

To: The Faculty

From: Elizabeth Garrett, Provost



Peter Conti, President, Academic Senate



Leo Braudy, UCAPT Chair



Date: January 28, 2011

Re: Tenure, Promotion and Appointments

Office of the Provost

Elizabeth Garrett
Provost and
Senior Vice President
for Academic Affairs

Frances R. and
John J. Duggan
Professor of Law,
Political Science
and Public Policy

Decisions on appointments, promotion and tenure are crucial to USC's commitment to academic excellence. We congratulate the departments that have already moved forward so vigorously by applying USC's longstanding principle that every grant of tenure should improve the average quality of the department. We are grateful to the committees who respect the integrity of the tenure process by giving a balanced analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of every candidate. And we thank the senior faculty who mentor junior colleagues. To signal the importance of mentoring, the annual retreat co-sponsored by the Provost and Academic Senate will this year be devoted to the Culture of Mentoring.

The enclosed 2011 edition of the UCAPT manual has several changes.

- Some faculty have raised questions about the procedures. UCAPT felt it would be helpful to create a FAQ that answers some of the most common questions.
- Recommendations by the Senate-Provost Research Committee on how best to evaluate collaborative scholarship are included.
- Important material has been rearranged and expanded in sections of Advice to Candidates, and Advice to Departments and School Committees.
- New or expanded sections deal with promotion to Full Professor, and designation as Clinical Scholar.

The FAQ also make clear some of the features of our promotion process that has served USC so well. UCAPT is a rotating committee. It is diverse by discipline and intellectual approach, and more than a quarter of its members over the last five years have been faculty of color. UCAPT members are outstanding scholars and creative artists, including University, Distinguished and Provost Professors. The President appoints members based on nominations from the Academic Senate leadership and deans, and self-nominations by faculty.

UCAPT welcomes excellent contributions made through all forms of research, solo or collaborative, interdisciplinary or within disciplinary cores, using traditional or avant-garde methods. In our system of checks and balances, if either a department or a dean recommends a case, it goes to UCAPT. If UCAPT and the dean disagree, the dean has the opportunity to comment on UCAPT's recommendation. Both the notes on UCAPT's deliberations and vote, and the written analysis by each individual panel member, go to the Provost with the full dossier.

If the decision is negative, the Provost always provides the reasons in writing to the dean to be conveyed to the individual, usually through the department chair; if the individual asks for a more detailed explanation, the Provost provides that to the dean to convey to the individual. Reconsideration of a case is possible if there is new evidence. Politicizing the appointment or promotion process has no place in our procedures, which demand evaluation solely on merit. Thus, lobbying for or against a candidate does not affect decisions.

Cases are decided individually on the evidence, without discrimination. During the last five years the success rate of minority and non-minority candidates for promotion to tenure has shown no statistically significant difference; in fact, the success rate of minority candidates happens to be approximately five percentage points higher.

USC began publishing details about UCAPT procedures a decade ago to demystify the process. The UCAPT manual explains the criteria for tenure, provides details on the procedure, and outlines how to prepare tenure dossiers to give a full picture of the candidate's work and its impact on the field.

We recommend that the manual be read by all candidates, faculty mentors, promotion and tenure committees, and all other faculty who wish to understand USC's process for making decisions on senior appointments, promotions, and awards of tenure that are so vital for our university's academic stature.

Cc: C. L. Max Nikias
Academic Deans

**University Committee on
Appointments, Promotions and Tenure**



**UCAPT MANUAL
January 2011**

Table of Contents

1.	Frequently Asked Questions	1
	<i>1.a Information about UCAPT</i>	
	<i>1.b Notes for Assistant Professors</i>	
	<i>1.c Notes for Departments and Schools</i>	
2.	Criteria for Tenure and Promotion	18
	<i>2.1 Expectations for Tenure and Promotion</i>	
	<i>2.2 Full Professor, Clinical Scholar and Similar Titles</i>	
	<i>2.3 School Clarifications</i>	
	<i>2.4 Interdisciplinary Scholarship and Teaching</i>	
	<i>2.5 International Scholarship and Teaching</i>	
3.	Process	22
	<i>3.1 Information for All New Faculty</i>	
	<i>3.2 Information for Interdisciplinary Candidates</i>	
	<i>3.3 Tenure Decision Date; Stopping the Clock for Parenting and Other Reasons</i>	
	<i>3.4 Pre-Tenure Reviews</i>	
	<i>3.5 Early Review; Promotion to Associate Professor; Effect of Negative Decision</i>	
	<i>3.6 Deadlines for Dossiers</i>	
	<i>3.7 Supplementing the Dossier; New Information</i>	
	<i>3.8 Confidentiality</i>	
	<i>3.9 Multiple Levels of Review; Automatic Review</i>	
	<i>3.10 Review of Interdisciplinary Candidates</i>	
	<i>3.11 Role of UCAPT and the Provost</i>	
	<i>3.12 Communicating Decisions; Explanations and Advice</i>	
	<i>3.13 Finality</i>	
4.	Dossier - Administrative and Faculty Assessments	27
	<i>4.1 The Importance of Candor</i>	
	<i>4.2 Documenting the Process Fully</i>	
	<i>4.3 Department and School Reports and Memos</i>	
	<i>4.4 Contents of Department Report and Memo</i>	
	<i>4.5 Dean's Responsibility</i>	
	<i>4.6 Part I-B of the Dossier should be used for Quantitative Data</i>	
5.	Dossier - Curriculum Vitae	31
6.	Dossier - Personal Statement	32

7.	Dossier - Teaching Record	32
	7.1 <i>Summary and Analysis</i>	
	7.2 <i>Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness</i>	
8.	Dossier – Service	34
9.	Dossier - Referees’ Letters of Evaluation	35
	9.1 <i>Solicitation of Letters</i>	
	9.2 <i>Method of Selection of Referees</i>	
	9.3 <i>Who Should be Referees</i>	
	9.4 <i>Contents and Number of Letters Meeting all Criteria</i>	
	9.5 <i>Contents and Number of Letters – In General</i>	
	9.6 <i>Organization of Letter Section of Dossier</i>	
	9.7 <i>Quoting or Naming Referees in Reports and Memos</i>	
	9.8 <i>Who Contacts Referees and Students</i>	
	9.9 <i>Honorarium</i>	
	9.10 <i>Revising the Template Request to Referees</i>	
10.	Dossier - Evidence of Scholarship or Professional Performance, and Teaching	38
11.	Senior Lateral Appointments	39
	11.1 <i>Timing</i>	
	11.2 <i>Contents of the Dossier</i>	
	11.3 <i>Internal Lateral Appointments</i>	
12.	General Provisions	41
	12.1 <i>Consistency</i>	
	12.2 <i>Changes in Edition of UCAPT documents</i>	
	12.3 <i>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</i>	
13.	Templates for Solicitation Letters for Referees	42
	13.1 <i>For promotion or appointment to Associate Professor or full Professor, whether or not involving the grant of tenure.</i>	
	13.2 <i>For use when the referee is a collaborator</i>	
	13.3 <i>For use when the candidate is in artistic field</i>	
14.	Checklist for Dossier Preparation	46
Appendix	UCAPT Dossier Evaluation Form	

Manual of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure

January 2011

The 2011 edition of the UCAPT manual begins with a new section, Frequently Asked Questions, to respond to inquiries that have been raised since the last edition, to highlight important points, and to indicate some of the changes since the 2008 edition. The topics in the FAQ are: (a) *Information About UCAPT*; (b) *Notes for Assistant Professors* (General Questions; The Candidate's Portion of the Dossier; Collaborative Work; Understanding Specific Criteria); and (c) *Notes for Departments and Schools* (General Questions; The Department's Portion of the Dossier; Notes for Deans). Candidates, mentors, and promotion committees are asked to read both sets of notes, as well as the rest of the manual. This edition also includes new information on Full Professors --see section 2.2(a)--and Clinical Scholars --section 2.2(b). Later sections include details on the process and on how to prepare the dossier of evidence on candidates and their contributions. Template letters to referees are included in section 13.

1. Frequently Asked Questions

1.a INFORMATION ABOUT UCAPT

a-1. What is UCAPT?

The University Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure is established by the Faculty Handbook and appointed by the President of the University. Both the Faculty Handbook and the University Bylaws vest the authority over tenure appointments in the President, who has delegated the responsibility to the Provost. UCAPT advises the Provost and President.

Appointment of UCAPT members by the President is made from nominations by the Academic Senate leadership, deans, and self-nominations. UCAPT members are a rotating group of outstanding scholars, educators, and creative artists, diverse by field, intellectual approach, ethnicity and gender. See section 3.11 and Faculty Handbook Section 4-H (1).

a-2. How does UCAPT embody USC's commitment to equal opportunity?

UCAPT's recommendations are made individually on a merit basis. Analysis of the data between 2005 and 2009 shows no statistically significant difference between minority and non-minority candidates in success rate for promotion to tenure. (The success rate for minority candidates happens to be five percentage points higher.) During the same period, over a quarter of UCAPT's members were themselves minority.

a-3. How does UCAPT evaluate interdisciplinary cases?

UCAPT sits in panels and can assign a dossier to a different panel, or use mixed panels, ad hoc committees or consultants as needed. It welcomes interdisciplinary work equally with that

within disciplinary cores, including work that crosses from social sciences into the humanities or transcends the home department

a-4. What other faculty committees are involved in tenure decisions?

Faculty Handbook Section 4-H (2) provides that the dean will be advised by a faculty committee, and that in larger schools there is also a departmental committee. In some departments the tenured faculty functions as a committee of the whole.

A typical path in a departmentalized school is (1) vote by department tenured faculty (often advised by a subcommittee), (2) decision by dean (after advice of school committee), (3) decision by the Provost as the President's delegate (after advice of UCAPT). If both department and dean are negative, the case goes no further.

a-5. Does USC learn from practice elsewhere?

Each university sets its own procedures; there are many variations and no consensus among research universities on which procedures are "best." Unlike many universities, for example, at USC negative evaluations by both department and dean are needed to stop a dossier from going forward; there is no requirement that tenure be approved by the Board of Trustees; and there are no tenure quotas

That said, UCAPT has benefitted, for example, from considering the report, *Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation: Advice for Tenured Faculty, Department Chairs, and Academic Administrators*, published by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and United Educators. www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/tenure-evaluation.pdf. UCAPT has also benefitted from considering the tenure criteria used at the National Institutes of Health.

a-6. Is it common at other universities for panels to be confidential?

Universities differ on how much information is disclosed. However, it is not unusual for the panels or ad hoc committees that consider specific cases at other universities to be confidential so as to encourage honest and objective evaluations and to reduce concerns about political interference, lobbying, peer pressure or pressure from deans. That confidentiality is maintained at USC; nevertheless, the Academic Senate leadership knows the membership of UCAPT and its panels.

Some comparisons: At Columbia University, "All aspects of the *ad hoc* proceedings are conducted with strict confidentiality which is both an act of civility to all concerned and a prerequisite for the type of critical examination the *ad hoc* review requires" and the membership of the *ad hoc* committee as well as "information about the committee's deliberations and the actual vote on the nomination is similarly restricted to the members of the committee and to the President and Provost or their representatives." Similarly, at Stanford, "the entire appointment, reappointment, or promotion proceedings during which specific candidates are discussed are to be held in strict confidence by all participants" and "the opinions expressed by the school or department faculty or by internal or external referees or reviewers shall not be discussed with the candidate or with other parties, except when necessary for University review of the process."

a-7. Is there transparency on how tenure is decided?

The UCAPT manual has been published for a decade in order to demystify the criteria and process. Each edition gives public answers to important questions that have come up since the prior one.

a-8. To whom is UCAPT accountable?

Under the University bylaws, it is accountable to the President. By the President's delegation, it is directly accountable to the Provost. For each dossier, the written evaluation by each individual UCAPT panel member, and notes on the panel's deliberation and vote, are reviewed by the Provost and available to the President. (See the appendix for a sample evaluation sheet.)

a-9. Is an unsuccessful candidate told the reasons for a denial?

Yes, the Provost's decision memo to the dean always states the reason for each denial. Usually the dean asks the department chair to deliver the message personally. If a candidate wishes more detail, a dean is designated to explain the reasons at length to the candidate. See section 3.12.

a-10. Are other faculty told the reason for a specific denial?

The candidate is free to share the reasons; otherwise USC respects the privacy of the individual, consistent with state law and university policy. There is regularly feedback to the school or department on how to improve the quality of dossiers.

a-11. Is the unsuccessful candidate told about the specific votes and recommendations?

No. In order to promote candid and honest appraisals, each recommendation in the decision process is reviewed by subsequent levels, but otherwise regarded as confidential. See answer a-6.

a-12. Is our tenure process subject to political or other influences?

No. Even our Board of Trustees, which has the legal power to make tenure decisions, has bound itself not to intervene, leaving the decision solely in the hands of the President, who has in turn delegated the decision to the chief academic officer, the Provost.

a-13. Is it helpful for allies or opponents of a candidate to organize a lobbying campaign?

No. On occasion at various universities, groups of alumni, political figures, or internal or external faculty have attempted to use lobbying campaigns or petitions to affect a decision. It is unprofessional for faculty to participate in such campaigns or to involve students in a personnel decision. Such influences have no part in the personnel process, and are excluded from the dossier. Volunteered letters or petitions suffer from a selection bias, and often are based on mistakes about the facts of the dossier, our process, or the candidate's work.

a-14. What protections are there against improper considerations influencing the process?

Both the confidentiality of the process, and the prohibition against lobbying, seek to provide protections against interference.

If any member of a department or committee believes that improper considerations have affected the decision of the body in which he or she participates, or the decision at a level earlier in the process, he or she should write to the Provost at the time his or her level submits its report. It is the Provost's responsibility to decide what remedy, if any, is appropriate.

a-15. Are there checks and balances in the system?

If the departmental vote is negative, there is automatic review by the dean. If either the department or dean is positive, there is automatic review by UCAPT. If UCAPT's recommendation differs from that of the dean, the dean has an opportunity to offer further analysis to the Provost. The Provost reviews the whole dossier.

If the final decision is negative, there is opportunity to seek reconsideration. See section 3.13. If the candidate believes there have been procedural irregularities, he or she should promptly write to the Provost since it is the Provost's responsibility to decide what remedy, if any, is appropriate for procedural defects. The Provost may authorize exceptions or waivers to this manual or other policies. If the candidate believes his or her rights have been violated, there is also a right to a grievance hearing by the Committee on Tenure and Privileges Appeals, by filing a grievance through the Academic Senate as provided in the Faculty Handbook, Section 7.

a-16. Do UCAPT subcommittees deal with any cases other than the usual?

Yes: (1) candidates for Associate University Librarian and University Librarian, Librarian III and IV in the Health Sciences Library, and Law Librarian III and IV, and the grant of continuing appointment status; (2) candidates for Associate Professor (Clinical Scholar) and Professor (Clinical Scholar) and similar titles -- see section 2-2(b); (3) candidates proposed by a school for tenure, and also recommended by an interdisciplinary committee for the title Provost's Professor, a designation reserved for leading scholars who do interdisciplinary work and are based in two or more schools or departments of USC College; and (4) candidates for appointment by the President to named professorships and chairs awarded on a university-wide basis, such as the Judge Widney Professorship (named after USC founder Robert Maclay Widney) reserved for eminent individuals from the arts, sciences, professions, business, and community leadership, and the title Presidential Professor, which is a rare honor bestowed upon an individual who combines the highest academic recognition with landmark contributions to society. Such appointments are non-tenure-track; the length of appointment and effort profile are individually determined; and any specific school affiliations are by agreement with the schools.

1.b NOTES FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

General Questions

b-1. What are the criteria for tenure?

See section 2.1 of the manual.

b-2. Does UCAPT have advice for beginning assistant professors?

The key advice is to teach well and publish work that meets the criteria mentioned in section 2.1. Beyond that there are three major pieces of advice:

- Have a multi-year research plan so that, by the end of your fifth year¹ you have published the quantum of work usual in your field as the way to have impact. (In many fields, that means a set of published peer-reviewed articles; in some, it is artistic work; in some, it means

¹ If a school has an approved longer tenure clock, any mentions of "fifth year," etc., have to be adjusted accordingly.

“publish the book!”) Ask senior colleagues to walk you through a realistic time line on how long it takes to publish articles or books or get R01 grants, etc. Remember that your work is circulated to referees at the end of your fifth year, and the series of articles (or book, etc.) are expected to be published by that time.

- Don’t allow yourself to be distracted from publishing the articles, book, etc., by excessive devotion of time to any of the other activities that, while extremely worthwhile, can take time away from your core scholarly work²: committee service, mentoring undergraduates, multiple new course preparations, service to external professional or community groups, clinical work, work in a joint appointment department, and so on. If necessary, ask your chair, dean or the Provost’s office to help you protect the time you need for your scholarship. If there are special circumstances like a new child or delay in setting up a lab, *promptly* apply for an extension of your probationary period. See Faculty Handbook Section 4-D(1)(a).
- Understand that the quality of the venue of publication or the grant peer-review process is important evidence. See section 1 answer b-7.

b-3. What are typical expectations of productivity?

Scholarship is evidenced by creative and excellent work that makes a real contribution and has an impact on the field, typically demonstrated in:

- a published university press book (preferably with published reviews), a second such book well underway (as evidenced by substantial drafts or finished chapters), and three-to-four substantial articles in top peer-reviewed journals, or
- two-to-three peer-reviewed articles a year, most first authored, most in top journals, or
- an independent research program as principal investigator with a sustained record of peer-reviewed substantial external funding from national institutes (preferably two R01 awards, or one and a competitive renewal, or equivalent components of Center or Project grants), and with appropriate publication of important results or
- whatever is appropriate for the field, as each school itself formulates subject to Provost approval.

b-4. Which is more important, quantity or quality?

It is important to emphasize that meeting numerical expectations for scholarship is not the standard for tenure. Contribution and impact are matters of quality. Nevertheless, they generally benefit from cumulative quantity: usually a series of published journal articles are more influential than just one. The amount of intellectual output (and quantitative data like citation count) play a role in the tenure decision, because they are indicative of the level of your activity and affect your stature in the eyes of peer reviewers. If there is less than the usual quantity of work, questions are raised. In some fields, a published university press book is regarded as a *sine qua non*.

b-5. Are teaching and mentoring important to the tenure decision?

A positive decision requires that the candidate has demonstrated excellence and creativity in teaching, including preparation, advisement, and the direction of research. On the other hand,

² For artistic fields, mentions of “scholarship,” “research,” and the like have to be replaced with appropriate terms.

devotion to teaching and mentoring should not be allowed to take away the time necessary to publish the expected scholarly work and obtain necessary extramural laboratory funding.

b-6. Is internal or external service important to the tenure decision?

University and community service are supplementary, not primary, criteria. UCAPT looks for evidence that the candidate for tenure makes a contribution to the collective academic enterprise and that it is a positive one. Candidates should avoid devoting so much time to university and community service that it detracts from their scholarship.

b-7. What is the best venue for publication?

Many evaluators prefer the famed university presses and the flagship journals that have widespread audiences and are frequently cited (and thus have high “impact factors”); others prefer the specialized journals and university presses where the strongest work in the subfield is published and will have most impact on those in the specialty. A candidate benefits from publishing articles in both types of venue. Candidates should understand that the evidence of editorial peer review is highly salient, and should try to publish in the most respected venues available to them. UCAPT considers the field and the quality of journals or publishers in developing a picture of the quality of the intellectual output of a candidate. See section 1 answer c-7.

b-8. How is digital scholarship evaluated?

UCAPT understands that some works are created to be viewed in an electronic medium. Other scholarship happens to be published in online-only journals or presses, and the electronic venues are analyzed in the same fashion as print.

For venues where the peer review process and impact factor are not apparent, departments should submit such explanatory information as the ratio of submissions to acceptances, the stature of others who publish in that venue, the stature of the referees or editors, and measures of the influence of the venue.

If a digital publication is not itself peer-reviewed, evaluation of its quality can be facilitated if it was supported by important peer-reviewed grant funding, or if it leads to significant publications in peer-reviewed scholarly journals.

b-9. How are conferences, etc., regarded?

This varies from discipline to discipline. Presenting papers at conferences can be a way of trying out ideas, making contact with others in the field, and other worthwhile goals. But over-emphasis on conference presentations can take time away from more substantial work and publication. In computer science, many scholars regard published conference papers from top conferences as equivalent to journal articles. But most fields do not rate them as highly.

Artistic exhibitions and cinema festivals have their own forms of peer review, and the importance of such venues can be evaluated with information supplied by the department and referees. See section 1 answer c-7.

b-10. Are there sources of guidance for the candidate?

Several sources are available. Every candidate should read the UCAPT manual. (Please be sure to read the answers below labeled Notes for Department and Schools.) Several valuable columns of advice by senior professors at USC and elsewhere are linked from the page *Essential Guide for Assistant Professors* (“The Online Mentor”) on the Faculty Portal, www.usc.edu/faculty :

- Some Unofficial Advice for Tenure-Track Assistant Professors.
- Personal Goals
- An Assistant Professor’s Guide to the Galaxy.
- Open Letter to 2010-11’s First-Time Tenure-Track Professors.

UCAPT encourages you to seek multiple mentors both inside and outside your department and both formal and informal. But remember that you have ultimate responsibility for your own career. You can get an idea of national standards by looking at the online CV’s of those who have been newly tenured at the leading national departments in your field.

For a decade the Academic Leadership & Development Committee and UCAPT have sponsored annual workshops for assistant professors in years 1-3 to answer questions about the criteria for tenure. Another annual workshop is offered for those in years 4-5 (and their chairs) to explain the tenure process.

b-11. Can a candidate rely on advice and predictions?

Neither advice nor predictions by any USC official except the Provost are definitive. Even if colleagues are optimistic, candidates for tenure should seek constructive criticism throughout their probationary period, remembering that external referees and UCAPT will make an evaluation by national standards, and that the final decision is made at the University level.

Similarly, neither advice about, nor interpretations of, University policy or this manual by any USC official except the Provost are definitive.

The Candidate’s Portion of the Dossier

b-12. What parts of the tenure dossier are the candidate’s responsibility?

- A current CV, that includes a list of all publications and grants received. For details, see section 1 answer b-13.
- A list of all courses taught, independent study supervisions, and graduate students and post-docs supervised, with dates of completion and their next positions (either in the CV or in a separate list.)
- Copies of all student evaluations (unless these are supplied by the department.)
- A personal statement (see below and section 6.)
- For collaborative work or team projects, an explanation of the candidate’s specific contribution to the collaborative publications or grants. (This can be done in the personal statement, or in annotations to the article and grant lists on the CV.) See also the other answers about collaborative work.
- Optionally, a communication to the department of names of a few experts whom the candidate suggests be consulted as referees (understanding that the candidate’s suggestions are thus indicated in the dossier, and may be evaluated differently from

referees suggested by the department.) A candidate may also identify potential referees whom he or she suspects may be biased and therefore undesirable to consult. (See section 9.2).

- Copies of published books.
- Suggestion of a few of the candidate's best publications to send to referees. See section 10. Copies of those articles.
- Copies of book manuscripts that are under submission, undergoing editing, or still in progress.
- "Pink sheets" on pending grants.
- Publisher's reader reports on pending book publications.
- Copies of all published reviews of books (or performances or exhibits, as appropriate.)

N.B. A candidate who neglects, after repeated requests, to provide the material will be regarded as having withdrawn from consideration.

b-13. What should the CV show?

The candidate should provide a current CV (showing the date of preparation.) Use whatever CV format is standard in your school or discipline, or see suggestions at http://cet.usc.edu/resources/academic_resources/cvs.html. See Section 5.

- For articles include first and last pages, and date. Separate peer-reviewed articles from other work. (Preferably list most recent first.)
- For grants, please include grant number, name, dates, total amount (and amount under your direction, if you are responsible for a component—if independently scored, please say so), the name of the principal investigator, and your role if you are not P.I. (e.g., co-principal investigator, investigator, consultant. Please be explicit if the agency recognizes equal co-principal investigators.)
- Either in the CV or in an attached list, please list courses and independent study supervisions by semester.
- Either in the CV or in an attached list, please list graduate students and post-docs supervised; if they completed their work, please show the date of completion and their next position.
- The CV should list both internal and external service.
- Please see section 1 answer b-14 as to joint work.
- Personal information such as birth date, birthplace, citizenship, and family information should *not* be included.

b-14. Should the CV show anything special as to collaborative work?

UCAPT seeks to understand the candidate's specific contribution to joint work, and welcomes explanations by the candidate, whether in the personal statement or in annotations to the lists of publications and grants in the CV. See section 6.

On your CV, if there are joint authors of publications, please underline the name of the senior author for each publication and please **boldface your own name**. If one of the co-authors is your student or post-doc, please indicate that name with an asterisk. Please explain if there is special meaning to your location in a sequence of middle authors.

On your CV (or in an attached table) if you were responsible for a part of a grant, please show that fact, the amount of the grant that you managed, and whether that part was independently scored. If the granting agency recognized equal co-principal investigators, please clearly say so. A table showing all the requested information will probably be easiest for readers.

b-15. What should be in the personal statement?

The personal statement is important but often need not be more than a few pages long. The candidate is provided this opportunity to convey to others the excitement and importance of his or her scholarly life's work. The candidate can explain the contribution of the body of work, and the trajectory of work done and planned. The candidate's role in collaborative publications and grants should be explained (if that doesn't appear in the CV or a separate table.). Approaches to teaching and service can be summarized. (Do not discuss here awards, prizes or other peer assessment of accomplishments; they are covered in the formal assessment material provided in part I of the dossier.)

b-16. What works can be listed as published?

A book or article is actually published when it is available for everyone to read, either in print or online. It can be listed as "in press" when the author has no more editorial work to do on the accepted work, and the publisher has assigned an ISBN number for a book or a DOI number (digital object identifier) for an article. The CV circulated to referees at the end of year 5 should be completely accurate as to which work is actually published or in press. Other work can be listed separately as under contract, revise and resubmit, etc., but the candidate should realize that such work is not regarded as finished.

b-17. Is earlier work counted?

UCAPT considers all work, but looks particularly at work done since the individual was appointed at USC (or since the previous promotion here). See section 4.0(a).

Collaborative Work

b-18. Who is credited for co-authorship?

The University recognizes and supports a variety of styles of scholarship, both independent and collaborative. In all cases, UCAPT looks to distinguish important and original contributions on the part of the candidate. UCAPT understands that in some fields co-authorship or team science is the norm.

Traditionally, the first author and the senior author receive most credit: the first author is assumed to have taken the lead on the specific publication, and the senior author is assumed to be the intellectual driving force. There may be an assumption that other authors have not made major contributions unless specific information is provided. See also section 1 answer b-14 about collaborative work on the CV.

b-19. Who is credited for grants?

Usually it is assumed that the intellectual leadership on a grant is provided by the principal

investigator (or, when recognized by the granting agency, equal co-principal investigators.) The investigator responsible for a separately scored portion of a large grant is credited with that portion.

UCAPT always seeks to understand the candidate's contribution; see the discussion in section 1 answer b-18 in reference to co-authorship.

Understanding Specific Criteria

b-20. What is meant by the “independent” work expected of candidates?

UCAPT expects a candidate for tenure to have a program of scholarship independent of the candidate's Ph.D. supervisor or post-doctoral mentor. It is understood that in some fields the new faculty member's early publications will be outgrowths of the Ph.D. dissertation, but even in such cases there should be publications that show the candidate's further intellectual growth.

A candidate for tenure is expected to have demonstrated important and original scholarly contributions. Traditionally most candidates published single-author articles or books, or established a lab of their own, or the like. In fields where co-authorship or team science is common (or where the candidate has chosen to work collaboratively) those markers may be absent, and UCAPT will seek other evidence of intellectual leadership and originality. If the bulk of the candidate's research is done jointly with senior and more established scholars, it is particularly important that there be evidence of the candidate's important original contribution. See also the other answers on collaborative work.

b-21. What is meant by a “contribution”?

Merely choosing an important topic or bringing together the methods of several disciplines is not enough. It is the results that count. UCAPT looks for evidence of a contribution to the field that can be stated in the form, for example, “She has found that XXX which has advanced notably the knowledge of YYY,” not “She studies the important topic of ZZZ,” nor “He is the first to study the connection of D, E and F.”

b-22. What is meant by “impact”?

Sometimes impact on the field is shown by evidence from referees that their own work has been changed by the candidate's findings, or that the candidate's work is required reading for courses, qualifying exams or the like. Sometimes the impact of the candidate's work is shown by invitations to give invited addresses, or the award of prizes, etc. Citation counts, and variants such as the h-index, are crude metrics, which should be supplemented by analysis of how and why the work is cited. If a book or articles have been published so late that there has been no time for published reviews or citations, UCAPT will lack such evidence of impact.

b-23. How are different kinds of evidence evaluated?

- Peer-reviewed articles, university press books, and grants
The quality of the venue indicates the rigor of the peer review process.
- Book reviews, encyclopedia and review articles, edited volumes, and chapters in edited volumes

While these may add to the candidate's visibility, they are not regarded by UCAPT as important evidence, and may not be the best use of the candidate's energies, unless their

significance is adequately explained. Time devoted to publish in such venues should never detract from the expectations for peer-reviewed journal and book publication.

- Interdisciplinary work

USC welcomes work that spans traditional disciplines equally with that falling within a single one. See section 1 answer a-3 and section 2.4.

- Avant-garde methods or controversial subjects

These are not negative aspects of a dossier, and can be quite positive. Candidates whose work touches upon a wide range of genres and subject matters have been granted tenure if the work is creative, important, and has impact on a field.

- Civic engagement

In some disciplines, evaluation of the impact of peer-reviewed publications can include not just impact on other scholars, but also impact on the practice of the profession, public policy, or the workings of institutions.

- Innovative ways to turn ideas into impact

Sometimes the candidate's work results in new public policies, new organizations or new models for the work of organizations, or new products or services that impact people's lives. These activities are not a substitute for peer-reviewed publication, but can be evaluated as additional measures of the impact of the candidate's scholarly contribution.

b-24. Is the number of dollars awarded in grants or type of indirect cost recovery significant for tenure?

Not per se. The careful peer review for highly selective grants is important information for tenure consideration. Thus it would be highly salient that an NIH R01 proposal received an excellent score even it was not funded because the agency appropriation was cut. On the other hand, even a very large grant that is awarded without equivalent peer review would not provide useful information for a tenure decision. There is no inherent quality difference in grants that are or are not accompanied by indirect cost recovery, rather the rigor of the peer review of NIH and similar funding sources is what is significant. (In many fields, of course, grants are not relevant, while for other areas, grants are necessary to provide the resources needed to conduct the research.)

b-25. How are unsolicited letters regarded?

Unsolicited letters are not part of the dossier, are not welcome, and are not considered significant: they have no appreciable weight because they are subject to selection bias. It is also generally not useful for the department to include letters from other USC faculty outside of those provided for in this manual. (Collaborator letters are already provided for in the manual.)

b-26. Will every assistant professor receive a full tenure review?

Not necessarily. While we hope that every tenure-track assistant professor flourishes and earns tenure, tenure-track faculty are appointed on a series of one year contracts, and may be non-reappointed in any year with notice as provided in Faculty Handbook Sections 4-F (3) and 3-B (5). If it appears in any year that the individual is unlikely to meet the standards for tenure, not renewing the contract is fairer to the candidate and better for the department. Schools are asked to consider the question of non-reappointment especially carefully at third year review, and in year five.

1.c NOTES FOR DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS

General Questions

c-1. What kind of memorandum from a department is most effective?

Analysis of issues is what the Provost requires, rather than advocacy of a conclusion. Negative evidence must be weighed as conscientiously as positive evidence, and doubts and questions must be analyzed seriously along with hopes and affirmations. For example, it is not persuasive to dismiss negative comments by a referee with ad hominem statements on why that referee should not have been chosen. Caveats contained in referee letters should be noted and evaluated as to what they signal. Split votes or dissenting views should never be suppressed. (See sections 4.1 and 4.4). Those who support a candidate should realize that greatest aid is to provide a balanced analysis. Some schools have long done this in their reports, while others need to be more aware of its importance: this type of analysis is a highly positive factor, not a negative one, and is much more influential with UCAPT than is advocacy.

Additionally, UCAPT takes more seriously the judgments of departmental and school committees when it is apparent that they have thoughtfully read the scholarship (or observed the art, etc.).

c-2. How should the department evaluate interdisciplinary work?

When the candidate has a joint appointment, collaborates with scholar(s) in other discipline(s), or otherwise flags his or her work as interdisciplinary, the departmental committee should include one or more members from the appropriate other department(s). Advice should be sought from these colleagues on selection of some referees from the other discipline(s) and also some referees who share the candidate's interdisciplinary focus, and advice should also be sought on analysis of publication venues. An evaluation by the other department(s) should be sought through a letter from its chair or an appropriate senior colleague, though no vote from that department should be held. See section 2.4.

c-3. How should the department evaluate collaborative work?

In order to assess the original, creative contribution of the candidate to collaborative works, the department should seek a few referees who are important co-authors with the candidate (in addition to the five or six non-coauthoring referees). The request letter to co-authoring referees should ask them to address the significance of the sequence of authors and the original, creative contribution of the candidate as a co-author. The candidate should be asked to discuss these topics in the personal statement or annotated CV. It is particularly important that the committee report also address these topics. See sections 9.3 (b) and 13.2 for a template letter for collaborators.

The department should take into account the NIH tenure criteria as revised “in keeping with the desire to encourage and reward team science, especially in clinical research”:

- “for members of multidisciplinary teams, continued high quality, original research following tenure is expected even if the multidisciplinary team disbands.”
- “for team research, clear evidence of distinct intellectual contribution to the outstanding research of a multidisciplinary team, such as: independent publication of methodological or

seminal contributions to the candidate's specific research area; where possible, explicit in-print acknowledgement of unique creative contributions in multi-author publications and/or selection for presentation of team findings at national and international scientific conferences; members of research teams should demonstrate peer recognition of their specific contributions and some publications should highlight their distinctive research; creative and unique contributions to team productivity should be documented in the reviews of advisory boards ...charged with program oversight and evaluations.”

- “for members of multidisciplinary teams, primary or senior authorship on key publications from the team or middle-authorship in a paradigm-shifting paper from the team.”
- “for team research, the letters should address the distinct contribution of the individual within the larger context of the multidisciplinary team effort.”

c-4. What is the role of the department and school in the pre-tenure years?

One or more mentors should be designated for each assistant professor. See also the On-Line Mentor page on the Faculty Portal, www.usc.edu/faculty under the Essential Guides tab. Each year the school should undertake an annual evaluation of teaching and scholarship that identifies areas for improvement as well as positive items. There should be a thorough and candid third year review on whether there is satisfactory progress toward tenure, as well as a serious stock-taking in year five on whether the candidate should go forward to a tenure decision; a negative recommendation should be conveyed to the dean. In these pre-tenure evaluations, departments should apply appropriate milestones, as described in Section 2.1.

Candidates whose inclination, ability and accomplishments do not match USC’s expectations can be asked, at any year during the probationary period and especially at years three or five, to seek a position at an institution whose demands better match their own aspirations. The school can non-reappoint in any year, giving notice as provided in Faculty Handbook Sections 3-B(5) and 4-F(3).

c-5. Will every assistant professor receive a full tenure review?

Not necessarily. See section 1 answers b-26 and c-9.

c-6. How does the department communicate its expectations?

Each school or department is encouraged to propose local clarifications of the preferable profiles of evidence. These clarifications may not contradict any matters addressed by the UCAPT manual. To be official, the expectations must be approved by the dean and Provost and made available to candidates. They should not be distributed or used for mentoring guidance without having such approval.

These clarifications should be based on whatever is typical for this discipline at leading departments. Disciplines differ substantially, for example, on the relative weight placed on books, articles, and conference proceedings; on the assessment of sole-authorship, principal authorship, and other collaboration; on the role of digital publication in the field and the ways that leading scholars who work in this area are evaluated by others; on the significance of first and last authorship; on the need for important external funding for research, such as R01’s; and on the importance of citations of the candidate’s work by other scholars or professionals in the field. The school clarifications should specify what quantitative indicators will be used for all faculty in that unit. See section 1 answer b-3.

c-7. What data should departments supply UCAPT about publication venues?

To evaluate venues, department should supply information as appropriate in each case. Impact factor is a metric for the influence of the venue. For venues that do not have an impact factor, departments should submit such information as the ratio of submissions to acceptances, the stature of others who publish in that venue, the stature of the referees or editors, and measures of the influence of the venue. See section 1 answers b-8 on digital scholarship and b-9 on conferences.

c-8. If the candidate has a joint appointment, does the secondary department vote on tenure?

No. To protect the candidate from conflicting expectations, only the primary department acts on the promotion. The secondary department or an appropriate professor in that department is asked to submit a letter of evaluation that the primary department can consider, so that the interdisciplinary work can be better understood and evaluated.

c-9. What happens if a candidate resigns or is non-reappointed before completion of the tenure process?

No tenure review is conducted if the candidate is non-reappointed before the academic year of the mandatory tenure decision (or fiscal year, for fiscal year appointments). If the candidate withdraws from consideration before the tenure decision, the process is not completed.

c-10. What should the department explain about its academic needs?

The department should explain the importance of the candidate's field within the broader discipline. UCAPT values letters from department chairs that explain how a candidate's research and teaching fit into the unit's strategy for excellence.

c-11. Can the department decide tenure? Can the dean?

No. While the recommendations by the department and dean are regarded very seriously, they are not necessarily followed. UCAPT makes its own evaluation of the dossier, including the letters from external referees and the published work. The final decision is made only by the Provost, to whom the President has delegated the responsibility.

Both the department and the dean have more influence on the ultimate decision when they offer a balanced analysis of stronger and weaker aspects of the dossier based on their careful reading of the work and the letters. They have less influence if they write as advocates either for or against the candidate. See section 1 answer c-1.

The Department's Portion of the Dossier

c-12. What portions of the tenure dossier are the department's responsibility?

Reports

- Statement of school/departmental criteria approved by the Provost.
- Departmental report (sometimes prepared by a subcommittee; sometimes included within chair's memo.) See section 4.4 for expectations on the contents of the department report and memo.
- Analysis of collaborative work. See section 1 answer c-3 and section 4.6.

- Description of department process and committee membership, and information on all votes taken (sometimes included within chair's memo). See section 4.2
- Chair's memo giving an independent evaluation, as well as summarizing the discussion at the departmental meeting.

Quantitative Data

- Cohort comparison data. See section 1 answer c-15.
- Analysis of citations. See section 1 answer c-14.
- Analysis of other quantitative data. See section 1 answer c-13 and section 4.6.

Teaching

- Student teaching evaluations, if not supplied by the candidate.
- Report on peer observation of teaching, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness. See section 7.2.
- Summary and analysis of teaching evaluations. See section 7.1.

Referees

- Statement that dean has approved selection of external referees.
- Table listing all asked to be referees. See section 9.6.
- Brief paragraph (not CV) on the stature of each external referee. Explanation of the choice of any referees not recognized as a top scholar.
- Sample letter sent to referees.
- Statement that dean has obtained provost office approval of any needed change from the template letters to referees. See section 13 for 2011 versions of templates for collaborators, artistic experts, and all other referees.
- Letters from referees, and all communications with those asked to be referees.
- All published reviews, "pink sheets," and publisher's reports, if not supplied by the candidate.
- See section 9 for other expectations about referees.

N.B. See also section 4.6 and the checklist in section 14.

c-13. What is the role of quantitative data in the dossier?

Data cannot substitute for judgment, but section 4.6 asks that quantitative analysis be included in part I-B of the dossier, unless the department explains why it believes they are inapplicable to the discipline. Each department should be consistent among candidates in using or not using such information. The department's memo should discuss whether the quantitative measures are consistent with the qualitative judgments offered.

c-14. How should citations be analyzed?

There should be separate analysis of work since the candidate was appointed or last promoted, where the candidate was first or senior author.

Unless the department explains why it believes quantitative analysis is inapplicable to the discipline, citation count provides some evidence of the impact of the work. The department should do a careful analysis of the citations. Are they survey articles? How and why is the work

cited? Self citations need to be excluded. Citations of manuscripts published in the leading journals of the field should be distinguished from those of articles that appear in less important journals. The referees are asked to comment on the quality of the journals and this can facilitate the differentiation of the various citations.

c-15. What kind of cohort comparison should be made?

We have long asked how the candidate ranks nationally among the cohort of colleagues working in the same area, because a comparative judgment is an essential part of a grant of tenure to one person to the exclusion of others who might be sought instead. Similarly we continue to consider whether a promotion candidate is as strong as those who receive lateral, look-over visiting or tenured appointments, so that internal candidates are considered in the context of the potential pool of external appointments.

Section 4.6 asks for comparison of the candidate with an appropriate peer group, as to number of publications, citations, and journals where published. The appropriate peer group would be about 5-10 scholars who were recently granted tenure at departments we regard as of equal or greater stature than our own. The department should state the definition of the comparison group, e.g., every person tenured in the last two years at departments rated higher than ours, and should include all the individuals falling in that group.

c-16. What source should be used for citation counts?

UCAPT suggests using whenever possible the data from Web of Science (e.g. Social Science Citation Index); use of other sources such as Google Scholar or Publish-or-Perish is discouraged. The studies of the reliability of citation statistics have been done using Web of Science only. The department should analyze the raw citation data (see section 4.6).

c-17. Is anything more than student surveys needed to evaluate teaching effectiveness?

Because effective teaching is so important, it is not sufficient to rely on student surveys and a few student letters as the tools of evaluation. See section 7.2 for guidelines on the evidence that the dossier should include on teaching, including the request to include peer observation. It would also be a positive factor if the candidate has applied teaching strategies whose effectiveness has been validated through research.

c-18. How should different kinds of evidence be evaluated?

See section 1 answer b-23.

c-19. How many letters does UCAPT need?

To make an informed evaluation, UCAPT needs five or six letters that meet the following criteria: from persons whose judgment we have reason to value (leaders in the field, who usually will be scholars at the top departments), who are arms-length from the candidate, who provide detailed and textured substantive analysis of the candidate's work, and who give a judgment on the work in terms of the national and international tenure standards applied at leading departments. There is no need for an excessive number of letters; what is needed are five or six letters that meet these criteria. (Letters meeting these standards should be placed in part VI-A of the dossier; other letters go in part VI-B.) When the candidate has done joint work, see section 1 answer c-21 as to additional letters from collaborators.

N.B. Please use the 2011 version of one of the template letters (see section 13), unless the dean has obtained Provost's office approval of modified language.

c-20. What should be done if a referee letter is incomplete?

If a referee letter does not give a judgment on the work in terms of the national and international tenure standards applied at leading departments, an email should be sent pointing out question 2 in the template letter, and requesting an email reply.

c-21. What referee letters should the department obtain about collaborative work?

In order to assess the original, creative contribution of the candidate to joint work, it is important for the department to seek a few referees who are important collaborators with the candidate (in addition to the five or six non-coauthoring referees.) The solicitation letter to co-authoring referees should ask them to address the significance of the sequence of authors and the original, creative contribution of the candidate as a co-author. (See section 9.3(b) and 13.2 for a request letter.) It is important that the committee report also address these topics.

c-22. Are published reviews and pink sheets included?

All published reviews of books and artistic work, publisher's reader reports on books not yet issued, and "pink sheets" on pending proposals are highly valuable and should always be included in dossiers. (Place them in part VI-C, after the letters.)

c-23. Can late information be added to the dossier?

Yes. New evidence (such as a new publication, or the score of a submitted proposal, or new teaching evaluations) can be added to the dossier at whatever stage of the process it is received. If it happens that charges of misconduct are brought to attention while the tenure process is underway, such charges will not be investigated by UCAPT but will be considered in the usual way; the Provost may delay the tenure decision if needed to resolve the charges

Notes for the Dean

c-24. What is the dean's role on referees?

The dean should review the list of proposed referees and the reasons for these selections early enough in the process so that there is time to make adjustments and, if needed, seek additional referees to provide a dossier adequate for UCAPT's review. See section 9.2(b).

If the dean consults with additional referees, the communications should be fully documented as part of the dean's memo.

c-25. What should be in the dean's memo?

Like all other levels of review, the dean is expected to provide an independent analysis, and one that gives a balanced assessment of strengths and weaknesses in the dossier. The dean's assessment should explain whether the candidate has made an impact, and demonstrates focus and originality. The dean's letter should have a final paragraph summarizing the candidate's contribution to the field. See section 4.5.

2.0 Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

2.1 *Expectations for Tenure and Promotion.*

The primary criteria are excellence and creativity in both teaching and scholarly research, as documented in the dossier, with outstanding performance required in one (almost always research) and at least solid performance in the other. We value scholars who have made an important and original contribution, who have had an impact on the field, who have achieved independence from their mentors, and whose work has a focus. Every appointment and grant of tenure should meet the national and international standards of the leading institutions, and raise the average quality of the appointing unit. A sustained scholarly trajectory should be predicted. The academic needs of the unit are considered.

A candidate should have high ratings in national peer-review, demonstrated for example by the quality of the outlets for the candidate's publications; in fields where a university press book is usual, should have good reviews of the book; should be known to the leaders in the field, through conferences, editorial boards, colloquia, and the like, as appropriate for the discipline; and in fields where Federal funding is appropriate, should have earned important research grants. See also the answers in section 1 including those on Understanding Specific Criteria.

The University recognizes and supports a variety of styles of scholarship, both independent and collaborative. In all cases, the University looks to distinguish important and original contributions on the part of the candidate.

2.2(a) *Full Professor*

What is the timetable for promotion to full promotion?

Number of years in rank is not part of the requirements for promotion to full professor. The timing is individual, and the usual expectations vary by discipline.

How much additional achievement is expected for promotion?

The promotion is based on achievement rather than promise. The candidate should have made additional substantial contributions that have made a significant impact in the field, beyond the contribution that earned tenure. The scholarly contribution expected by the time of promotion to full professor is sometimes expressed as at least twice that expected of a candidate for tenure. The post-tenure body of work should be examined alongside the pre-tenure body of work to understand the candidate's trajectory, and demonstrate that he or she will continue to produce research at a rate and of a quality commensurate with leaders in the field.

What cohort comparison is appropriate?

The work of the candidate should have achieved recognition at a national or international level as an expert in his or her field. It should be comparable in importance to those of newly-promoted full professors at leading departments where work of the same type is done.

What is the role of collaborative work?

Recognizing the university's support of interdisciplinary scholarship, associate professors are encouraged to take advantage of the freedom afforded by tenure to pursue their scholarly

interests whether they fall within or across traditional disciplinary boundaries. An associate professor may also have more opportunities for productive collaboration than a candidate for tenure, though it continues to be expected that the individual's contribution should be original and important.

What are other expectations for promotion?

Tenured faculty have special responsibilities for mentoring junior faculty both within and outside the home department, and for leadership in service and governance on the departmental, school, and university levels. They are expected to have progressed as a teacher and mentor of students, which in many fields includes success in mentoring Ph.D. students. In some disciplines, leadership in application of research to societal needs may be an important part of the evidence presented.

How are long term associate professors considered?

If someone has been an associate professor for fifteen years or more, it is understood that scholarly expectations may have changed since the candidate began an academic career. The dean and the individual may agree on an individual development plan that specifies what publication will be expected for the dean to make a favorable recommendation for promotion. The Provost's office is available for consultation. The dossiers in such situations will be evaluated at the departmental, school and university level through the usual committees, and require the usual evaluation by external referees.

The candidate's entire body of scholarship is considered, with an expectation of valuable recent scholarly productivity. Excellence and creativity in both teaching and scholarly research are expected, with outstanding performance in one and at least solid performance in the other. The dossier may make the case that it is the teaching that has been outstanding. Excellence in teaching must be fully documented (see section 7.2). See also general expectations in section 1.

The Faculty Handbook provides that emeritus status may be approved in contemplation of retirement; if promotion in rank is proposed at that time, the Provost may approve an abridgement of the usual process.

If promotion to full professor is denied, is reconsideration possible?

A new recommendation for promotion may be submitted in a subsequent year, and the original denial will not stand in the way of a promotion if there is new evidence to consider. Both the original dossier and a supplement will be submitted.

2.2(b) Clinical Scholar and similar titles

What is the Clinical Scholar designation?

The designation Clinical Scholar is awarded by the President of the University on the same timetable as tenure, after a recommendation by UCAPT, and is intended to convey the same honor and dignity as tenured status. Excellence in research, teaching, and clinical service, and at least strength in other areas of service, is required. The differentiation is that a candidate for Clinical Scholar will have a different effort profile from a candidate for tenure (e.g., more effort devoted to clinical work and less to research) or will be undertaking different types of research

(e.g., leadership of clinical trials rather than PI of R01s). See Section 4-B of the Faculty Handbook.

What are the expectations for the Clinical Scholar designation?

Evidence that the candidate is recognized at the national level and esteemed by experts in his or her field for being an innovator of clinically important research. As an example, Clinical Scholars may have provided substantive intellectual input and leadership to large collaborative treatment or clinical trials groups (e.g. NCI, ACTG).

Evidence that there is a theme of expertise (e.g. a long track record of developing treatments for a particular disease or developing new and novel procedures for specific surgical problems.) It is understood that the nature of the research for Clinical Scholars may be more broad based than that produced by tenured faculty. For full professor, recognition at the international level is expected.

Can existing Clinical Scholars vote on promotion to this designation?

The UCAPT panel that considers Clinical Scholar dossiers typically will include one or more faculty who are themselves Clinical Scholars.

2.3 School Clarifications See section 1.

2.4 Interdisciplinary Scholarship and Teaching

Both departments and schools should note when the candidate’s scholarship spans disciplinary or school boundaries, makes a real link between fundamental and applied research, or has a strong focus on problems of societal importance. It is essential to strive to evaluate such work properly when it differs from the usual expectations of the home department or discipline.

Committees evaluating interdisciplinary work should try to value appropriately publication outside the home discipline and its usual journals, recognize interdisciplinary graduate teaching and co-teaching, and credit faculty who advise or co-advise graduate students outside the home department. The committees should make special effort to understand other disciplines’ customs on co-authorship, sequence of authors, and use of conferences, journals or monographs as premiere outlets.

Stated here for convenience are sections on Interdisciplinary Candidates that were placed elsewhere in this manual, in sections 3.2, 3.3(c), 3.4(a), 3.10 and 9.3(a), in earlier editions.

3.2 Information for Interdisciplinary Candidates

For interdisciplinary candidate, it is desirable that the ways interdisciplinary excellence will be evaluated (either as set out in the School Clarifications or as individually agreed) are made available to the individual at the time of the offer letter, or else made available early in the candidate's probationary period. It is also desirable that an interdisciplinary candidate have mentors in both units, who ideally would work together to give the candidate a consistent message about research and publications, and guidance on how to avoid excessive burdens of

teaching and service. For candidates with appointment in more than one unit, a Joint Appointment checklist should be approved so that workload expectations are clear. See Section 2.4.

3.3(c) *Lengthy Interdisciplinary Research*

If interdisciplinary work requires substantially longer start-up time than research in a single discipline, a request may be made, early in the probationary period, to consider extension of that period. Such a request should include the recommendations of each of the relevant department chairs and deans. See section 2.4.

3.4(a) *Interdisciplinary Pre-tenure Review*

For scholarship identified as interdisciplinary the third-year review committee must include a member from the other discipline(s). Even if the candidate does not have a joint or courtesy appointment, either the individual or the home department may identify the scholarship as interdisciplinary by memo to the dean before the start of the third year review process. (The Provost may grant a waiver of these procedures). See section 2.4.

3.10 *Review of Interdisciplinary Candidate*

For scholarship that has been identified as interdisciplinary, the tenure or promotion committee must include a member from the other discipline(s).

In addition, appropriate members of the other department(s) or program(s), even if in another school, should be asked to provide letters of evaluation concerning the merits of a candidate's interdisciplinary work.

(A candidate may suggest that such letters be sought or not sought, or may suggest that particular evaluators be used or not used, and the suggestions will be duly considered.) The secondary department does not vote on the promotion, and the candidate does not have to satisfy the requirements of two departments.

Each interdisciplinary evaluation should be included in the dossier before its final consideration by the home department. Even if the candidate does not have a joint or courtesy appointment, either the individual or the home department may identify the scholarship as interdisciplinary by memo to the dean before the beginning of preparation of the dossier. (The Provost may grant a waiver of these procedures.)

UCAPT will use appropriate flexibility in reviewing interdisciplinary dossiers. See answer a-3 in section 1.

The Faculty Handbook has long provided that tenure is held in the school, and in suitable interdisciplinary cases a school may explicitly propose that the award of tenure be in the school rather than any individual department.

9.3(a) Interdisciplinary Referees

For interdisciplinary scholarship, the lists of external referees should include experts from the other discipline(s), as well as experts in the individual's own type of interdisciplinary scholarship. See section 2.4.

2.5 *International Scholarship and Teaching*

Be sure that recognition is given to faculty for their participation in significant international activities: teaching and research abroad as well as service to distinguished foreign institutions and students. Work conducted overseas or in conjunction with overseas organizations may be less visible than work done on campus or domestically. Nevertheless, such efforts should be evaluated and accorded reasonable weight in promotion and tenure decisions.

3.0 Process

3.1 *Information for All New Faculty*

The offer letter should provide each newly-appointed tenure-track faculty member with the web link to established faculty policies including the Faculty Handbook and this manual (<http://www.usc.edu/policies>) as well as the candidate's Tenure Decision Date.

Each new tenure-track faculty member should ask the department chair or other appropriate administrator for any Provost-approved school clarifications on criteria, relative weights of criteria, and evidence. The Faculty Handbook and this manual are available at <http://www.usc.edu/policies>. In addition, the faculty member should discuss with the department chair or other appropriate administrator the standards and procedures for tenure, and the schedule of necessary renewals.

Tenure-track faculty are also invited to programs sponsored for them by the University's Academic Leadership and Development Committee. Useful information including university policies is easily accessible at the Faculty Portal, <http://www.usc.edu/faculty>, by clicking on "Essential Guide" and then "Assistant Professors." If a faculty member has unanswered questions, he or she should contact the dean or, if needed, the Office of the Provost.

3.2 *Information for Interdisciplinary Candidates.* See section 2.4.

3.3 *Tenure Decision Date; Stopping the Clock for Parenting and Other Reasons*

A Tenure Decision Date is established for each individual as provided in the Faculty Handbook, <http://www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook>. It is one year before the end of the Probationary period.

3.3(a) *Revising the Tenure Decision Date*

If a tenure-track faculty member believes the Tenure Decision Date was not properly set according to the Faculty Handbook, or the individual believes there is any other reason that

justifies an extension or revision of the Tenure Decision Date (such as leaves of absence or special circumstances), it is important that the individual make a written request promptly, as soon as the reason arises. Such requests are submitted by the individual through the department chair and dean to the Provost, and are considered by the Committee on Probationary Deadlines, which advises the Provost. Only the Provost, on the President's behalf, has authority to change the Tenure Decision Date.

It is also possible, though very rare, for the Provost on the basis of UCAPT's own consideration, to extend the Tenure Decision Date or to grant a two-year terminal appointment during which the candidate can submit specific needed evidence.

3.3(b) Parenting Leaves, Extensions, and Other Arrangements

For information on this important topic, see the Faculty Handbook, www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook.

3.3(c) Lengthy Interdisciplinary Research. See section 2.4.

3.4 Pre-Tenure Reviews

- Tenure-track faculty are subject to annual performance reviews on their progress toward meeting tenure standards, and are subject to annual reappointment. Annual merit review is discussed in the University policy on evaluation of faculty, <http://www.usc.edu/policies>, and in school evaluation guidelines. There should also be annual consultation between the faculty member and the dean or chair to establish the next year's activity profile. Annual merit and third-year reports may be included in the dossier, to show how the candidate has responded to suggestions for improvement.
- There is a particularly thorough review midway in the probationary period (generally in the third year). The internal review is similar to that done at the time of consideration for tenure. **While it has not been customary to use external referees, a department may utilize a few external referees if this would be useful.** By the time of the third year review, the candidate should submit to the department a brief statement describing the intended focus or contribution of his or her research and scholarship, including any substantive or methodological cross-disciplinary aspects.
- The year before the tenure decision (generally the fifth year), each candidate should discuss the process with the department chair or dean and take stock, to consider whether the candidate should go forward for tenure evaluation or should seek other career paths. The candidate may notify the dean in writing that he or she does not wish to be considered for tenure, or the school may decide to issue a terminal year letter.
- Department chairs and deans, third-year and merit review committees, and other colleagues always include constructive criticism in annual and third-year reviews, rather than conveying unalloyed optimism about any candidate's prospects for tenure. The tenure decision is not the department's, but rather is the Provost's. Even if departmental colleagues are optimistic, candidates should seek advice on ways to improve throughout

their probationary period, remembering that external referees and UCAPT will make an evaluation by national standards.

3.4(a) Interdisciplinary Pre-tenure Review. See section 2.4.

3.5 Early Review; Promotion to Associate Professor; Effect of Negative Decision

A dossier put forward for promotion or tenure earlier than usual does not need to meet any enhanced standard; number of years in rank is not a part of our requirements.

Whether a review is conducted early or at the usual time, a negative decision by the Provost on tenure will result in issuance of a terminal year letter. So that the record is clear, it is preferable that the candidate acknowledge this in writing before an early review is begun. Rarely, the Provost may permit a case to be withdrawn and resubmitted by the Tenure Decision Date or other date as the Provost determines.

The Provost may decide on promotion to Associate Professor separately from the grant of tenure. When a promotion to associate professor is considered separately from the grant of tenure (either in an individual case or under school-specific policy), if the decision on promotion is negative, a terminal year letter will be issued.

3.6 Deadlines for Dossiers

Dossiers of candidates for tenure should reach UCAPT by the **February 1** before the Tenure Decision Date. Promotion dossiers not involving tenure should reach UCAPT by **October 15**. Senior external appointment dossiers (associate or full professor) should reach UCAPT by **March 15**, if possible; these dossiers must be submitted for Provost's approval before a firm offer letter is issued. (See section 11 of this manual.) Any dossier that misses these deadlines risks substantial delay at UCAPT. **The dean should take steps to see that departments and school committees observe a timetable** such that the complete dossier can be submitted to UCAPT in a timely manner.

If there is a need for an early decision, the dean should let the Provost's Office know as much in advance as possible, specifying the reason and the date by which a decision is requested. Do not prolong consideration at department or school level and then request immediate UCAPT action. In most cases, good management by the school will make it possible to submit the dossier early enough to allow the normal pace of UCAPT consideration. In exceptional situations, where expedited UCAPT consideration is necessitated by circumstances such as a competing offer, **the dean must explain personally** to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs the reason for the urgency, why the dossier could not be submitted earlier, why the Provost should make an exception to our usual processes, and the date by which a decision is requested.

An extremely late dossier submission to UCAPT risks being interpreted as a sign that the candidate is not serious about an academic career, that the department had doubts so troubling that they were unwilling to make a timely recommendation, that letter writers were not willing to

participate, or alternatively that there has been extremely bad management. It is important, therefore, that dossiers submitted with a significant delay contain a clear discussion of the origins of the delay. A promotion dossier not involving tenure, which is submitted extremely late after the October 15 deadline, may be returned for re-submission the following year.

It is not permissible for a department or school to plan to submit a tenure dossier after the Tenure Decision Date. Such a delay is extremely unfair to the candidate and will be considered by the Provost as exceedingly bad management.

3.7 Supplementing the Dossier; New Information

While a dossier is under consideration, the individual, department, dean, or Provost can supplement it with new information. If those responsible for conducting the review receive letters or information on the decision, outside the usual process, they will forward the letters or summaries of the conversations to the dean or Provost, but unsolicited communications are not included in the dossier. See section 1.

3.8 Confidentiality

All USC faculty participating in the process at any stage must respect its confidentiality, and not reveal votes, the names or views of referees, the contents of discussions, or the contents of the dossier to anyone. Intentional or continuing breaches of confidentiality are considered to be serious misconduct.

Departments and schools should take appropriate steps to maintain confidentiality, including during the physical preparation of the dossier and dossier storage. It is unwise to make a broad electronic distribution of the dossier, instead password-protected web sites can be used. Paper copies should be shredded after use.

3.9 Multiple Levels of Review; Automatic Review

The department chair, dean, and Provost, and the faculty groups at each level, all have important roles to play in promotion and tenure decisions. When a school is organized by departments, recommendations from both the department and the dean are solicited. On both levels, it is necessary to include a report of the advice of appropriately constituted committees of faculty colleagues, selected according to the practice of the unit and this manual.

If a candidate for tenure is not recommended by the department-level faculty body (or the school-level faculty body, for schools without departments that act on promotions), there is automatic review of the recommendation by the dean. If the negative decision is sustained by the dean, the candidate will be so informed and there will be no consideration by UCAPT and the Provost. The full dossier will go forward to UCAPT if there is a positive recommendation from either the dean or the department-level faculty body (or the school-level faculty body, for schools without departments that act on promotions).

A faculty member who serves on a school-level committee or UCAPT will vote on promotion and tenure recommendations in his or her department, and will recuse him or her self on such cases in the later committees. The dean, Provost and President will not vote within their departments on promotion and tenure recommendations.

3.10 *Review of Interdisciplinary Candidate.* See section 2.4.

3.11 *Role of UCAPT and the Provost*

UCAPT is advisory to the Provost and President. UCAPT's panels seek to assure that there is appropriate consistency in standards across units, that candidates' performance meets the standards of national peer institutions, and that the quality of a school's faculty progresses over time. When UCAPT panel members raise questions about the adequacy of the dossier at the panel meeting or in advance, the Provost's Office will contact the dean to give him or her an opportunity to submit supplemental material.

The Provost gives careful consideration to all promotion and tenure cases, and to the recommendations of the UCAPT panel. The ultimate responsibility for granting promotion and tenure, granting the Clinical Scholar designation, and for appointing associate professors or professors with or without tenure, rests with the Provost on behalf of the President.

3.12 *Communicating Decisions; Explanations and Advice*

The Provost's decision will be communicated to the dean; the dean will inform the department chair, who will notify the individual. In case of a denial, the person responsible for conveying the disappointing news should use compassion, and colleagues should treat an unsuccessful tenure candidate with professionalism and decency, taking special care not to isolate the person socially. Active efforts to assist the candidate in relocating to another position benefit both the University and the individual.

On request by a candidate who has been unsuccessful, the dean will provide a written explanation. Committee members and other participants in the process should not attempt to provide their own explanations. The Provost's Office will consult with the dean on preparation of the explanation.

For candidates who have been successful, it would often be helpful if the dean or chair, some months later, **pass on constructive advice to improve the candidate's later work.** While preserving the confidentiality of referees and committees, the dean or chair could summarize perceptive criticisms. Knowledge of these judgments might help a candidate do even better in the future.

The Provost informs the UCAPT chair and panel of decisions, and the dean should give similar feedback to the school-level committee as well as informing the department.

3.13 Finality

If a negative decision is made and a terminal year letter sent, that is a final action. If extraordinary circumstances (such as new evidence about the candidate's accomplishments during the probationary period, or a claim of unfair process) warrant a request for reconsideration, the department or individual may ask the dean to contact the Provost's Office for the procedures on reconsideration. Other than claims of unfair process, requests for reconsideration may be submitted **only on the basis of new evidence** about probation-period accomplishments, will be reviewed in the first instance by the dean, and will go forward to the Provost only if there is an affirmative recommendation by the dean. The individual also has the right to a hearing as part of the grievance process detailed in the Faculty Handbook.

4.0 Dossier - Administrative and Faculty Assessments

A checklist for dossier preparation is provided in section 14, and should be used by staff and faculty at both the department and school level.

The evidence on which the decision is made is submitted by the candidate (or shared with him or her) and contained in the dossier: this generally consists of the curriculum vitae, bibliography of publications, and statement of support for research (part II of the dossier), the personal statement (part III), the data in the teaching record (part IV), the data in the record of service (part V) and the supporting material on scholarship and teaching (the appendix). See section 1 answers b-12 and b-13.

The initial review of the scholarly record is by referees and expressed in their letters of evaluation (part VI). Place first (part VI-A) the letters that meet all the stated criteria, then (part VI-B) other letters. All published reviews of books and artistic performances and "pink sheets" on grant proposals and readers reports on book manuscripts, should go into the appendix. Subsequent administrative and faculty assessments are placed in part I-A of the dossier. Quantitative data should be placed in part I-B.

4.0(a) What Time Period is Most Relevant

The evidence for tenure must show demonstrated and significant additional attainments after a faculty member has been appointed. The evidence for promotion to Professor must show demonstrated and significant additional attainments since the previous promotion.

The following discussion is arranged according to the seven parts used in the dossier.

4.1 The Importance of Candor

The reports from the department and school-level committees, memos from chairs and deans, and letters from referees are of greatest use to UCAPT if they are analyses of issues rather than

advocacy of a conclusion. Those who support a candidate should realize that the way to be of greatest aid is to provide a balanced analysis. Some schools have long done this in their reports, and this type of analysis is a **highly positive factor**, not a negative one.

The committees should try to foresee and discuss what questions may be raised later in the process, and should particularly consider whatever is least strong in the dossier. Explain the reasoning of both the majority and minority, and explain the committee's **responses to negative views expressed in discussions or in the referees' letters**. UCAPT expects to see a summary of all sides of the discussion, **presenting pros and cons and tradeoffs**.

Sometimes, of course, after a department does its job of developing evidence in the dossier, analyzing weaknesses as well as strengths, and applying appropriate academic standards, it will recommend against the award of tenure. In such cases, and all other things being equal, deans should presume that the department will be permitted to conduct a new search to fill the position. On the other hand, if a department shows an inability to understand and apply standards of academic quality, so that it is left to later levels to analyze the weaknesses in a dossier, that inability would be a reason for the dean to consider shifting resources towards other departments with higher standards. Similarly, Academic Program Reviews of a department or school may consider the standards of academic quality exhibited in appointment and tenure actions.

4.2 Documenting the Process Fully

The school and departmental committee reports should describe the process used and the committee membership.

Copies of all subcommittee and committee reports, data on all votes, and all letters and summaries of conversations with those asked to be referees must be included in the dossier. If a dean or chair, or any individual faculty member involved in the process, has reason to question the usefulness, accuracy, or integrity of any of these items, memos explaining that conclusion may be included in the dossier at the time that level considers the case, but the questioned material should not be removed or altered.

If a committee votes twice, or a second subcommittee is appointed, the earlier information should be included along with an explanation of the process.

Departments and schools should not exclude from the dossier information they fear later levels may misinterpret, retake votes so they appear unanimous, or skew the selection of referees to achieve some desired outcome. Instead they should append explanations of what they believe is the appropriate significance of all the available information. Faculty colleagues on school and university committees will be as able as the department is to assess the information properly, as long as the department includes appropriate explanation.

Those colleagues involved in the decision at the department or school level who judge a promotion or grant of tenure to be unjustified can be most helpful if they submit thoughtful analysis. Faculty should not try to campaign in opposition or support, and should neither solicit

evaluations nor lobby those asked to be referees. Individual faculty members in the department or on a school personnel committee who wish to ensure that their views are adequately represented in the dossier may, if necessary, write directly to the department chair, dean, or Provost with their analysis at the time their level submits its report; these letters will be included in the dossier.

4.3 Department and School Reports and Memos

This manual as well as any school clarifications on criteria approved by the Provost (see section 2.3) should be provided to each promotion sub-committee when it starts work. They should be quoted in the committee reports as a reference point in evaluation of the individual's teaching and scholarship. **Please explain and justify any dossiers that deviate significantly from established standards.**

Each review needs to reflect what was seen at that level as most persuasive and as most problematic. Each level should simply put down their analysis of the issues in the dossier, present pros and cons and tradeoffs, and set forth the reasons for their recommendation.

Often dossiers can be shortened without loss of substance. **If higher review levels within the school adopt the reasoning of a previous report, they can just say that.**

There is no need for committees or deans to repeat or summarize what is already in the file, including referees' letters and career summary. The decision can often be greatly expedited if later levels do not delay the process by preparing a redundant document.

4.4 Contents of Department Report and Memo

The department chair and committee should remember that the dossier will be evaluated by colleagues from other departments, and should try to educate those outside the department who will read the dossier. Please discuss:

- For appointment, the pro-active outreach assuring equal opportunity.
- The usual expected qualitative and quantitative standards (books, articles, etc.) in the discipline, and the usual time-table for promotion if different from other disciplines.
- Whether the quantitative measures (section 4.6) are consistent with the qualitative judgments provided.
- The quality of the journals and presses published in, or conferences presented at.
- The significance of co-authorships and of first or last authorships, in that discipline.
- What level and type of peer-review external funding is desirable.
- Whether citation frequency is important, and if important, what is the relevant comparison?
- The candidate's next major project (a brief description is sufficient) and how it is expected to contribute to the field.
- The candidate's faculty load profile.
- The department's needs and goals.

- How the candidate's qualifications will advance the department's academic plan and fit into the unit's strategy for excellence.
- How important the candidate's field is within the broader discipline.
- Any disagreements with the judgments or procedures of the faculty committee which the chair may have.
- For interdisciplinary candidates, what the standards are for interdisciplinary excellence in the particular case. How and why these standards differ from usual disciplinary standards in order to accommodate interdisciplinary scholarship. (Discuss this in the memo from the chair of the primary department. If this topic is dealt with in the School Clarifications or the individual offer letter, the appropriate document should also be attached.)

Candor will be much more helpful than praise; avoid hyperbole. A dossier must be honest and must talk about problems. It should explain split views in the department or in the letters, and why the majority nevertheless was positive.

4.5 Dean's Responsibility

The dean's personal decision in promotion and tenure cases is the most important exercise of judgment and strategic thinking of all his or her responsibilities. Each review needs to reflect what was seen at that level as **most persuasive and as most problematic**. Each level should simply put down its **analysis of the issues** in the dossier, **present pros and cons and tradeoffs**, and set forth the reasons for their recommendation.

If higher review levels within the school adopt the reasoning of a previous report, they can just say that. There is no need to summarize the CV. Avoid redundancy.

School-level committees and deans will of course consider what has been said at lower levels, and if they disagree, the higher level should give reasons for the disagreement. While the dean will also consider carefully the advice of the school-level committee, of course the dean need not agree with its recommendations. Indeed, an honest and independent assessment by all the individuals and committees who participate in the process is central to a meaningful review.

The dean's letter should have a final paragraph summarizing the candidate's contributions to the field.

4.6 Part I-B of the Dossier should be used for Quantitative Data

UCAPT requests that quantitative data be included in all dossiers (placed in part I-B) unless the department explains why it believes they are inapplicable to the discipline. Quantitative data sometimes are quite valuable—though they cannot substitute for judgment. Each department should be consistent among candidates in using or not using such information. The department's memo should discuss whether the quantitative measures are consistent with the qualitative judgments offered.

Each department will decide what data is of use in that discipline, but the following information is frequently submitted by many units:

- A chart showing number of publications per year.
- Citation counts on the candidate's publications.
- Journal impact factors (or, if not applicable, a list providing information on the relative importance of the journals the candidate has published in).
- Comparison of the candidate with an appropriate peer group, as to number of publications, citations, and journals where published. (An example of a possible peer group might be all those granted tenure (or promoted to full professor) in the last two years in the departments with which we compare ourselves.)
- A list of grants on which the candidate was the P.I., with agency, grant numbers, start and end dates, and amount. Portions of Center or Project grants, separately scored, on which the candidate was P.I., can also be listed here, with amount of direct costs controlled by the candidate. (See section 5.)

5. Dossier - Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae and bibliography need to be complete, current, dated, and accurate. Exact dates of academic degrees, previous employment, and publications are essential, as are exact faculty and staff titles with modifiers (and explanation of tenure-track status if it is unclear.) Helpful references on how to construct a CV are posted at the Center for Excellence in Teaching web site. <http://www.usc.edu/programs/cet/resources/portfolio/cv.html>

Include a bibliography of publications or list of creative works:

- Articles in refereed journals should be separate from non-refereed publications (e.g. invited contributions to journals, non-refereed chapters in edited book, and contributions to symposiums in journals).
- Publications should not be mixed with presentations such as invited lectures and seminars.
- First and last page numbers should be listed for each article.

The record of the candidate's financial support must be included, specifically noting:

- **Projects where the candidate was the principal investigator.**
- The source and type of grant (e.g., R01).
- The total direct support, and duration of the grant.
- The candidates' role on the project and percent of time on the project. (If the individual was a co-principal investigator or leader of part of a larger grant, **explain the candidate's specific role and the amount of direct support administered by the candidate.**)

Also see section 1 answers b-13 & b-14. If these data are not provided, the CV will be returned for modification.

The difficulty of obtaining funding in some fields and the inappropriateness of funding in other fields is recognized by those reviewing the dossier.

6. Dossier - Personal Statement

The personal statement is important, **but often need not be more than two pages long**. The candidate is provided this opportunity to convey to others the excitement and importance of his or her life's scholarly work. Approaches to teaching, research, and service should be explained, accomplishments in the three areas should be summarized, and future work should be mapped out. (Peer assessment of accomplishments, awards, and prizes are to be covered in the formal assessment material of part I of the dossier.)

The third-year statement by the candidate (described in section 3.4) may optionally be attached to this personal statement.

Overall, the candidate can explain the contribution of the body of work, and the trajectory of work done and planned. All faculty candidates for promotion or tenure who engage in collaborative research should include in their dossiers (either in the personal statement, annotations to the CV or a personal "statement of collaboration") an explanation of the importance and value of collaboration to their research, how it advances the scholarship in the candidates' home disciplinary field or the interdisciplinary fields involved; the kinds of collaboration(s) s/he has undertaken, and an account of their own original and creative contribution to such collaboration(s).

Also see section 1 answer b-15.

7. Dossier - Teaching Record

Anyone's teaching generally improves through systematic examination of both content and methods. A good teacher assists students to learn and be able to perform on the basis of their learning. USC's Center for Excellence in Teaching offers individualized and confidential assistance to faculty and departments toward meeting their teaching goals. Faculty who seek the Center's help early in their careers profit the most. More experienced faculty have also grown to appreciate the Center's many services, which are offered freely and in a collegial spirit.

Teaching-related activity can sometimes be evaluated as scholarly work--if it can be documented and peer-reviewed, and if it makes use of a high level of expertise related to the discipline or interdisciplinary field. Its quality can be shown if it breaks new ground or is innovative, or has significant impact on a scholarly field, or is the foundation for the work of others.

Probationary faculty should preferably have reasonable teaching loads. If the candidate has had heavy teaching responsibilities, **explain the circumstances**.

7.1 *Summary and Analysis*

This section should begin with a memo by the department's leadership that: (a) explains where the candidate's teaching fits within the unit's instructional mission, current and future; and (b)

summarizes and **analyzes** the evidence presented of teaching effectiveness (contained in section 7.2), covering both **strengths** and **weaknesses**. For the benefit of those outside the subject, the department may also describe the typical students taking the candidate's courses. Please provide with this memo the following information:

- A chronological list of classes taught with contact hours and enrollment size for each. (For promotion to full professor, the list generally will go back to the grant of tenure.)
- Principal courses developed or substantially revised.
- A list of graduate students mentored (past and present) showing each one's next career position.

7.2 Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

The methods recommended in this section, while they were included in previous editions, have not yet been widely used. The Center for Excellence in Teaching is available for advice, as is the Provost's Office.

(a) UCAPT asks for the following in all cases:

- Course syllabi provided to students for one (or a few) course(s) that the candidate considers most indicative of his or her approaches to teaching, and that demonstrates results of student learning.
- Student evaluations, using a process that seeks the maximum participation possible for courses of equivalent size and type (such as in-class or distance learning). If evaluations are presented based on USC's standard questionnaire, UCAPT suggests that the candidate's average scores on items 3, 4, & 5 for individual courses should be compared to the distribution of departmental scores for comparable courses or faculty.
- Classroom observations by faculty colleagues close to the time of the candidate's consideration for promotion. These observations should comment on strengths and weaknesses in the candidate's presentation of course material and in-classroom interactions with students. These collegial reviews are even more valuable if they also include classroom visitations over a period of years and include forward-looking advice, and present evidence of the instructor's growing mastery in stimulating student learning. (Some schools have each member of the unit's teaching committee visit at least two classes taught by the candidate, and submit written evaluations for consideration by the unit's appointments and promotions committee.)

(b) UCAPT highly values the following additional kinds of evidence:

- Evidence that the candidate's teaching is effective. Without meaning to limit faculty creativity in devising teaching methods that are effective, examples mentioned in the Strategic Plan include: (a) protocols through which students

demonstrate their mastery in a public forum; (b) use and assessment of information technology or multi-media that promote students' engagement and learning or that adapt course materials to individual students' needs; (c) the accommodation of different learning styles among students; (d) innovations to customary practices (dependence on lectures, standard semester length, constraints of disciplinary boundaries, etc.), aimed at increasing a course's benefits to students; and (e) the use and assessment of work produced by students in service-oriented or experiential settings outside classroom walls.

- Demonstration that the candidate has applied teaching strategies whose effectiveness has been validated through research. The research may refer to the candidate's own teaching, or be drawn from publications about teaching effectiveness. The research may rely on quantitative, ethnographic, or other methodologies that the candidate's field of scholarship values.
- (c) The following kind of evidence may also be used if the department finds it helpful:
- Letters from a sample of former students who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's teaching and how it affected them. **These students may not be suggested nor solicited by the candidate. Please explain the selection method** and enclose the solicitation letter. A candidate's teaching assignments will suggest the distribution between undergraduates and graduate students contributing to this section.

8. Dossier - Service

Include available evidence of University, professional and community service activity related to the candidate's field, such as journal editorial boards. Assess the quality and the effectiveness of the contributions to the service functions of the University and to mentoring. Explain how the candidate for tenure makes a contribution to the collective academic enterprise and that it is positive and not negative.

Probationary faculty should preferably have minimal service responsibilities. They should avoid volunteering for heavy internal or community responsibilities. Departments and schools should take care in making service assignments to them. A candidate who believes that service responsibilities are infringing on research time should promptly discuss the situation with the dean and, if necessary, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. If any candidate has had heavy service responsibilities, the dossier should explain the circumstances.

If the candidate has a joint appointment, it is desirable that the total service obligations be no greater than for someone with appointment in only one department.

For promotion to professor, increased evidence is required of service to the University, and mentoring of junior faculty, both within and outside of the department.

9. Dossier - Referees' Letters of Evaluation

9.1 *Solicitation of Letters*

A revised template letter to solicit an evaluation is attached. **If the department wants to rephrase the letter, the dean must consult with the Provost's Office in advance.** Requests for letters of evaluation must always ask the appropriate version of the question whether the candidate's work meets the standards as applied at leading institutions for a similar position or the award of tenure. **If letters are submitted that do not address this question, a supplemental request must be made by mail or email, explaining that our committees find very useful such evaluations and the referee's reasons for the conclusion.**

9.2 *Method of Selection of Referees*

Develop a list of referees independently of the candidate. The great majority of letters should be from referees who have not been suggested by the candidate, and who have not had a teaching, personal, or work relationship with the candidate. (It is not relevant whether the referee and candidate have met.) Generally, it is desirable that the candidate suggests *no more than* two or three referees. The candidate should be given the opportunity to list individuals whom the candidate believes to be biased.

9.2(a) *Interdisciplinary Referees* See section 2.4.

9.2(b) *Role of Dean in Reviewing Referees*

The list of referees, and the reasons for unusual choices, should be reviewed by the dean early enough in the process so there is time to make adjustments or seek additional referees, if needed, to provide a dossier adequate for UCAPT's review. Having the dean review the list is very useful as an opportunity to avoid serious problems with the dossier. Deans are encouraged to consider the list of referees at this stage so that they are satisfied it is sufficient for evaluation. The Provost's Office is available for consultation.

If the dean consults with additional referees when the dossier reaches the school level, the communications should be fully documented as part of the dean's memo.

9.3 *Who Should be Referees*

- The most useful referees are academic leaders in tenure-granting major universities, who are arm's length, i.e., independent of the candidate (not suggested by the candidate, and not connected to the candidate by collaboration, friendship, commercial ties, or collegiality at the same institution).
- If a referee is not a leading scholar at a major research university, please explain why he or she is an expert whose judgment is important to us. We understand that some universities, while not necessarily in the top tier, have individuals who are widely considered first class.

- Include referees from the broader discipline as well as the subspecialty. Seeking evidence from the broader discipline gives UCAPT a feel for the influence, importance and originality of the work.
- Some of the letters may be from the profession when the candidate is from a non-academic background, is being considered for a position where performance or other creative activity is key, or works in an area where impact on policy and practice is a legitimate criterion for influence on the field. Nevertheless, even in such cases a minimum of five or six letters from independent academic referees must be included to explain whether the candidate would qualify for that appointment at leading institutions.
- It would be unusual to seek the judgment of faculty holding a lower rank than that proposed for the candidate, or to seek the judgment of non-tenured faculty on a question of tenure.
- Internal letters of evaluation are generally not as informative as letters from eminent external referees. Internal letters are desirable when they are from members of the secondary department in interdisciplinary cases (see section 3.10), when they are from collaborators explaining the candidate's contribution to joint work (see section 9.3(b)), or when they present detailed substantive analysis of the candidate's work.

9.3(a) *Interdisciplinary Referees.* See section 2.4.

9.3(b) *Collaborators*

The University recognizes the importance of intra- and interdisciplinary collaborative research resulting in co-authored publications. If much of the candidate's work is co-authored, co-created, or otherwise produced collaboratively, then in order to assess the original, creative contribution of the candidate to such works, a few referees should be important co-authors with the candidate. These co-author referees shall be in addition to the five or six non-collaborating referees. Letters from co-authoring referees should address the significance of the sequence of authors and the original, creative contribution of the candidate as a co-author. See the template letter in section 13.2. These topics should also be addressed in the committee report.

9.4 *Contents and Number of Letters Meeting all Criteria*

There should be a minimum of five or six letters from academic leaders, independent of the candidate, who give a substantive analysis and who explain whether the referee believes the candidate's work meets the standards as applied at **leading institutions** for a similar position or the award of tenure. Substantive analysis necessitates penetrating evaluation of a candidate's scholarly or creative contributions (usually requiring at least two single-spaced pages.) Letters meeting all of these criteria are placed in part VI–A of the dossier.

9.5 Contents and Number of Letters – In General

It is common to solicit at least ten external letters of evaluation from individuals who are at the top of their fields, at leading tenure-granting academic research institutions. This number makes it likely we will receive five or six that meet all the criteria. There is no need to obtain a larger number of letters once there are five or six that meet all the criteria.

Letters from key collaborators, and referees suggested by the candidate, are additional to the expected five or six meeting all the criteria. These letters are placed in part VI-B of the dossier, along with letters from referees who are not arms-length, letters that do not give a substantive analysis, and letters that do not answer all the questions.

Letters of general praise are not of help to UCAPT. Letters directly solicited by the candidate are not acceptable. Referees' evaluation letters, like committee reports, are of greatest aid to the individual and to UCAPT if the writers see their task as analyzing issues rather than as advocating a position. **Supplemental evaluations may be sought by the dean, or UCAPT**, to ensure that UCAPT has a sufficient basis to evaluate the candidate.

9.6 Organization of Letter Section of Dossier

Preface the set of letters with a chart, showing for each referee who suggested the name, whether the referee has ties of **friendship, collegueship or collaboration** with the candidate, and **accurately indicates** whether the referee's letter answers all the questions in the letter of request.

The chart should include all referees approached, including all those who decline for lack of time or any other reason. The reasons for declining should be included. Provide copies of all letters and e-mail received from referees and notes on all phone calls with them. Please explain if an unusual number of referees decline to provide letters.

Explain why each referee was chosen, with a short bio of a few sentences summarizing the significance of the referee. **Do not enclose a full CV, a directory listing, or a biosketch.**

In organizing the dossier section on evaluations, **place in part VI-A the letters from independent referees at major universities** who answer all the questions asked. **There should be a minimum of five or six such letters.** Letters that do not meet these criteria are placed in part VI-B.

It is highly preferable that letters of evaluation be solicited at one time and included in a timely dossier. If submission of a dossier is delayed, some of the letters will be old. Of course, all letters solicited must be included (and non-replies noted), but if the dossier is stale, the candidate will not have the benefit of having his or her most recent work considered by the earlier referees. At least some of the letters must be fresh enough to confirm the trajectory of the candidate's work.

To avoid delay, a dossier should be forwarded after a sufficient number of letters are received, even if phone calls or email have not been successful in getting the rest. The dossier should explain the circumstances, and the late letters should follow in a supplement.

9.7 Quoting or Naming Referees in Reports and Memos

To preserve the confidentiality of the referees' letters, the reports should not quote verbatim from referees' letters or give their names. While such letters are generally held confidential by California courts, that protection may be **lost** if reports or memos name the referees or use direct quotations from their letters. The use of anonymous indirect quotations or paraphrases is allowed, though the practice is not particularly helpful because it provides no additional information. What is helpful is an informed interpretation of key phrases and of ideas that run through the letters.

9.8 Who Contacts Referees and Students

The candidate must not have access to the list of referees or students to be approached, and must not personally solicit nor contact them. The department or committee chair or dean organizes the contacting of referees and students whose opinions are solicited. Any contact made by individual committee members or others with solicited referees must be coordinated by the chair or dean. Individual faculty colleagues may suggest to a department chair or dean a few potential referees, but they should neither solicit evaluations nor contact those asked to be referees.

9.9 Honorarium

A school may if it wishes offer an honorarium to referees in recognition that a thorough evaluation takes time and effort. Several units have found this practice very helpful in obtaining thoughtful and substantive evaluations. Other deans prohibit such honorariums.

9.10 Revising the Template Request to Referees

Please check in advance with the Provost Office. The letter to the referees should not suggest that the department has already decided to extend an offer with tenure.

10. Dossier - Evidence of Scholarship or Professional Performance, and Teaching

Provide a copy of samples of recent publications and other works: reprints, accepted manuscripts, and artistic samples. The candidate's best work should always be included. If the material will fit in a single volume, include all published scholarly work.

- Include with the dossier a copy of each published book, or accepted book manuscript.
- **Include all significant published reviews of the candidate's work (scholarly or artistic), as well as reviews that are in-press and comments of publishers' evaluators, if available.**
- Include "pink sheets" of pending grants.

If the material is lengthy, use a second volume, but quantity is not a value in itself. **The dossier should never be longer than two volumes.**

11. Senior Lateral Appointments

Senior lateral appointments basically use the same dossier format and UCAPT process as do promotions, but some abbreviation and modifications of the process are permissible, as detailed below. **Appointment offers require approval by the Provost through the UCAPT process if they are at the associate professor or professor rank, whether with or without tenure.** (Visiting, non-tenure-track, and assistant professor appointments are made by the dean.)

It makes little sense for a school to make its decision on one set of information, and then to take months to amass a wholly different paper file for UCAPT. Essentially a school should not make its decision until it has information that would satisfy UCAPT, and UCAPT will review promptly the information already assembled by the school.

If the need for speed requires it, the dean may submit the dossier to UCAPT before it is complete (for example, so that the school committee and UCAPT can read the dossier simultaneously); the school process must be completed before the Provost can act. To avoid delay, a dossier should be forwarded after a sufficient number of letters are received even if phone calls or email have not been successful in getting the rest. The dossier should explain the circumstances, and the late letters should follow in a supplement.

In some cases, the Provost will have been consulted early about an appointment or its funding. However, even in such cases, the Provost's decision on tenure is not made until after the completion of the UCAPT process.

11.1 Timing

Appointment dossiers should be submitted to UCAPT as early as possible to allow due consideration. The department should notify UCAPT **as soon as the appointment is in the pipeline**, to allow scheduling. **The dossiers should reach UCAPT by March 15**, if possible. UCAPT will attempt to meet whatever real deadlines exist. It is bad management on a dean's part, however, if the department or school delays extensively and then requests a rush response from UCAPT.

Where expedited UCAPT consideration is requested, the dean must personally explain to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs the reason for the urgency, why the dossier could not be submitted earlier, why Provost should make an exception to our usual processes, and the date by which a decision is requested.

The Provost's approval must be obtained before a firm offer letter is issued (except for visiting, assistant professor, and non-tenure-track positions.)

There are three possible sequences:

- (1) Preferably, the school should submit the dossier to UCAPT before extending any letter of offer to the candidate, and UCAPT will process the dossier as speedily as possible. (The dean should use the appropriate template, or review special language with assistance by the General Counsel's Office.)

- (2) If time does not permit going through UCAPT first, a **conditional offer** may be made to the candidate. **It is imperative that such a letter state unequivocally that its terms are conditional on approval by the Provost, using the University’s template language for such situations.** Any conditional offer must be immediately followed by submission of a dossier to UCAPT. The conditional offer does not in itself authorize employment by USC.
- (3) Sometimes, of course, a school will extend a visiting appointment in order that the individual and the school can look each other over. During that look-over year, if the school decides positively an appointment dossier will be submitted to UCAPT. The national search preceding a look-over visiting appointment must be as serious and thorough as that for any tenured or tenure-track position.

It is undesirable to use Visiting titles as a “pending” status when both sides already regard the appointment as intended to be a permanent one: either submit a dossier to UCAPT before the offer, or make a conditional offer followed by prompt submission to UCAPT.

11.2 Contents of the Dossier

- Administrative and Faculty Assessments. Department and school custom may allow the use of different committees for appointment than for promotion. Appointments use a different form than promotions. Lateral appointments require both pre- and post- recruitment affirmative action forms, to authorize the search and to list all applicants (not just finalists). Committees should describe the measures taken to assure that there was proactive outreach, and no discrimination against women or members of under-represented minority groups.
- Curriculum Vitae. CV, bibliography, and record of financial support are required as for promotions.
- Personal Statement. This may or may not be available.
- Teaching Record. If the normal information is not available, an official or colleague at the candidate’s current institution may be asked for an assessment of the individual as teacher and mentor.
- Service. Sufficient information may be available in the CV or from the public record.
- Referees’ Letters of Evaluation. If there is good reason to do so, emails may be used instead of hard copies. Deans must contact the Provost’s office in advance if the request to referees should be worded differently from the template, because of the stature of the candidate or similar reason. For scholars of great eminence a somewhat smaller number of referees may suffice, perhaps focusing on the individual’s current work, collegiality, teaching effectiveness and future plans.

<p>It is still important to have five or six letters from referees who are leading scholars at major universities, independent of the candidate, and able to portray adequately to UCAPT the eminence of the candidate.</p>

- Deans may make a request personally to the Provost's Office if there is need to relax further our usual processes on the grounds that a senior lateral appointment is extraordinarily distinguished.
- Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship or Professional Performance, and Teaching. Evidence of scholarship may be available from the public record, and supporting evidence of teaching may not always be available.

11.3 Internal Lateral Appointments

Under our longstanding practice, an abbreviated process is used when a faculty member currently holding a tenured appointment in one USC department is proposed for a tenured appointment in a different one. (The same abbreviated process would apply if someone holding a tenured appointment in department A with a secondary appointment in department B was proposed for a tenured appointment in department B with a secondary appointment in department A. A tenured appointment may be made only in one academic unit.) The timing need not conform to the usual schedule. The contents of the dossier will be abridged upon consultation with the Provost's office; generally a current CV will be sufficient. External letters are not requested. Recommendations from the new department's faculty and the dean are required, as is the approval of the Provost (see section 3.9). Generally no consultation with UCAPT is necessary before the Provost makes his decision about the new appointment. A new appointment letter will then be issued reflecting the changed status and title, and incorporating by reference all unchanged terms.

When an individual formerly held a tenured appointment at USC but currently does not, the regular process for considering an external appointment is followed. For individuals currently holding a non-tenure-track appointment at USC, see section 12.3.

12. General Provisions

12.1 Consistency

All those participating in the review should take care to follow the policies stated in the Faculty Handbook and this manual, so that actual practice observes the stated criteria. Any exceptions to the policies or manual should be authorized by the Provost. Protections against discrimination apply with full force to the appointment, promotion and tenure process and the criteria for decisions are consistent over time among candidates with different personal characteristics—such as race, gender, disability, age and national origin. Consistency in criteria does not mean, however, that a dossier is compared to the weakest case recently approved; each action is judged by national standards and should aim at improving the average quality of the department. Committee members, when reviewing candidates in disciplines with which they are familiar, will take care to observe the standard tenure processes rather than, for example, independently seeking external advice. All information that is relied on should be documented in the dossier.

12.2 Changes in Edition of UCAPT Documents

The candidate may write to the dean before the start of the third year review process, or before the start of the preparation of the tenure dossier, requesting that the review be conducted under the UCAPT guidelines or manual in force when the individual was first appointed, and specifying the relevant difference. The chair's memo should mention which edition of the UCAPT guidelines or manual pertains to the case, if it is not the current one, and the relevant difference.

12.3 Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Individuals with non-tenure-track appointment are not eligible for consideration for tenure through promotion or transfer. They may, of course, apply for appointment to an open position on an equal basis in competition with the national pool of available candidates.

13. Templates for Solicitation Letters for Referees

13.1 For promotion or appointment as Associate Professor or full Professor, whether or not involving the grant of tenure.

Dear [Professor name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the Department of [] in a frank evaluation of the work of [candidate's name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [] [with/without tenure.] Please let me know as soon as possible by e-mail [] whether or not you are able to assist us by reviewing the enclosed materials and submitting a letter of evaluation by []. [Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$____. (Please supply your Social Security Number.)]

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, and a sample of publications [or other scholarly product]. If you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please send a short biographical sketch about yourself and address the following issues in your letter:

1. Please analyze [candidate's name]'s scholarly contributions. Have they had a significant impact on thinking in the field? Please give concrete examples of such impact and explain how the quality of [candidate's name]'s scholarship has been responsible for the effects you describe. If [candidate's name]'s scholarship has not been extraordinary, please state that candidly and offer your interpretation of its value.

2. USC's promotion committees also find it very useful to have your responses to these three questions: (a) Could you specify a handful of the leading departments with the most rigorous standards for scholarship, places where scholars pursuing the same kinds of work as [candidate's name] are [appointed/promoted] (these places may include your own institution)? (b) In your judgment, does [candidate's name]'s scholarship meet the standards for [promotion/appointment] to a similar position in these departments [and the award of tenure] (assuming a vacancy existed and that teaching and service expectations were met)? (c) What aspect of [candidate's name]'s scholarship leads you to this conclusion?

3. Please briefly describe the circumstances in which you know [candidate's name], if you have met face-to-face. Describe any professional or personal relationships you have had.
4. If you have not already covered the subject, we would appreciate your evaluation of the significance of the venues in which [candidate's name] has published [and the prizes/grants/awards he/she has received.]
5. Finally, sometimes outside evaluators have direct knowledge about other aspects of a candidate's academic role--such as teaching of students, or professional or public service. If you do, please add your evaluations of [candidate's name]'s accomplishments in these areas.

We value your **frank** and **detailed** judgments highly. We appreciate that an analytical evaluation requires greater effort than a letter of general praise and advocacy, or one that simply retraces [candidate's name]'s vitae.

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by school and University promotion committees and officials, and is intended to be read by no one else. Please help us reach an informed decision about whether USC should [offer [candidate's name] a lifetime appointment.] [offer [candidate's name] this appointment] [grant [candidate's name] this promotion.]

Revised January 2011

13.2 For use when the referee is a collaborator.

Dear [Professor name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the Department of [] in a frank evaluation of the work of [candidate's name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [] [with/without tenure]. Please let me know as soon as possible by e-mail [] whether or not you are able to assist by reviewing the enclosed materials and submitting a letter of evaluation by []. [Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$____. (Please supply your Social Security Number.)]

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae and personal statement. I am soliciting your input particularly because you are a collaborator with [candidate's name] and USC's promotion committees would like to understand the contribution of [candidate's name] to your joint work. Because it may be awkward for you to comment on your own work, I am not seeking your overall assessment of the candidate's scholarship, but would be grateful if you could address the following issues concerning your joint work with [candidate's name]:

1. Please describe the circumstances in which you know the candidate and came to work together, and any other professional or personal relationships you have had.
2. Please help us understand [candidate's name] contribution to collaborative work:

- Please discuss the significance of the sequence of author names in your joint publications, and [candidate's name]'s contribution.
 - What is [his/her] role in driving the project(s) forward?
 - Is [she/he] leading a major effort within the project or making key scientific contributions to it?
 - What accomplishments/achievements can be attributed to [him/her]?
 - Was the contribution essential for the overall success of the project?
 - To what degree did the contribution influence the overall outcome or direction of the project?
 - Was the contribution original rather than a reproduction of the work of others (e.g., did the candidate develop software with novel, original features that will be used by others in the field, or did the candidate merely modify existing software to make it compatible with the workflow of the project)?
 - How is [candidate's name] contribution regarded in [his/her] field of research?
3. Finally, sometimes outside evaluators have direct knowledge about other aspects of a candidate's academic role – such as teaching of students, or professional or public service. If you do, please add your evaluation of [candidate's name]'s accomplishments in these areas.

We value your frank and detailed judgments highly. We appreciate that an analytical evaluation requires greater effort than a letter of general praise and advocacy, or one that simply retraces [candidate's name]'s vitae.

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by school and USC promotion committees and officials, and is intended to be read by no one else.

We are grateful for your effort to help us reach an informed decision about whether USC should [offer [candidate's name] a lifetime appointment] [offer [candidate's name] this appointment] [grant [candidate's name] this promotion].

Revised January 2011

13.3 For use when the candidate is in artistic field.

For promotion or appointment as Associate Professor or full Professor, whether or not involving the grant of tenure.

Dear [referee's title and name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the School of [] in a frank evaluation of the work of [candidate's name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [] [with/without tenure.] Please let me know as soon as possible by e-mail [] whether or not you are able to assist us by reviewing the enclosed materials and submitting a letter of evaluation by []. [Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$____. (Please supply your Social Security Number.)]

I have enclosed a professional resume, personal statement, and [samples of/links to/descriptions of/ some of his/her work.] If you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please send a short biographical sketch about yourself and address the following issues in your letter:

1. Please analyze [candidate's name]'s creative [*comment to school: you may substitute "performance", "production", "design", "exhibition" or the like, as relevant*] contributions. Have they had a significant impact on the field? Please give concrete examples of such impacts and explain how the quality of [candidate's name]'s work has been responsible for the effects you describe. If [candidate's name]'s work has not been significant and out of the ordinary, please state that candidly and offer your interpretation of its value.
2. USC's promotion committees also find it very useful to have your responses to these three questions: (a) Could you specify a handful of the leading academic departments with the most rigorous standards for creative work [*or school may substitute the other term used in #1 instead of 'creative'*], places where individuals pursuing the same kinds of work as [candidate's name] are [appointed/promoted]? (These places may include your own institution.) (b) In your judgment, does [candidate's name]'s work meet the standards for [promotion/appointment] to a similar position in these departments [and the award of tenure] (assuming a vacancy existed and that teaching and service expectations were met)? (c) What aspect of [candidate's name]'s work leads you to this conclusion?
3. Please briefly describe the circumstances in which you know [candidate's name], if you have met face-to-face. Describe any professional or personal relationships you have had.

[For collaborators: Since you have worked together, our committee will appreciate what you can tell us about the nature and extent of [candidate's name]'s contributions to the joint work.]

4. If you have not already covered the subject, we would appreciate your evaluation of the significance of the venues in which [candidate's name] has appeared [and the prizes/grants/awards he/she has received.]

5. Finally, sometimes outside evaluators have direct knowledge about other aspects of a candidate's academic role--such as teaching of students, or professional or public service. If you do, please add your evaluations of [candidate's name]'s accomplishments in these areas.

We value your **frank** and **detailed** judgments highly. We appreciate that an analytical evaluation requires greater effort than a letter of general praise and advocacy, or one that simply retraces [candidate's name]'s resume.

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by school and University promotion committees and officials, and is intended to be read by no one else. Please help us reach an informed decision about whether USC should [offer [candidate's name] a lifetime appointment.] [offer [candidate's name] this appointment] [grant [candidate's name] this promotion.]

Revised January 2011

14. Checklist for dossier Preparation

The checklist on page 47 should be prepared by the departmental administrators who assemble the dossier. The dean's staff should review it when checking the dossier for completeness and accuracy, so that no problems remain to be discovered by UCAPT staff.

CHECKLIST FOR DOSSIER PREPARATION

School _____ Name of Candidate _____

<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Recommendation for Appointment Form or Recommendation for Promotion Form</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Pre-Recruitment and Post-Recruitment Affirmative Action Forms [required only for initial appointment] [Online forms, print them out and attach. List all applicants, not just finalists.]</i>
I-A.	<i>Administrative and Faculty Assessments. (See section 4)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Dean. Independent assessment and recommendation with a candid explanation of reasons. Do not repeat information already in the dossier.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Note whether the dean approved in advance the list of referees as adequate for UCAPT consideration.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>School Committee. Report of the school faculty committee that advises the dean.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>For Interdisciplinary Candidates: Is assessment by faculty of appropriate other USC program included?</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Department Chair. Independent assessment with explanation of department needs and strategic goals. Do not repeat information already in the dossier. For appointments, explain pro-active outreach.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Department Faculty. Report of screening or other committee representing department faculty.</i>
I-B.	<i>Quantitative Data. (See section 4.6)</i>
II.	<i>Curriculum Vitae. (See section I, answer b13, b14 and section 5)</i>
III.	<i>Personal Statement. Candidate may include approaches to teaching, research, and service, together with proposals for future work. Often, two or three pages will suffice. (See section 6)</i>
IV.	<i>Teaching Record. Please place supporting details in Part VII, the appendix. (See section 7)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Memo comparing candidate's teaching quality to department and school norms.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Summary of evidence concerning the candidate's record of mentoring, courses taught, curriculum development activities, and other student interactions. (See section 7)</i>
V.	<i>Service Record. Include available evidence of University, professional and community service activity related to the candidate's field. Assess the quality and the effectiveness of the contributions. (See section 8)</i>
VI.	<i>Referee Letters. Preface each letter with short bio explaining the referee's stature. (Not full CV or directory entry.) (See section I, answer c12, 19 and section 9)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Include a chart of all referees, indicating who suggested the referee, the relationship to the candidate, and whether all the questions were answered.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Include sample solicitation letter.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Explain choice of any referees not recognized as top scholars at major universities.</i>
VI-A	<i>Place first <u>five</u> or <u>six</u> substantive letters, answering all questions, from academic scholars who are independent (not suggested by candidate and without prior working, collegial or personal relationships).</i>
VI-B	<i>Place letters from key collaborations, and referees suggested by the candidate, letters that do not give a substantive analysis, and letters that do not answer all the questions.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Does list include (as appropriate) referees from the broader discipline, and Interdisciplinary referees, including those recommended by appropriate other USC program(s)?</i>
VII.	<i>Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship or Professional Performance, and Teaching. Include books and <u>selected</u> reprints, accepted manuscripts, reviews of the candidate's abstracts, samples, and photographs with a succinct description of date, source, and importance; details on teaching evaluations. If these are lengthy, use a second volume for the appendix (though no more). (Books may be sent alongside the dossier.)</i>

Updated Jan 2011

Appendix – Dossier Evaluation Form

**University of Southern California
Appointments and Promotions Evaluation**

Date _____ Name of Candidate _____

Department _____

School _____

Date of Mandatory Decision of Tenure _____

Appointment

Promotion

Proposed Rank _____

Present Rank _____

Evaluation of Dossier

	Adequate for Evaluation	Inadequate for Evaluation
I. Administrative/faculty Assessments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. Curriculum Vitae.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
III. Personal Statement.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV. Teaching Record.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. Service Record.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. Letter of Reference.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. Evidence of research/scholarly/creative activity.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation of Candidate

		Low								High	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Please rate this candidate on the scale by marking the appropriate box:											
Teaching		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research/Scholarly/creative activity		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If either teaching or research/scholarly/creative activity is less than outstanding, do you find the supplementary criteria such as professional activity, grant support, or university/public service so strong as to merit exceptional consideration?											
								<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input type="checkbox"/> No	
								(if yes, please comment on the reverse of this page)			
Overall Evaluation		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What is your advice as to the panel's recommendation for action?

- Approve** Strongly Tentatively
- Disapprove**..... Strongly Tentatively
- Request more evidence (as noted in "adequacy" section)**
- Discuss at a panel meeting**

NAME _____ SIGNATURE _____
(Please print)

DATE _____

Important: Please elaborate your recommendation on the following page.

Overall Assessment of the case, main strength and main weakness.

Assessment of Research

Assessment of Teaching

Other Considerations

Assessment of Dean's Letter

Assessment of Lower Level Reviews

Assessment of External Reviewers

Is the nature of the candidate's contributions adequately explained?

Other comments