

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

Merit Guidelines for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

November 2013

(Revision Approved CLA Collegial Assembly, April 2015)

Preamble/Rationale

In 2012 a CLA Ad Hoc Committee framed guidelines for Tenure/Tenure Track Merit. In 2013 (because for the first time there is a separate merit pool for Non-Tenure Track Faculty) the CLA Executive Committee appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to frame guidelines for NTT Merit. Committee members were Daniel Chomsky (Political Science), Rachael Groner (FYW), Jessie Iwata (IH), Catherine Panzarella (Psychology), and Ralph Young (History). Ralph Young served as chair; Kevin Delaney served as administrative liaison; Pamela Barnett and Beth Bailey (Chair of the TT Merit Committee) served as consultants. (This revision benefitted from the insights and advice from Christine Palumbo-De Simone (FYW), and Anna Peak (IH) who served on the NTT Merit Awards Committee in 2014 and 2015.)

The committee worked within the framework of the T/TT Committee's overall goals:

- Acknowledge disciplinary differences while offering departments a clearer cross-college standard of comparison
- Move toward awarding a roughly equivalent number of merit points to equally effective faculty members in different fields or disciplines by taking disciplinary differences into account
- Standardize, across departments, the type of merit materials submitted to the CLA merit committee (while recognizing disciplinary difference)
- Give clear answers to basic questions that arise every merit cycle
- Offer the CLA committee a model for handling the discrepancy between points requested and points available
- Clarify the relationship among teaching, service, and research in the CLA merit process.

But the primary goal of the NTT Ad Hoc Committee was to concentrate on the specific duties and challenges of NTT Instructors and frame appropriate guidelines to determine the qualities of exceptional teaching that deserve merit consideration. The Committee also took into account the fact that some NTTs' primary contractual duty is administrative. These Administrative NTTs should be treated equally in the merit process and should be evaluated according to their contractual duties.

These guidelines will be submitted to the CLA Executive Committee; the version of these guidelines that the Executive Committee approves and is endorsed by the Dean will be submitted directly to the departments. The approved guidelines were implemented

beginning in merit year 2012-13 and the revised guidelines will be implemented for the merit year 2014-15. After CLA has used the revised guidelines for five full merit cycles an ad hoc committee appointed by the CLA Executive Committee will evaluate them. Proposed revisions will go through the same process.

General Information and Requirements

Department Guidelines

The college will require each department to use the final, approved version of these guidelines to craft a clear departmental statement of merit criteria for its NTT faculty. Department guidelines will be made available to departmental faculty and filed with CLA. Departments may update or amend these documents, but they 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.

Professional Obligations

Non-Tenure-line faculty must fulfill the obligations specified in their contracts. For most NTTs their primary duty is teaching. Their secondary duty is service. Although teaching and service are expected of NTT instructors, many, if not most NTT liberal arts professionals engage in research in their discipline. It is the view of this committee, and indeed TAUP, that research/publication is a legitimate area for NTT merit. NTTs should be eligible for merit for research to the extent that their research contributes to their respective fields and to the reputation of Temple University. Research and publication should be evaluated along the same lines as stipulated in the T/TT Merit Guidelines (appended here). However NTTs may only apply for research/publication merit if they perform well in their primary areas of responsibility. Having met the conditions stipulated in their contract NTTs are eligible in all other categories.

Allotting Points at CLA Level

There is not a tier system for NTTs with Administrative appointments since each of these appointments is unique, but they should be considered similarly to Teaching NTTs for excellence in their contractual duties.

For Teaching NTTs when recommended merit points exceed available points, the CLA NTT Merit Committee will use a primary/secondary system. Instead of reducing points awarded evenly across all items or creating criteria specific to that year alone, the committee will give first priority to items in the primary tier, awarding the full number of points it judges proper based on the guidelines below. Points awarded for the secondary category ("second tier") items/actions will only be awarded after all primary category ("first tier") awards have been distributed and only if there are any units still available.

Service merit units for teaching faculty are based on the demands of the individual task, and so are not standardized. Merit for research will follow the comprehensive guidelines established for Tenured and Tenure Track faculty.

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 making this decision.
- 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 to all.

Exceptions to Recommended Awards

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

NTT MERIT GUIDELINES

Teaching

All NTT faculty members with teaching assignments are expected to teach well. The CLA merit committee will recommend merit for demonstrably excellent or effective innovative teaching that is above and beyond the expected levels of performance. For merit purposes, “teaching” requires interaction with students, whether face-to-face or as part of an online course.

Candidates for teaching merit should submit a teaching portfolio that demonstrates excellence in teaching, with evidence from the instructor, students, and peers. A portfolio should typically include:

Evidence from the Instructor

Evidence from the instructor serves as the framing material for the portfolio, and as such, it should include the following information:

- A letter including a rationale for merit, and an explanation of how the instructor’s courses fit into the department and college curriculum.
- A statement of teaching philosophy.
- Syllabi and other course materials for all courses taught during the merit year. Course materials might include assignments, exams, and samples of student work.

Evidence from Students

- SFFs, or equivalent forms, for the merit year.

Evidence from Peers

- A letter from the department chair describing the merit candidate’s overall workload, including number of courses, type of courses, description of particularly heavy demand courses, description of the service, administrative, clinical or other activities of the candidate for merit.
- A standards-based Peer Review or Observation Letter that addresses the quality of the instructor’s course design, classroom delivery, and assessment and feedback practices. The letter would be based on a review of course materials (for example: syllabus, assignments, exams, rubrics, graded student work) and a classroom observation.
 1. The peer review/observation section addressing course design should comment on the extent to which the course goals are aligned with the assessments and other elements of the syllabus.

2. Peer reviews/observations of classroom delivery should evaluate instructor's clarity, organization, variety and pacing of instruction, engagement with students, presentation skills and content knowledge.
3. Peer reviews/observations of assessment and feedback should evaluate the alignment of assessment with learning goal, and clarity of grading standards.

A department process that stipulates who is peer reviewed, how often, and by whom, should be developed as soon as possible, if not in place already. Peer reviewers should use an evaluation instrument approved by the department or the college and that addresses the elements listed above (clarity, organization, etc.). Unless school or dept. guidelines stipulate otherwise, instructors may select a colleague to observe and provide the peer review. The reviewer is not required to serve in the same department as the instructor.

Clinical supervision and other training activities that involve interaction with and evaluation of students should be considered for teaching merit with appropriate adjustments to the guidelines to accommodate instruction that is not in a typical classroom framework. For example, when SFFs are not used for clinical supervision an equivalent form of student evaluation should be submitted.

The primary and secondary categories (tiers) defined in this document's introduction apply to teaching merit as follows:

TEACHING (range: up to 5 units)

Primary Category (Tier I)

- Consistently exceptional teaching, with evidence of excellent course design, delivery, rigor and assessment, and feedback processes that demonstrate student learning (see description of portfolio requirements above).
- 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, the CLA Distinguished Teacher award, or a Department Teaching Award).
- Significant innovation in classroom (or clinical) 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 which clarifies goals and assessments), 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 (as evidenced in SFFs or other forms of student evaluation; and standards-based peer review in the Teaching Portfolio).

- Being the recipient of a prestigious fellowship such as a Fulbright Scholar Fellowship or Fulbright Specialist Fellowship for teaching, or being invited to present a seminar or short 2-4 week course at another university in the US or abroad.

Secondary Category (Tier II)

(This tier will only be considered if there are any units left over after the Tier I primary priority units have all been distributed.)

- New course, designed, approved by COI, and taught successfully. Creating an online course (or converting an existing course into a comprehensive, rigorous online format). This item recognizes work that commonly takes more than a single year. Submit COI forms, syllabus, and portfolio that clearly address the new course: work involved, and assessment of course following first time taught.
- High investment in teaching responsibility, e.g., having a heavy teaching load for which faculty member does not receive any course reduction, supervising independent study students, mentoring interns, faculty advisor to student groups, and other such contributions to the department.
- Academic presentations on teaching, pedagogy, or clinical supervision at professional conferences.
- Curricular-related publications in professional discipline-specific or pedagogical journals.
- Investing in professional development on pedagogical issues; efforts at self-improvement as a teacher or clinical supervisor (e.g., continuing education, use of Teaching & Learning Center, Instructional Support Center, attendance at institutional, regional or national professional conferences). Support of curriculum and pedagogy within the academic department or across departments.

Service

Range: up to 3 units

While we recognize that some departments offer limited service opportunities for NTTs with heavy teaching loads, NTTs may request merit for department, college, university, professional, or professionally-based community service that goes beyond the basic expectation of their position or is performed and a level of excellence.

Applicants must document service as extensively as any other meritorious work, detailing the scope and duration of activities and the importance of that work to the department, college, university or profession. Rather than simply listing “chaired national professional organization’s membership committee,” the applicant must submit a detailed list of the work s/he did, including the amount of time and effort it took, document successful outcomes, and detail his/her contribution. A letter from the committee or department chair, college or university administrator, or administrator within the professional organization is welcome documentation of work done.

Service for Administrative Appointments

Some NTTs in the College of Liberal Arts have administrative appointments in which their primary responsibility is assigned to activities other than teaching. These include faculty who do significant advising of undergraduate or graduate students, who are heavily involved in department or program administration, or who direct clinical programs. Each of these appointments is unique to the needs for which the position was designed. NTT administrative faculty deserve the same consideration for merit as teaching faculty. If an administrative NTT can document that the work exceeds the compensation provided, s/he will be eligible for merit. Merit units will be awarded under the category of service because the TAUP contract categorizes merit units into only 3 categories: teaching, research and service.

Administrative faculty need to be evaluated for merit primarily according to the criteria in the job descriptions for their positions. However, the criteria for evaluating their contribution and merit is different from evaluating faculty teaching, research, and service. When a faculty member with an administrative position does his or her job, this is not considered “service”. When the administrative faculty member does their job in an unusual, unique, highly valued way, adding value to the department more than just doing their administrative duties, we need to recognize and reward that faculty member with a merit award.

Candidates applying for merit in this category should substantiate their work through a portfolio that must include the job description and a clear statement from the candidate and the Chair to explain how their work was particularly meritorious. The portfolio should include documents that demonstrate the value or difficulty of their work, such as peer or supervisor letters of support, and examples of the kind of work that was completed

NB:

- The responsibilities as specified in the Administrative NTT's contract or annual letter will be used as the primary criteria to evaluate his or her performance and eligibility for merit.
- The Chair's letter making the case for each merit candidate will be essential because each of these positions is unique.
- As such, individual Departments and Programs are welcome to come up with their own process for documenting the activities of faculty on these appointments if it would make easier the Chair's ability to write a proper letter of support.

Research

Range: Same as in TT Merit Guidelines

If an NTT shows **strong work in Teaching and Service** s/he may apply for merit in research and publication along the same criteria set forth in the TT Guidelines.

Appendix: CLA TT Research Merit Guidelines

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 all three 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