, and identification of agency supporting the research.

INVITED ADDRESSES:

Give same information as Papers presented.

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS, EXTERNALLY FUNDED:

List all grants for the last five years. Indicate your official title (P.I., consultant, etc.), name of project, agency funding it, year of funding, and total amount of grant or contract.

You may indicate grant proposals written but not funded, giving the above information, and indicating why the proposal was not funded.

TEACHING:

LIST COURSES TAUGHT IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS:

NAME SPECIAL AWARDS RECEIVED FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE:

INDEPENDENT STUDY COURSES:

For the last five years, give names of students and title of projects.

MASTER'S THESES SUPERVISED:

List name, title of thesis, date.

DISSERTATIONS SUPERVISED:

List name, title of dissertation, date.

MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL COMMITTEE SERVICE IN ADDITION TO STUDENTS YOU SUPERVISED:

Name of student, indicate if master's or Ph.D. and year of graduation.

SERVICE:

SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION:

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY:

SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE:

SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT:

SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY RELATING TO PROFESSIONS:

PAID CONSULTANCIES:

Give name of company, your role, and dates of service.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

Name of the organizations, give title of any offices you hold, and give dates of your membership.