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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

As defined by the USC Academic Senate for the 2011-2012 academic year, the mission of the Committee on Non-tenure-track Faculty Affairs (CNTTFA) is as follows:

The Committee on Non-tenure-track Faculty monitors the working environment, conditions of employment, benefits eligibility, opportunities for participation in governance, opportunities for professional advancement, and participation in the academic life of the university provided for non-tenure-track faculty. It tracks any significant changes in the proportion of non-tenure-track to tenure-track faculty within the total faculty in individual units and in the university as a whole, and monitors compliance with the Faculty Handbook and with stated school policies of the school or unit. It may make recommendations to relevant Senate and University committees, and to the Academic Senate, concerning any policy issues which bear on the use and profile of non-tenure-track faculty.

Membership will include non-tenure-track faculty (full-time and part-time, research track, clinical track, and teaching track) as well as tenure-track faculty.

As a result of the monitoring role, the CNTTFA periodically performs surveys of campus guidelines and practices. In one recent survey, each school was asked to report the number of fulltime tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. Data was gathered from fourteen schools represented on the committee. Data was not obtained from two schools represented on the committee, and two additional schools were not represented on the committee and were therefore not represented in the data. When the represented schools’ numbers were aggregated, more than half\(^1\) of the fulltime faculty in those schools were NTT. A second survey was performed to obtain data regarding the existence and content of both written guidelines for NTT faculty and qualitative information about how those guidelines are being implemented. Based on that survey, this report identifies certain written criteria and practices developed by some USC schools, as well as peer universities, that the CNTTFA submits should be considered as exemplars. They are exemplary because they benefit not only the NTT faculty but also the university, the school, and its faculty as a whole. *It should be noted that many of these issues and recommendations apply to NTT faculty, but are also relevant to tenure-track faculty, who experience many of the same challenges.*

\(^1\)Data was collected from 13 schools, and the Writing Program. Please direct specific questions regarding the data to Ginger Clark at ginger.clark@usc.edu.
B. Methodology

The research used to inform this document was comprised of the following:

1. An inventory of all written NTT faculty-related criteria and guidelines from most schools within the university. This inventory was comprised of questions asked during the 2008-2009 inventory, as well as questions derived from what we realized we didn’t know based on the results of the 2009 White Paper.

2. An inventory of the degree to which faculty were aware of written criteria and guidelines, as well as what they deemed to be the strengths and weaknesses of these criteria.


The document was modeled on the format and content contained in both the 2009 and 2002 White Paper on Non-tenure-track Faculty Guidelines and Criteria. The rationale being that each of those documents, but the 2009 document in particular, were influential in bringing about significant change in a short amount of time, initiating the creation of criteria and guidelines pertaining to NTT faculty, and improving the working conditions for NTT faculty among a number of schools within the university.

NOTE: It is important to note that there are some written guidelines in place that are not reviewed in the paper. This has happened because data collection was reliant not only on the committee members’ ability to access that information, but also upon there being a committee member on the committee to access that information. These criteria vary widely even within schools (particularly for the larger schools), and we did not have representation from each academic unit on the committee.

C. Core Issues

The most important issues surveyed in these three sources of information were:

a. Profile
b. Workload
c. Merit Review
d. Promotion
e. Governance
f. Contracts
g. Sabbaticals

D. Criteria

In keeping with the model used by the 2009 White Paper, in which research indicated that criteria should be used in distinguishing exemplary practices from acceptable or ineffective practices, the following criteria were used:
a. Substance: Content that effectively addressed one of the seven issues listed above.
b. Clarity: Adequate written detail and explanation.
c. Fairness and consistency: An indication that the policy can be applied fairly and consistently in multiple, similar situations.
d. Rationale: The reasoning behind the policy is logical and relevant.
e. Implementation: The extent to which the practice or policy is actually utilized in the unit.

E. Guiding Values

During this process, the committee used the university’s own Trojan values to inform its work: caring, respect, diversity, team spirit, networks, and service to the community. When these values are reflected in our policies, guidelines, and practices, we cultivate an environment where faculty have clear paths to development, support for innovation and creativity, time for reflection and productivity, and respect and recognition that increase motivation and endurance, and deepen loyalty to the university. Establishing this kind of environment makes a statement: that the university is committed to providing the resources and developing a community where free inquiry, informed risk taking, and ethical conduct can naturally emerge.

We believe that the sharing of ideas and approaches to NTT criteria, guidelines, and practices that reflect these ideals benefits the university at large by encouraging each school to write its NTT guidelines such that those guidelines communicate that USC values its faculty, anticipates their developmental needs, and recognizes the importance of their success to the success of the university. Each school’s NTT guidelines, criteria, and practices should reflect USC’s larger commitment to create and maintain a welcome environment for growth and success for all faculty, which will also fulfill the larger goal of the university to attract and retain the best and brightest minds at our university.

II. EXEMPLARY WRITTEN CRITERIA AND PRACTICES

OVERARCHING QUALITIES

The CNTTFA identified two factors that should ideally be applied to all NTT criteria, guidelines, and practices:

1. Recognition of the administrative flexibility required by the varying needs of the many schools and departments of the University.

2. Recognition of the interconnected nature of the seven Core Issues listed above, so that they are seen as an interdependent whole that governs the relationship between the NTT faculty, the schools, and the university.
DATA SAMPLING

NOTE: All USC data in this paper was obtained by CNTTFA members, but there were limits on the CNTTFA’s ability to obtain data:
  • The CNTTFA did not have members from all schools, units, and departments.
  • In larger schools, different departments may have different NTT criteria, guidelines, and practices, even though they are housed under the same school.
  • The data collected was limited by the members’ ability to locate the requested information; some members found it difficult to locate written NTT criteria or guidelines of any kind, while the only written documents that others found were out of date or not formally adopted.

This paper was designed to reflect trends and highlight positive practices that are beneficial to the development and success of faculty, schools, and the university. While the CNTTFA attempted to capture all of the most progressive approaches to NTT criteria, guidelines, and practices at USC, it likely did not have access to some innovative approaches for the reasons described above. Also, it would be impossible to effectively highlight all of the data collected, so, while many schools did report criteria that were effective, only a few were featured as exemplary in the interest of concision. The CNTTFA would greatly appreciate input regarding any exceptional NTT criteria, guidelines, and practices that may have been overlooked, and will attempt to disseminate that information in future papers and updates.

PROFILES

1. USC Inventory
   a. It was encouraging to see that most units represented in the survey did have written profiles indicating distribution of faculty responsibilities between teaching, service, and research.

   b. The Division of Physical Therapy and the School of Dentistry both report having flexibility in negotiating workload profiles according to actual faculty responsibility and needs.

   c. The School of Education also provides clear guidance to NTT concerning the percentage of time to be spent in teaching, service, and research, and allows some negotiation of profile distribution for clinical faculty that want to do research, as well as for some faculty involved in special projects.

   d. The Libraries just released comprehensive, clear, and mutually beneficial guidelines for their faculty. These new guidelines are significantly more advantageous to faculty in terms of job security than the previous guidelines. The Libraries appear to have embraced the idea of providing their NTT faculty with guidelines that reflect their value to the university and that provide a commitment to those whose performance meets their stated criteria. Those guidelines are in the process of review by the Academic Senate.
2. **Peer Institutions**
   
a. Of the eleven peer universities surveyed, most provided clear definitions of each title, and half provided detailed narratives describing the types of work involved in faculty profiles and the amount of commitment required for each type of work. (Cornell, Harvard, UCLA, Cal, UPenn, Yale)

3. **Profile Recommendations: Exemplary Written Criteria and Practices:**
   
a. While most units listed profiles that distributed responsibilities across at least two areas of teaching, research, or service, there were a few units that limited the responsibilities of their faculty primarily to one category. It is recommended that all faculty be given at least some range of responsibility so that they have opportunities to get involved in multiple activities and leadership roles on campus. These options promote growth, networking, collaboration, support, and a broadening of expertise. These elements are related to job satisfaction, which is directly related to productivity and time spent in the position.

b. Varying types of school-approved workload profiles should be made available to NTT faculty within a school and widely disseminated so that faculty can request the profile that best fits their mutually-agreed-upon position. The CNTTFA recognizes, however, that allowing negotiation can create inequity if faculty members are not informed of all the reasonably available options or do not have strong negotiation skills; therefore transparency is needed to allow for equitable access to options.

**WORKLOAD**

1. **USC Inventory**
   
a. The School of Business continues to be a leader in providing its faculty with clarity and accurate partitioning of workload according to their work profiles.

b. It was encouraging to see so many schools reporting new written workload profiles that were clear and reflective of the actual work being done by their NTT faculty, including The School of Music and Dornsife College.

2. **Peer Institutions**

No university listed the typical workload (e.g., # of courses taught per year) for particular titles. Although the committee recognizes that listing the typical workload would reduce flexibility in adapting positions to the needs of each academic unit, the committee also recognizes that occasional disparities in the workload required of NTT faculty may exceed the reasonable variance designed to meet the needs of the academic unit.
Therefore, the committee especially appreciated the section in Princeton’s handbook where it explicitly states that the Dean of Faculty will regularly oversee the workload assignments of non-tenured faculty so that work is not unfairly distributed to those with less power and security within the university.

3. **Negotiated Workload Profile Recommendations: Exemplary Written Criteria and Practices:**

   a. There is some divergence between the mutually-agreed-upon profile and the assigned work load for many NTT faculty. While many units reported teaching assignments that reflected the percentage of time expected for teaching responsibilities in the work profile, others reported very high teaching loads that were not reflective of their mutually-agreed-upon profile distributions. In other words, the NTT faculty did not have sufficient time to commit to their other profile areas because their course assignments were too high, too large, or too work intensive, with no assistance, accommodation, or relief from other duties. It is recommended that a) teaching loads reflect the percentage of time assigned to teaching duties in the faculty profile, b) teaching loads be reduced when additional administration, service, or research duties are assigned, and c) workload and profile be determined in consultation with faculty to develop reasonable workload expectations and avoid overburdening of NTT faculty. An equivalent approach is recommended for faculty who have high research or service loads.

   b. Meetings should occur annually between faculty and deans to determine plans, goals, and objectives that will allow each faculty member to successfully contribute to the needs of the school for the coming year, as well as trying to meet the developmental needs of the individual.

   c. Should a discrepancy between the mutually-agreed-upon profile and the assigned workload emerge, faculty should be allowed to negotiate changes to their workload to make it consistent with the mutually-agreed-upon profile.

   d. It is recommended that implementation of a policy be instituted, similar to Princeton’s, and overseen by the Provost’s office, that includes language in the faculty handbook encouraging schools to provide reasonable workload adjustments when additional responsibilities are assigned.

   e. Each school should convene an NTT faculty advisory board to guide NTT faculty through the various stages of their career development.
ANNUAL MERIT REVIEW

1. USC Inventory

   a. The Schools of Business, Social Work, Education, Pharmacy, Cinema, and Theater have a regular, systematic, and comprehensive process for reviewing the performance of NTT faculty. Each year NTT faculty complete a detailed annual review form that assesses their performance relative to criteria that were developed by faculty, with the full and equal participation of NTT faculty. These criteria are shared with faculty at the same time as the workload profile, meaning that every faculty member knows the criteria that will be used to review his or her performance at the beginning of each year where merit review occurs. These schools use a peer-review process, meaning that one or more NTT faculty members, or Merit Review Committees, review each file to ensure that the process includes input from faculty with comparable experience. Faculty are provided with their ranking according to their performance in comparison to their NTT peers in the school.

   b. The School of Education has clear general guidelines that identify the kinds of work the school most values. These guidelines help faculty plan to do work that will have the most value for the school and then highlight that work during their merit reviews.

   c. The School of Business and the Libraries use several methods to evaluate teaching, including peer observation, classroom assessment, review of class materials, and professional development, as well as teaching evaluations. The School of Cinema provides this type of feedback if requested. NTT faculty in other schools were concerned that their teaching is often measured using very limited criteria, such as student evaluations (which measure likeability as much as teaching effectiveness), when other valid measures are available. This is a general weakness evaluating teaching for both NTT and tenure-track faculty.

   d. The Schools of Social Work and Cinema, and some departments in the School of Business, also provide specific feedback to NTT faculty each year as part of the merit review process, including guidance regarding progress toward promotion. A “Professional Development Committee” can be requested in the School of Social Work that provides feedback and guidance to each NTT faculty member. The School of Cinema will also provide this feedback if requested.

   e. The School of Music should be commended for instituting a new, more formal merit review process that uses clear, published guidelines for evaluating NTT faculty’s performance. These guidelines correspond to the faculty members’ workload profiles. Under the new guidelines, faculty prepare their own Report of Activities, and a Faculty Merit Review Committee, comprised of NTT faculty, conducts the review. There is also a published schedule detailing the timing of
the reviews. Faculty are given a summary of their strengths and weaknesses, as well as their ranking, by the review committee.

2. **Peer Institutions**

   a. UCLA, Cal, and UPenn have clear merit review processes published in their faculty handbooks, with timelines, criteria, and procedures clearly indicated.

3. **Annual Merit Review Recommendations: Exemplary Written Criteria and Practices**: *These recommendations are also relevant to the needs of tenure-track faculty.*

   a. All schools are encouraged to have a regular, consistent, and comprehensive merit review process that is based on clear written standards and criteria. Both NTT and tenure-track faculty in each school should be involved in developing the process and the criteria used to conduct it. The criteria should be not only published but also disseminated widely to faculty. NTT faculty in some schools were concerned that, although there is a merit-review process, the standards used to assess merit are not clear, comprehensive, or made known to the faculty.

   b. The merit-pay process for each unit should be described in writing and the description should include: 1) what constitutes the different levels of meritorious NTT work for that unit; 2) what the merit pool is for each year and what percentage ranges are assigned to the ranking categories; and 3) how annual performance-review documents should be formatted and organized, and what content they should contain. The School of Education has a good example of such a rubric.

   c. Merit-review criteria should be aligned with both (1) the relevant criteria in the faculty member’s profile and employment contract and (2) promotion criteria.

   d. Teaching should be evaluated using a variety of methods, including peer observation, classroom assessment, and the review of class materials, rather than only relying on student evaluations.

   e. Merit-pay increases should be based on the extent to which the NTT faculty member has met the merit-review criteria.

   f. Schools are urged to use the annual review process as a mentoring opportunity by providing each faculty member with guidance regarding his or her future prospects concerning the likelihood of retention, promotion, or non-renewal.

   g. Peer review should be formally added to merit review to maximize reliable and valid evaluations. Accordingly, NTT colleagues should be included in the merit review process of other NTT faculty to ensure that the process includes input from faculty with comparable experience.
h. Written evaluations resulting from the merit review should be provided to each faculty member annually. Each merit review committee should also request a report from the Dean outlining the extent to which the Dean’s decisions were consistent with the recommendations of the committee, and any changes that were made, in order to provide feedback to improve future evaluations and decisions made by the committee.

i. In some cases, merit review and academic advancement are separate processes, such as when a primary academic appointment differs from a primary work location and/or reporting structure. In such cases, reviews should be coordinated (sometimes across schools, where indicated) to reduce duplication of effort and enhance consideration of each context in which a faculty member's performance is evaluated.

PROMOTIONS

1. USC Inventory

   a. The School of Social Work remains a stellar model in having clear and accessible promotion guidelines, a practice of providing development committees, if requested, to help NTT faculty prepare for promotion, and a systematic mentoring processes as part of the promotion process. NTT faculty are involved in the promotion process, which ensures their work is understood by the reviewing committee. The School’s approach to promotion goes beyond a written statement to a comprehensive and thoughtful practice.

   b. The Schools of Theater and Pharmacy also provide feedback for faculty before they are due for promotion.

   c. The School of Pharmacy and some departments in the School of Engineering have a mandatory promotion policy from Assistant to Associate Professor as a means of ensuring quality instruction and research among NTT faculty.

   d. The Schools of Business and Dentistry have clear guidelines, assessment criteria, and transparent communication and documentation relating to NTT promotion.

   e. The Dornsife College, The Annenberg Schools, and the School of Music should be commended for recently developing clearer promotion criteria and guidelines for their NTT faculty.

   f. The School of Engineering has websites with detailed information on both orientation, as well as numerous mentoring opportunities.
2. **Peer Institutions**

a. Most peer institutions leave promotion of NTT faculty to the deans of individual schools. USC would be at the leading edge in recommending clear promotional guidelines and processes within each school.

3. **Promotion Recommendations: Exemplary Written Criteria and Practices:**

a. The overarching suggestion is that promotion processes should be more clearly communicated – including criteria and transparency. The University Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (UCAPT) manual might be used as a starting point for this process, adapted for the characteristics of NTT faculty.

b. The promotion process for each unit should be described in writing and made accessible to all faculty in the unit. These descriptions should include: 1) clearly identified NTT promotion or advancement opportunities within the school; 2) information about the timing of NTT promotions; 3) information about how promotions are awarded (i.e., the process to be used and who will be involved); 4) what constitutes promotable NTT work in that unit (i.e., the criteria to be used and what weight will be assigned to various activities); 5) information about what duties, responsibilities, and benefits accompany an NTT promotion (e.g., mentoring responsibilities, administrative responsibilities, change in title, X% salary increase, multi-year contract, ability to serve on committees, ability to take paid professional leave, ability take leadership roles, etc.); and 6) examples of dossiers and electronic forms to guide faculty as to the best content, organization, and formatting for promotion dossiers.

As stated above, the UCAPT Manual could be used as a model and modified to develop workable and fair guidelines for NTT faculty promotion. For example, administrative decisions could be changed from the university to the dean and school level. There would need, however, to be some acknowledgement of the vastly diverse profiles required for NTT faculty and the fact that their work is often not visible at a national or international level, so the desired impact of their work would need to be redefined.

c. Some form of school-wide oversight over promotions should occur to ensure that qualified faculty are promoted in a timely manner and that promotion guidelines and criteria are followed. This is particularly important for larger schools with many units and departments. It is recommended that the promotion process be uniform, regular, and equivalent within all units to avoid subjective or arbitrary decisions.

d. Mechanisms for mentoring should be developed for each unit so that junior faculty can be oriented to the type of work valued by the unit, school, and university. These mechanisms could include: a) salary, promotion, and tenure committees populated at least partially by NTT faculty in the same unit (when
possible); b) unit-sponsored workshops for junior NTT faculty; and c) group and individual mentoring for junior faculty, among other things.

University-wide, Provost-sponsored workshops are available for professional development issues. The provost has also offered to provide support for unit-sponsored events.

e. Many schools have written guidelines but no clear criteria for assessing teaching, research, or service. It is recommended that clear criteria be provided in each unit.

f. Each school should determine the best way to identify faculty that should be retained and rewarded for high quality work. Some schools may adopt an “up or out” promotion policy from Assistant to Associate, to mirror the tenure track. Others may use development committees for this task.

GOVERNANCE

1. **USC Inventory**

   a. The Schools of Business, Medicine, Pharmacy, and Social Work continue their role as leaders in maintaining well-defined governance documents, with NTT widely involved in governance activities. The Schools of Pharmacy and Social Work allow NTT as their Chairs of Faculty Council and as their Academic Senate representatives, for example.

   b. Two schools that do not have current or approved governance documents, but are also models for NTT participation in governance, in practice, are the School of Education and the Dornsife College. The School of Education has alternating terms for their Chair of Faculty Council, tenure track and then NTT. The Chair of the Faculty Council is the school’s representative for the Academic Senate, meaning that it is an NTT faculty member on alternating terms.

   c. The Schools of Music and Fine Arts have made great strides in creating governance documents and moving toward including NTT in governance activities.

2. **Peer Institutions**

   a. In all but one peer institution reviewed, most NTT faculty had voting rights in both their academic units and the General Faculty, except in the case of awarding tenure or compensation to tenured faculty.
3. Governance Recommendations: Exemplary Written Criteria and Practices:

a. It is recommended that the university strongly encourage all academic units to include NTT faculty as voting members of their faculty, allow NTT to attend and vote in all general faculty meetings, and allow NTT to serve as voting members on Faculty Council, Academic Senate, and other senior committees.

b. It is also recommended that both NTT and tenure-track faculty be eligible to serve as Faculty Council Chair and Representatives to Academic Senate. Notably, the Academic Senate recently voted unanimously to amend its constitution and bylaws to recognize its support for the full participation of NTT faculty in university governance, allowing for NTT faculty to serve as President of the Academic Senate.

c. Universally, even in schools where NTT faculty were included in governance, there was a consensus across the university that NTT faculty voice (and anecdotally tenure-track faculty voice) is not as strong as it should be in the development and implementation of school policy. Decisions are often made by administration without adequate transparency to the faculty as to what the process was or why decisions were made. The faculty felt that more communication and consultation was needed for the guidelines to be effectively endorsed and carried out by the faculty. Faculty should be an integral part of decision making from beginning to end. When decisions are made in smaller appointed faculty groups, dialogue should be encouraged during larger faculty meetings about the issues so that comments from the larger constituency can be addressed.

Schools should develop and share with their full faculty the process by which they determine their needs for NTT faculty hires, such that faculty can be involved in strategic planning for best use of all faculty’s strengths in meeting the needs of the schools. This process should also be tied to how faculty performance is evaluated, so that the hiring process and performance evaluation are aligned with the goals of the school.

CONTRACTS

1. USC Inventory

The consensus among those polled indicated that contracts were informative on a basic level in their delineation of length of term and profile. Some schools have revised their internal guidelines in order to implement multi-year contracts based on level of employment.

a. The Dornsife College offers multi-year contracts for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors of Research.

b. The Schools of Music and Social Work similarly offer longer contract periods, ranging from one, three, or five years, depending on rank.
c. The School of Business offers one- and three-year contracts.

d. The School of Pharmacy offers one-, four-, and five-year contracts to NTT at the Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor ranks.

e. For research faculty in Engineering, positions are not terminated if funding for the position exists.

2. Peer Institutions

a. Of the peer institutions reviewed for this paper, all but one university used multi-year contracts to attract and retain senior NTT faculty members. Terms ranged from 1 to 6 years, with the most common terms being 1 year at the junior level, 3 years at the mid-level, and 5 years at the senior level. Half of the universities had “up or out” policies regarding time in junior levels, for quality assurance. Two had “Tenure of Title” benefits for some NTT positions, and two had “Security of Employment” benefits.

3. Contract Recommendations: Exemplary Written Criteria and Practices:

a. It is recommended that opportunities for advancement and promotion be provided, with benefits tied to promotion. Benefits would include true multi-year contracts with junior faculty hired for 1-year terms, mid-level faculty hired for 3-year terms, and senior faculty hired for 5-year terms. The committee also recommends that each academic unit determine whether an “up or out” policy would strengthen their faculty. A set percentage pay raise, new title, and leadership opportunities should accompany such advancement.

b. There is widespread dissatisfaction with the standard contract and preponderance of the one-year “rolling” contracts that are currently used for many, if not most, NTT faculty at USC. It is therefore recommended that all schools follow the lead of Dornsife College, the School of Communication and Journalism, and School of Music in implementing multi-year contracts for NTT faculty at the mid and senior levels.

c. Leaving the length and terms of NTT contracts at the complete discretion of the Deans and subject to individual negotiation underscores the potential inequities of the current system. The committee therefore recommends the creation and implementation of clear and transparent standards to guide the negotiation, renewal, and length of NTT contracts. All NTT faculty at a given level of employment should be offered the same contract length and be made aware of the terms of renewal, assuming the needs of the school do not change, and performance is satisfactory. The committee would also recommend that negotiable terms be made transparent among all contracts.
d. Clarification is necessary regarding whether faculty are being given true multi-year contracts as opposed to “rolling” one-year contracts, which may be terminated at the end of each year without requiring good cause.

e. It is recommended the multi-year contracts be used as an incentive and reward for high quality work.

**SABBATICALS AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

1. **USC Inventory**

   a. A recent memorandum was distributed by the Provost’s Office in October of 2011 expanding the Advancing Scholarship in the Humanities and Social Sciences (AHSS) program to include NTT faculty members among those potentially eligible for certain sabbaticals. Cinema has been awarded a Provost-funded sabbatical. Full details can be found on the web: http://fdp.usc.edu.

   b. Many schools offer funding to NTT for specific professional development opportunities, which do not constitute full sabbaticals. For example, in January of 2011, the Dornsife College announced a faculty-development grant program specifically for NTT faculty members. In this program, there are two levels to support faculty in their pursuit of excellence in teaching.

   c. The Libraries now allow paid professional leaves for their NTT faculty members and have documents that describe the process. The Schools of Pharmacy, Law, and Social Work have also provided paid professional leave to NTT.

   d. The School of Education has allowed NTT faculty to apply for and take Fulbright-funded leaves.

2. **Peer Institutions**

   a. Seven of the ten peer institution handbooks reviewed provided for sabbaticals or paid professional leave for NTT faculty. And most, in fact, are funded at the university level, rather than the academic-unit level. Stanford’s policy was most clear in its provision for the range of eligible NTT faculty.

3. **Sabbaticals and Professional Development Recommendations: Exemplary Written Criteria and Practices:**

   a. In recruiting and retaining preeminent NTT faculty, providing opportunities for university-supported professional development would be a very attractive enticement. Providing for competitive, university-funded, multi-disciplinary, large impact projects with paid professional leave for NTT faculty, on the same schedule and terms offered to tenure-track faculty, when the leave will contribute
to the quality and prestige of the academic unit and the university can only strengthen the quality of faculty at USC.

b. The Dornsife College, the Libraries, and the School of Education guidelines are encouraging, but no other documentation was found in other schools or departments concerning paid professional leave. The committee believes that affording NTT faculty the ability to take advantage of paid professional leaves such as the Fulbright program, course releases, or sabbaticals, will help promote the level of scholarship and education that NTT faculty provide.

c. When paid professional leaves are allowed, it is recommended that release from regular duties during the leave be a part of that benefit, so that faculty are not expected to compound their work when they return from such a leave.

CONCLUSION

The committee is encouraged by progress made in developing NTT faculty guidelines. We are hopeful that this updated paper will lead to further change that is mutually beneficial to faculty, schools, and the university in recruiting, cultivating, and retaining a critical mass of innovative, productive, and highly regarded faculty.
APPENDIX A

Schools Represented in the Data

Annenberg School of Communication and Journalism
School of Architecture
School of Cinematic Arts
Ostrow School of Dentistry
Viterbi School of Engineering
Davis School of Gerontology
Gould School of Law
The Libraries
Keck School of Medicine
Marshall School of Business
Leventhal School of Accounting
Rossier School of Education
Thornton School of Music
School of Pharmacy
School of Social Work
School of Theater
The Writing Program