

Temple University Guidelines for Review of Tenure and Promotion Applications in Schools and Colleges Governed by the Collective Bargaining Contracts with the Temple Association of University Professionals and the Law Professors Collective Bargaining Association
[Revised February 14, 2011]

The following President's Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion are effective for all tenure and promotion actions beginning in the 2011-12 academic year. However, it is recognized that some candidates for tenure and promotion may have already prepared their cases in compliance with the 2006 Guidelines. Therefore, the following "grandfathering" principle will govern all tenure and promotion cases for 2011-12 and 2012-13: if in the candidate's estimation, his or her case is enhanced by employing the 2006 Guidelines rather than the 2011 Guidelines, then the candidate should be given the option.

Application

These Guidelines for Review of Tenure and Promotion Applications apply to deliberations on tenure and promotion by departmental and school or college committees, the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, department chairs, deans, the Council of Deans, and the provost on applications for tenure and promotion in schools and colleges governed by the collective bargaining contracts with the Temple University Association of University Professionals (TAUP) and the Law Professors Collective Bargaining Association.

Deliberations on tenure and promotion in other schools and colleges, specifically Medicine, Dentistry, and Podiatric Medicine, shall continue to be governed by the Faculty Handbook and by the University Guidelines for the President's Review of Tenure and Promotion of October, 2001.

These guidelines do not modify or supersede standards for promotion and tenure set forth in the pertinent collective bargaining contracts or, where pertinent, in the Faculty Handbook. Rather, they establish expectations about the assessment that should be conducted by reviewers¹—faculty committees, the department chair and academic administrators, the Council of Deans, and the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee—and about the documentation that should be submitted for candidates recommended for tenure and/or promotion.

School and College Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

Each school and college shall adopt guidelines responsive to the needs of individual disciplines and academic fields. This is in keeping with the respective collective bargaining contracts which recognize Temple's right to issue guidelines for tenure and promotion at the school and college levels as well as at the university level.

To assure fairness to candidates for tenure and promotion and consistency of tenure and promotion standards with the collective bargaining contracts and these guidelines, college or school tenure and promotion guidelines must be submitted to Temple University for approval by the provost after review by university counsel. For the first year, these guidelines must be approved by May 1st, 2011 for implementation in the 2011-2012 academic year. Thereafter, guidelines used in any given academic year must have been approved by December of the previous year.

¹ The term 'reviewer(s)' hereafter in this document shall refer to internal collegial reviewing bodies such as, but not limited to, Departmental, School or University-wide individuals, bodies and/or committees. External evaluators shall refer to persons outside the university who are requested to provide an assessment of the candidate's tenure and/or promotion dossier.

These guidelines will be posted on the website of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Schools and Colleges should post their School/College guidelines on their website. The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs will provide links to these documents.

Preamble

Tenure and promotion reviews are among the most important decisions made by Temple University. Because faculty members are the core of the University, the composition of the faculty is the single most important determinant of academic quality. The review process is guided primarily by the provost, working in close partnership with the president.

I. THE REVIEW PROCESS

Confidentiality

The contents of tenure and promotion files, including digital records, are to be treated as confidential personnel files. Access to files should be limited to faculty committees, the department chair, the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, and administrative and academic personnel authorized to compile, evaluate and make recommendations with respect to tenure and promotion. If the candidate appeals a tenure or promotion action, the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee shall have access to the candidate's file.

The candidate also has access to the contents of his or her file. The candidate does not have access to the identity of the external evaluators. A candidate who seeks to review letters from external evaluators must at any level of the review process make a written request to the vice provost for faculty affairs who has the sole responsibility for redacting letters. Only redacted letters that protect as fully as possible the identity of the external evaluators will be made available to the candidate, and only in response to a written request.

When required by law or the orders of courts or agencies with jurisdiction over the University's personnel processes, a candidate's full promotion and/or tenure file will be provided to the appropriate court or agency.

Every reviewer in the tenure and promotion process, including if necessary the members of the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, is required to sign and abide by a confidentiality agreement; a sample of which can be found in the appendix.

Documentation of Recommendations Related to Tenure and Promotion

At each level of review, recommendations related to tenure and promotion are to be recorded on the tenure and promotion and transmittal document and transmitted to the next level in a timely manner.

At each level, the candidate will be provided with a copy of the transmittal document.² Candidates may respond in writing to the transmittal document(s), directing their responses as follows:

² In the event a transmittal document and/or other accompanying tenure and promotion document(s) include identifying information about the external evaluators, it is the responsibility of the reviewing committee to ensure that the document(s) is/are appropriately redacted, in consultation with the vice provost for faculty affairs before it is made available to the candidate.

- 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 referral by the Council of Deans are directed to the 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.

Candidate responses are sent to all previous levels of review for information only and included in the file for consideration at all subsequent levels of review.

II. STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

The standards for tenure are stated in the TAUP and Law Professors' Collective Bargaining Association contracts:

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 shall be secondary. The standard of outstanding performance in research/scholarship/creative activity for tenure shall be informed by standards for tenure at other national research universities appropriate to the discipline under consideration. The award of tenure, thus, is recognition of past performance 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 standards for promotion are stated in the TAUP and Law Professors' Collective Bargaining Association contracts as follows:

Consideration for promotion 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 shall be secondary. The standard of outstanding performance shall be informed by standards for promotion to the same rank at other national research universities appropriate to the discipline under consideration. Promotion to any rank, thus, is recognition of past performance and an assessment that the faculty member is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. Personal and professional integrity are assumed. The ultimate goal of all promotions is to build the best possible faculty for the University.

III. GATHERING EVIDENCE

Specific guidelines for assembling materials for tenure and promotion applications may be

found in the companion document, “Organizational Outline for Promotion and Tenure Files.”

The Responsibilities of Candidates

The faculty member who seeks tenure or promotion has the responsibility to meet Temple University’s standards and expectations for tenure and promotion and in each case to document for the tenure and/or promotion file his/her work in research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching/instruction, and service. A candidate may nominate external evaluators for consideration by the reviewing committees and academic administrators.

The candidate should provide a current curriculum vita. He/she should provide copies of scholarly or creative work and any appropriate materials illustrating research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching/instruction, and service that he/she wishes in support of his/her application.

The candidate should include in the file a list of all courses taught, the semester in which each course was taught, and the style or format of the teaching/instruction assignment. Course syllabi for a representative body of courses taught also should be included. The candidate should provide complete copies of Student Feedback Forms (SFF) or equivalent teaching evaluation reports for all courses taught (except for courses taught for the first time which may be included upon the candidate’s written request) or courses too small to generate SFF or equivalent teaching evaluation reports. The candidate may provide representative, systematically collected samples of a range of student work and other evidence of student response to class. It is highly recommended that other forms of teaching evaluations such as statement(s) of teaching philosophy, and/or teaching and/or course portfolios be included.

In most disciplines, the candidate will provide copies of all of his/her research, scholarship and creative activity. If creative work cannot readily be submitted as part of a tenure or promotion file, documentation of the work, such as photographs or digital records, may be submitted. For multi-authored publications, the candidate should provide a statement of his/her role in each publication, because the order of authorship may or may not reflect the candidate’s contribution. It is the candidate’s responsibility to include in the file an appropriate sampling of all of his/her previous work, prior to coming to Temple, as required by a school’s/college’s discipline-specific guidelines or as requested by any level of review. Individual schools/college tenure and promotion guidelines will determine the information required.

When a previously tenured or promoted faculty member seeks promotion, he/she should submit copies of the body of research, scholarship, or creative activity since the last successful review for tenure or promotion. However, reviewers should consider the candidate’s entire curriculum vita and body of work in determining whether the candidate’s accomplishments meet the standard for the rank for which he/she is being considered.

If new information concerning materials included 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 under review, of the publication of a work in press, or of a decision on a grant application. New information should be given to the dean, who shall forward to all previous levels of review for information. The same information shall be included in the file for consideration at all subsequent levels of review.

The Responsibilities of Department Committees, Chairs and Deans

The Department Committee, the Chair and the Dean have multiple responsibilities in the tenure and promotion

process, some of which are mentioned below and others of which are in various University policies, collective bargaining contracts and school/college guidelines.

It is the responsibility of Department Committees and Department Chairs to include all available peer reviews of teaching along with a description of how such peer reviews were conducted. Department Committees and Chairs should also describe and explain discipline-specific standards of assessment as they relate to the review of the candidate.

Deans are responsible for receiving separate lists of recommended external evaluators from candidates, department chairs and/or department committees. As stated in the TAUP and Law Professors Collective Bargaining Association contracts:

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion and the departmental tenure and/or promotion committee shall each separately submit lists to the Dean that contain the names and professional affiliations of persons whom they recommend to be external evaluators. After review of these recommendations, the Dean may, in his/her discretion, add additional evaluators to the lists. All external evaluation letters received shall be part of the individual's dossier.

Once the dean has selected evaluators, he/she may either seek the letters directly or may require a reviewing committee or a reviewing administrator to seek the letters. The solicitation of letters shall follow the procedures set forth in these guidelines.

In recommending external evaluations of candidates, reviewers should be especially conscious of their responsibility to obtain the judgments of persons who can speak authoritatively to the standards of outstanding performance in the profession and the discipline. Such external evaluators can be recognized by reputation in their fields, appointment to positions of trust in professional organizations, and work at distinguished programs. The external evaluations must include an assessment of research/scholarship/creative activity, and may also include comments on teaching/instruction and service. The external evaluators designated by reviewers should be independent of the candidate³. Letters of evaluation should be obtained from a minimum of three and typically no more than five independent external evaluators. The final determination regarding the number of outside evaluators may vary according to school/college tenure and promotion guidelines.⁴ Letters from other persons familiar with the candidate's work can also be included in the file.

External evaluators should be recognized scholars, artists and/or performers who are authorities in the candidate's field of study or practice and, if at an academic institution, at a rank no lower than the one for which the candidate is making the application. External evaluators may be drawn from nationally and internationally recognized research universities, art institutes, music conservatories, think tanks, special research institutes, government agencies, elite colleges with strong research enterprises, and so forth. External evaluators normally should be tenured faculty members; if not, justification must be provided. On some occasions, especially in the professional schools, an external evaluator may be drawn from professional practice. Such external evaluators should have a record of pertinent scholarship or creative work and should be qualified to make assessments for tenure and promotion at national research universities.

Materials submitted regarding the qualifications of external evaluators should include information that helps reviewers assess their letters. It is important to explain why an external evaluator was chosen-for

³ External evaluators are independent if they do not stand to gain, directly or indirectly, from the success of the candidate's application for tenure or promotion. Independence is best defined in relation to the field or discipline of the candidate. For example, in many fields, someone is not independent if that person has a personal relationship with the candidate that transcends a collegial relationship, or was on the candidate's dissertation committee or has been a co-author with the candidate.

⁴ Please consult the Additional Promotion and Tenure Guidelines [updated January, 2017] regarding changes in the number/composition of external evaluators.

example, an evaluator is distinguished in the field, or is conducting research and teaching at a major research institution or in a prestigious program. Brief biographies of external evaluators should be included in the file of the candidate. The file should specify whether external evaluators were nominated by the candidate or identified by reviewers. Each external evaluator must be asked to disclose the nature of his or her relationship, if any, with the candidate. The candidate's file should also include a copy of the standard letter sent to the external evaluators. A sample of a standard letter can be found in the appendix.

Each external evaluator should be provided with the candidate's curriculum vita and with such items of the candidate's scholarship and/or creative work as the external evaluator will need to make an adequate assessment. Letters of evaluation should comment in some depth on the quality of the candidate's research/scholarship/ and/or creative work, the recognition the candidate has achieved in his/her field, the stature of the forums in which the faculty member has published or presented research, scholarship or creative activity, and the candidate's potential for continuing and greater achievements in the field.

External evaluators may comment on elements of the candidate's teaching/instruction, based on published instructional materials, presentations by the candidate at professional meetings, performance of students trained by the candidate, or other direct evidence. They may also provide information about a faculty member's service to the profession or discipline and in work with governmental or private entities. External evaluators might also consider comparing the candidate with others they have recently reviewed, at their own institutions or in other external evaluations, and be asked to assess whether the candidate meets tenure standards at comparable U.S. major research universities.

In the interest of gathering as much compelling evidence as possible, the department must also solicit input from students.

IV. EVALUATING EVIDENCE: THE REVIEW PROCESS

Each tenure and promotion file should be viewed as a whole. Research/scholarship/creative activity and teaching/instruction must be primary in this evaluation. After examining each element of the candidate's file, reviewers determine whether the candidate's total body of work presents a record of outstanding performance and continuing promise of outstanding performance as a faculty member. Each review should take into account the evaluation that has occurred as a result of the candidate's third year review with respect to their progress toward tenure.

Reviewers also will consider the personal and professional integrity of the candidate. Personal and professional integrity are assumed in the tenure and promotion standards. Therefore the candidate need not present evidence of such. The presumption may be rebutted if information is obtained by the University and presented in the review process at the appropriate levels of review. Such evidence becomes part of the file, and will be made available to the candidate, who may respond to it.

Evaluating Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

Candidates for tenure or promotion should demonstrate that they meet the standard for research/scholarship/creativity activity of appropriate national research universities in their discipline. Candidates may include work in progress. All candidates should demonstrate independent work beyond the terminal degree. Reviewers should be sensitive to the value placed on joint publication within relevant fields. Reviewers also should assess patterns of sustained ongoing activity. For promotion to full professor, candidates must provide clear evidence of considerable prominence in the field.

Evaluations of the candidate's work by colleagues in the discipline, including external evaluators, will be carefully assessed. Other information about the significance of the work should be sought, including measures that are suggestive of its importance, significance, or potential impact. In some fields, for example, citation counts, journal impact rankings and/or surveys of library holdings are considered important measures, whereas in other fields, awards, published reviews, reports of publishers' referees, solo shows of the work in prestigious venues, performances, etc., may be used primarily. In all cases, measures used to evaluate a candidate's research/scholarship/creative activity should be sensitive to discipline norms and should be documented and explained by reviewers. Reviewers and external evaluators should give

primary consideration to work published or in press (a manuscript is in press if it is finished, accepted by a publisher, and is in the production process). However, they may also consider refereed papers presented at professional meetings or invited lectures. This work should be evaluated for quality, significance, and impact, considering the stature and selectivity of the forum and subsequent influence of the presentation.

Films, tapes, multi-media shows, slide performances, on-line publications and other technology-based works have become common in certain disciplines and may constitute the whole body of work in some disciplines, such as filmmaking or broadcast journalism. These should be reviewed directly by external evaluators and reviewers.

External funding is important for the advancement of scholarship in many fields. External funding may be given substantial weight in tenure and promotion deliberations. The rigor of the peer review process, the prestige of the grants or fellowships awarded, and the stature of the granting agency may all reflect a faculty member's scholarly standing.

Awards from Temple University or from professional organizations recognizing outstanding performance in scholarly or creative work may be given weight in evaluating a faculty member's accomplishments, considering the stature of the award and of the organization that confers it. A candidate's role in helping to raise the academic standards and profile of the department/college/university should be evaluated and recognized properly.

Evaluating Teaching/Instruction

Outstanding teaching/instruction may be evaluated by various methods, including but not limited to student evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching/instruction, and assessments of the quality or significance of curricular and teaching or instructional materials, teaching awards, papers and publications on teaching/instruction, student's work products, and other student outcomes. Individual units are encouraged to use more than one method of evaluating teaching in their assessments.

Reviewers may look at the development and improvement of course content, the breadth of a candidate's teaching/instruction experience, the candidate's methods of assessing student performance, and his/her teaching/instruction techniques to determine whether a candidate is steadily engaged in the improvement of teaching/instruction and to assess whether he/she is likely to continue to do so in the future. A faculty member's effectiveness in teaching courses at various levels (undergraduate, graduate, professional) offered in his/her department and school or college should be considered. Similarly, a faculty member's effectiveness in teaching classes in different formats pertinent to his/her department, school, or college should be assessed using course syllabi, teaching or instructional materials, peer reports, teaching awards, and student evaluations. Student work, collected in a systematic, representative way, may serve as evidence of teaching/instruction effectiveness. Commitment to long-term outstanding performance in teaching/instruction is also demonstrated by responsiveness to evaluations of teaching/instruction by peers and students, participation in professional development programs, and work in developing new courses or improving existing courses.

Typically, published textbooks or other published instructional or pedagogical materials are evidence of teaching or instructional ability, and should be evaluated according to their quality and influence. Reviewers should base their evaluations on an array of documented evidence about the candidate's teaching/instruction, considering both teaching or instructional methodology and success in transmitting substantive knowledge and intellectual methods to students. As applicable, an assessment of teaching/instruction should demonstrate that a candidate has made substantial contributions to Temple University's mission as a diverse urban university and as a national research university offering instruction in an array of formats at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels.

Evaluating Service

In service, a candidate is expected over time to successfully undertake progressively more serious responsibilities within the University, in his/her profession, and in the community. Outstanding discipline-related service to the community and larger world, to the University, and to scholarly disciplines is valued in tenure and promotion decisions. But it is to be considered as secondary to a

candidate's performance in research/scholarship/creative activity and teaching/instruction. Reviewers should evaluate (a) the evidence of a faculty member's service to the University, community, and his/her profession, and (b) the quality and importance of those contributions, including the means by which such assessment was undertaken. Independent evaluation of the scope and effectiveness of a candidate's service should be obtained wherever possible.

V. PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Long Term Academic Needs

A candidate for tenure must also be shown to meet the long term academic needs of his/her department and/or school or college in addition to outstanding performance and continuing promise of outstanding performance as a faculty member in research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching/instruction and service. Reviewers must evaluate whether a candidate for tenure meets the long term academic needs of his/her academic unit(s) and their evaluation on this criterion must be included in their recommendations.

Tenure on Hire

Schools and colleges recommending the appointment of a new faculty member with tenure will follow an expedited tenure review based on the most recent Temple University policies and procedures regarding tenure and promotion. Although tenure-on-hire candidates will be held to the same standards as current Temple faculty members, it is understood that the organization of materials for an expedited tenure review may be abbreviated. Tenure-on-hire candidates should provide sufficient evidence of outstanding contributions to research/scholarship/creative activities, teaching/instruction, and service so that departmental and school or college evaluations can be completed.

Conclusion

These guidelines are intended to assist candidates for promotion and/or tenure, reviewing committees, department chair, and administrators to understand the nature of the review. They describe an array of activities that candidates may engage in as they undertake their responsibilities in research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching/instruction, and service. The entire array of activities and achievements described herein is not expected of any particular candidate for tenure and/or promotion. Reviewers evaluate the evidence presented in the file as a whole, considering the relationship of each aspect of the candidate's performance to his or her performance to all other areas, and giving primary consideration to research/scholarship/creative activity and teaching/instruction. The reviewing committees, the department chair, and academic administrators must conduct careful evaluation employing the evaluative methods suggested in these guidelines together with other methods specific to their discipline or profession.

APPENDICES

**Appendix 1
Tenure and Promotion Confidentiality Agreement**

Name of Reviewer

By my signature below and in consideration of my participation as [Insert Role] for Temple University, I pledge to adhere to the following:

1. I accept my responsibility to protect the integrity of Temple University and all candidates.
2. I agree to disclose promptly to the Provost, Dean and/or his/her designee any appearance of real or potential conflict of interest in relationship between myself and a prospect or candidate.
3. I acknowledge that information management is a crucial component of my work. This work includes information developed and received about candidates and their departments and colleges. I understand that this effort is necessary to maintain the highest-quality faculty, to avoid putting them in jeopardy among their colleagues, and to protect Temple University's integrity. Specifically, I will adhere to the following principles:
 - I will respect the absolute confidentiality of all candidates. I will not reveal the identity of or any other information about candidates before or after my review and/or the review committee completes it work;
 - I will be fair, accurate, honest and responsible in my management of information germane to the review process;
 - I will guard against inaccuracies, carelessness, bias, and distortion made by either emphasis or omission of information;
 - I will strive to treat issues impartially and handle controversial subjects dispassionately;
 - If requested, I will give accurate and complete reports on candidates to the Provost.
4. I will place the best interest of Temple University ahead of all special and personal interests, and I will use common sense and good judgment in applying ethical principles to all review work.
5. I consider the letter and spirit of this statement to be a matter of personal responsibility.

Signature

Date

Appendix 2
Sample Standard Letter Sent to External Evaluator(s)

[Insert Date]

[Insert Name]

[Insert Address]

[Insert Address]

[Insert City/State/Zip Code]

Dear Mr./Mrs./Ms./Professor [Insert LastName]:

Re: Application of [Insert Candidate Name] for [Insert Promotion/Tenure, etc.]

Dear [Insert Evaluator's Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external evaluator for [insert Name of Candidate]. [Insert candidate name and type of actions he/she will undergo, e.g. tenure and promotion to Associate Professor]. Your experience, expertise, and reputation make you an especially appropriate person to help us evaluate Professor [Insert Name of Candidate]'s scholarly/creative work.

For your review, I am enclosing a copy of [candidate's work]. As you will note from the candidate's CV, s/he has published and/or co-published several other works and I would be happy to send you copies of these as well if you would find them helpful. Certainly, to the extent you are familiar with the candidate's other work and can evaluate the enclosed work in that context, we welcome your comments.

Our standards for tenure and promotion, a full version of which I also enclose, provide that [quote here standards related to rank candidate is seeking as found in the school/college's and/or department's approved guidelines].

Our procedures contemplate that you submit a written report that discusses the quality of the Faculty Member's scholarship/creative work, the extent to which it reflects substantive knowledge of the subject matter and makes a positive contribution to the field, the recognition the Faculty Member has achieved in his or her field, the stature of the forums in which the Faculty Member has published or presented his or her scholarship/creative work, whether the Faculty Member meets the relevant standard for [insert rank faculty candidate is requesting], as well as other information or commentary you deem relevant to the Faculty Member's qualifications for [insert rank faculty candidate is requesting].

With respect to the Faculty Member's scholarship, please address the technical and conceptual quality of his or her work, how it builds upon and advances the scholarship in the field, and the extent to which it contributes to the field. It would also be helpful to discuss the Faculty Member's scholarship/creative work in context, discuss how his or her work is regarded by others, and offer your views on his or her potential for future scholarly/creative work achievement. [Optional Addition: Finally, we would appreciate your views on whether the Faculty Member's work would meet the standards for [insert rank requested] at other major U.S. research institutions.]

In addition, if you have seen [insert candidate name] present his or her work at professional meetings, we welcome any observations you might have about the quality of teaching. If you have worked with

[insert candidate name] in any other context germane to this evaluation, we would appreciate information on that subject as well.

The report should be in letter form; its length is subject to your discretion. We ask that you include either a copy of your curriculum vitae or bio-sketch. Temple University procedure allows us to share copies of external evaluator letters with the candidate. In order to protect the external evaluator's confidentiality to the greatest extent possible, all identifying information is redacted before the evaluation letters are shown to the candidate.

We would appreciate receiving your report by [insert date] in order to complete our evaluation in a timely manner. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at [insert telephone number] or via email at [insert email address]. Once again, please accept our sincere thanks for your assistance in this important matter.

Sincerely,

[Insert Name]
[Insert Title]

Enclosures

Appendix 3

Historical Resource Document

The 2006 Revised Guidelines included the following materials in the form of three appendices. Their purpose was to "suggest the kinds of evidence that reviewers should take into account in the evaluation of research/scholarship/creative activity, teaching/instruction and service." These materials were to "provide examples and details that clarify the principles set out in the guidelines." At that time, it was anticipated that "[a]s soon as every school and college has approved guidelines in place, these appendices may no longer be required as part of these University guidelines."

The 2010 President's Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Committee discussed whether to drop these materials entirely from the revised guidelines. In order to protect candidates who have been preparing for tenure or promotion following the examples set forth below, the Ad Hoc Committee decided to leave these materials in place as suggestive evidence appended to the revised guidelines for one transition year (until the end of the tenure and promotion cycle for 2011-12). During that period, each school and college should review and revise (if necessary) their school/college guidelines to ensure that they include appropriate examples of discipline-appropriate evidence that reviewers should take into account in evaluating candidates' work.

Evaluation of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

The fundamental purpose of research, scholarship and creative activity is to advance knowledge and produce art. Both direct measures of advances in knowledge and/or aesthetics and more indirect measures may vary widely from discipline to discipline and reviewers should employ a full array of such measures in making evaluations of the importance of research/scholarship/creative activity to make the best assessment of whether a faculty member's contributions are outstanding. Reviewers and external evaluators should assess the character of the faculty member's program of research/scholarship/creative activity, placing it in the larger context of the discipline or the body of knowledge of which it is part. They should evaluate the quality and importance of the candidate's contributions, and state the means by which such assessments were undertaken.

Publications

Scholarly contributions may appear in the form of articles, essays, books, book chapters, and similarly published works. Reviewers and external evaluators should assess the importance of the work, the stature of the journal or other forum in which it was published, the rigor and selectivity of the reviewing process, and the impact that the work has had on the profession. If the work has been reviewed in articles, review essays, or comments in the popular press, those reviews should be considered and included in the candidate's file.

Books published by a candidate should be assessed for their quality and importance. When available, published reviews of the book should be considered and included in the file. It is easiest to evaluate such reviews when the reviewers' names are released. [Note: The 2010 Ad Hoc Committee found the previous sentence confusing and not helpful. It left the sentence unchanged because this appendix contains a historical document. The Ad Hoc Committee urges any school or college that wishes to use this sentence to clarify its meaning in terms of the discipline involved]. When the reviews remain anonymous, reviewers must carefully consider the publisher's reputation and stature. Self-published books and books from vanity presses should rarely be given favorable weight in making an evaluation of faculty research/scholarship/creative activity.

Books in press can also be considered, especially in tenure decisions. The candidate may demonstrate the potential impact of work in press through evidence such as the standing of the press and reviews by evaluators selected by the press. Copies of manuscripts in press and reviews by the press's evaluators should be sent to external evaluators and included in the file. Reviewers in the department and school or college should read and evaluate the manuscript.

The order of authorship may or may not reflect the candidate's contribution to a publication. The relationship between author order and contribution to the work differs widely from discipline to discipline. Because of variations in traditions and conventions, reviewers should take care to understand the norms within a discipline.

Editing of scholarly volumes or collections, journals, and reference works (e.g., encyclopedias) as well as other published contributions, such as published abstracts and book reviews, should be carefully assessed. Reviewers and external evaluators should consider the reputation, selectivity, and reviewing procedures of the publisher; published reviews; and the extent of citation.

While published instructional materials should usually be considered as contributions to teaching/instruction, they may be considered research/scholarship when they introduce new scholarly information, reorder scholarship in innovative ways, or organize existing scholarship significantly modify[ing] theories in the field.

Creative Work in the Arts

For creative works-such as exhibits and performances, the nature of the work (solo or ensemble performance, one-person or group show), the standing of the forum in which the performance or exhibit occurs, the scope of the audience, the method for selecting participants, and the subsequent published reviews should be taken into account. Published reviews and letters of critique or evaluation written by appropriate Temple faculty who have attended performances or viewed exhibits should be included in the file and considered. Commissions for creative works, the selection of works of art for permanent public collections, and exhibition or performance in commercial forums are indicators of works' importance. Reviewers and external evaluators should identify the importance of such commissions, collections, and exhibitions. Prizes and awards should be given significant weight.

External Funding

Candidates should document all attempts to obtain external funding. Reviews by funding agencies can show evidence of progress in obtaining funding and candidates may include reviewers' reports. Notices of awards should be included.

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. Reviewers and external evaluators should consider the prestige of the meeting at which a presentation was made, its review process, the score of the meeting (e.g., local, national), and the character of the audience. Where possible, papers or materials should be submitted to external evaluators.

Other Recognition

Temple University prizes or awards given to recognize outstanding performance in research/scholarship/creative activity may be considered. Support from Temple, such as study leaves and summer research grants, is given to assist faculty members and does not necessarily reflect the quality or merit of faculty work or a faculty member's attainments in research/scholarship/creative activity and teaching/instruction. While merit salary awards may reflect a faculty member's progress, they do not necessarily reflect the level of performance required to earn tenure or promotion.

A Special Note on the Evaluation of Published Works

This section provides guidance on methods commonly used in some disciplines for evaluating published research/scholarship/creative activity. Reviewers should apply rigorous standards applicable to the candidates' disciplines and fields.

The judgment of faculty committees, the department chair, academic administrators and external evaluators who have read a work are direct evidence of its worth. Common methods used in research universities to assist in the evaluation of research/scholarship/creative activity include the determination of the frequency with which work is cited, the stature of journals in which work is published, and the extent to which books and journals are held by major libraries. This type of evaluation should take place at the first level of review.

1. Citations to Scholarly Publications. The value of scholarship is in its contribution to the advancement of knowledge. Work that is widely cited by scholars and others adds to understanding of the discipline and perhaps of the larger world. The frequency with which work is cited may reflect the value that a publication has to the development of the field. It also reflects the extent to which other scholars have used the publication in their exploration of the field. Self-citation by the author should not be included in reporting the frequency of citation. In addition to journals, reviewers should seek citations of the candidate's work in books, conference proceedings, and as reading material for courses taught at other universities. Such reference and use of the candidate's work signify its influence in the academy.

2. The Stature of Journals. Schools and colleges should provide an evaluation of key journals in the candidate's field. The stature of the journal in which a work is published provides a measure of the impact it will make in the discipline. First among accepted measures of the stature of an academic or professional journal is its peer-review status. High-stature journals tend to receive very large numbers of manuscripts, are very selective in what they publish, and have strong editorial boards and cadres of manuscript reviewers who conduct rigorous peer review of submitted materials. Some journals (e.g., newsletters, state or regional journals with small circulations, trade journals and edited volumes) typically do not undergo rigorous peer review. External evaluators should be asked to comment on the strength of the press or journal which publishes the candidate's work.

The "citation impact factor" is a measure of the frequency with which articles, briefs, essays, and other materials in that journal are cited in the academic profession and can be a measure of the journal's stature in a profession. Reviewers and external evaluators should consider how journals in a discipline rank compared to one another to better place the importance of the journals in which candidates have published their work.

3. Frequency with which books and journals are held in major libraries. In evaluating the research/scholarship/creative activity of a faculty member, it is often useful to determine how many libraries hold the book or journal. This reflects the judgment of faculty and professional librarians about the value of the published work.

Citations, impact factors and the peer review status of journals can be confirmed through Thompson Web of 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.

Evaluation of Teaching/Instruction

Breadth of Teaching/Instruction Styles and Format

Teaching/instruction should be assessed with attention to the style or format of the teaching/instruction assignment (e.g., lecture course, laboratory section, studio, individual or group tutorial or other form of individualized instruction, master's or doctoral thesis). Teaching from introductory courses through advanced graduate and/or professional work; teaching at various campuses or locations; supervising internships; advising students about academic matters; direction of honors papers; theses and dissertations; and involvement with teaching-related student activities should be evaluated.

Curricular Development and Instructional Materials

Development of curricula and courses is an important contribution to teaching/instruction. Innovations in teaching methods or instructional methodology, including technological advances, should be documented and evaluated. Evaluation of teaching/instruction should take into account the instructional materials of a course, including syllabus; exams; demonstrations; experiments; materials prepared by the faculty member such as supplementary course readings, problems, workbooks, or laboratory materials; and various forms of learning technology (audio-visual, distance learning, and digital materials).

Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching/Instruction

Student evaluations play an important role in the overall evaluation of faculty teaching/instruction. Review of the Course and Teaching Evaluation (CATE) survey results should not be limited to the overall evaluation questions since valuable information may be derived from questions about the instructor's promptness in returning written assignments, fairness in grading, facilitation of student questions in class, amount of effort required in the course, course organization, and the clarity of course goals. Other student evaluations, such as letters and testimonials, should be given substantial weight if solicited systematically to provide unbiased representation of student opinion. Candidates should not themselves solicit letters from students.

Classroom visits by peers are useful when done periodically, guided by a clear set of criteria for evaluation, and undertaken as part of a broader system of classroom visiting. After examining the syllabi and the readings, peer evaluators should make several class visits. Reviews should be structured and comprehensive, and address class content, effectiveness in delivering information and engaging students in learning, and other impressions about classroom effectiveness. These evaluations should be included in the candidate's file.

Other Materials to be Considered

Student work deriving from the instructional process, including master's theses, doctoral dissertations, student-published materials, student performances, recitals and exhibitions, and similar evidence of student performance may be considered, assessing the full range of students instructed. These materials should be described and evaluated.

Teaching/instruction skills may be demonstrated through public lectures or other presentations to

professional conferences, faculty and/or student groups, or community groups.

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.

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.

Evaluation of Service

Outstanding discipline-related service to the community and larger world, to the University, and to scholarly disciplines is valued in promotion and tenure decisions. But it is to be considered as secondary to a candidate's performance in research/scholarship/creative activity and teaching/instruction. Reviewers should evaluate both (a) the evidence of a faculty member's service to the University, community, and his/her profession, and (b) the quality and importance of those contributions, including the means by which such assessment was undertaken. Independent evaluation of the scope and effectiveness of a candidate's service should be obtained wherever possible.

In general, service to be considered arises from a faculty member's status as a citizen of the University and a member of a learned profession or discipline. A member of the music faculty who leads or performs in a community orchestra is clearly contributing to the community his/her professional skills and knowledge as a member of the faculty; but a political scientist who plays in that orchestra is not engaged in service that is based on his/her special knowledge and skill as a faculty member and may not therefore be said to have rendered University-related service.

Service within the University

In evaluating service within the University, distinctions should be made between very important and nominal service assignments, between brief and extended service, between regular and sporadic participation, and between effective and ineffective involvement. Merely holding committee or other assignments does not meet the standard for service. An important form of service within the University is assistance to student organizations. Faculty members who participate effectively as advisors, committee members, or mentors for student organizations contribute significantly to the quality of student life and the University.

Service outside of the University

A special form of community service is patient or client service undertaken in the context of a university program or a program sponsored by private or public non-profit entities that serve the community. Faculty may also engage in professional service activity for compensation within the limits of the University's extra compensation policy. Unless the work product of such services is available for general circulation to the community and can be evaluated by reviewers, such professional service is not normally regarded as community service.

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 associations. Service to a profession may include serving on examining or licensing bodies or similar governmental entities, serving on grievance or professional practice committees, sitting on advisory commissions, advising government agencies or private entities, publishing practitioner guides or other materials, and similar activities. Reviewers should describe the importance of the journal, organization or body, and the nature of the candidate's contributions. For all types of service, a listing of activities in the curriculum vita of a candidate does not usually speak to whether the service was "outstanding", nor should the sole evidence of such service be information provided by the candidate. Instead, reviewers should seek some tangible, external evidence for and/or evaluation of the quality and scope of the service provided by a candidate.