


MEMORANDUM

Office of the Provost

Lloyd Armstrong, Jr.
Provost

TO: Academic Deans
FROM: Lloyd Armstrong, Jr. 
DATE: February 28, 2005
SUBJECT: UCAPT Guidelines

Enclosed is the 2005 edition of the guidelines of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure, last issued October 27, 2003 (my 2003 cover memos are also enclosed as they continue to be useful). Please share this material widely with new and probationary faculty, promotion committee members, and other colleagues. They are posted at <http://www.usc.edu/policies> under "Faculty, Teaching and Research." Observing the guidelines will maximize the chances for successful outcomes.

This edition has several new or revised provisions, which are set out below for convenience. Most of the changes have been made to reflect USC's Plan for Increasing Academic Excellence.

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, 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. Particularly in inter-disciplinary work, it is important to devise means to evaluate work as co-P.I. or member of a research team. UCAPT and the Provost's office are available to offer assistance to help departments evaluate interdisciplinary work.

Extension of Tenure Decision Date: 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.

Pre-Tenure Reviews: 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).

Multiple Levels of Review: For scholarship that has been identified as interdisciplinary, the tenure or promotion committee must include a member from the other discipline(s). In addition, the other department(s) or program(s), even if in another school, must be asked to provide an evaluation concerning the merits of the candidate's interdisciplinary work. This 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).

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. In cases where research crosses school lines, it is also possible that tenure be held in the Graduate School. Where tenure is proposed to be held in the school or in the Graduate School, the relevant dean will organize review committees as needed to assure careful consideration of the dossier.

Teaching Record: [An additional method of documenting teaching excellence:] Evidence that the candidate's work is learner-centered. Without meaning to limit faculty creativity in devising learner-centered methods, examples would include teachers who emphasize demonstrations of student mastery; harness technology for more responsiveness and flexibility; serve a broader base of students; recognize that different students have different learning styles; promote students' opportunity to collect, integrate, evaluate and use information, as by trying structures other than the traditional lecture format, semester length, student audience, and disciplinary boundaries; mentor undergraduate and advanced students and junior colleagues; conduct service-learning and experiential courses that explore the applied implications of theory and scholarship, and derive fundamental hypotheses and insights from applied experience.

Service: 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.

Referees' Letters of Evaluation: Selection of Referees: Where the scholarship has been identified as interdisciplinary, help must be requested from other appropriate USC department(s) or program(s), even if in another school, in defining the list of referees.

Sample Solicitation Letter: Where the scholarship has been identified as interdisciplinary, the request should refer to "impact on the interdisciplinary specialty [he or she] works in, as well as on the wider field."

In addition, in all tenure cases whether or not interdisciplinary, the request should ask whether the work meets "the standards for a similar position, and the award of tenure."

And, for all dossiers whether or not interdisciplinary:

Appendix: If the appendix material is lengthy, use a second volume (though no more), but selectivity is highly preferred over quantity.

Include all significant published reviews of the candidate's work, as well as reviews that are in-press and comments of publisher's evaluators, if available.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Deans
FROM: Lloyd Armstrong, Jr.
DATE: October 27, 2003
SUBJECT: UCAPT Procedures

Enclosed is the first of three sets of guidelines of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure, updating the 2001 edition. The enclosure deals with tenure and promotion standards and process, as well as general provisions that apply to all UCAPT matters. For the convenience of faculty, these guidelines bring together in one place a summary of relevant Faculty Handbook sections and answers to questions that often occur. Please share these guidelines widely with new and probationary faculty, promotion committee members, and other colleagues. They will be posted at <http://www.usc.edu/policies>.

The guidelines seek to promote our shared goal of excellence in appointments and promotions. They explain what is already widely practiced. I mention here for emphasis some specific points:

- Deadlines for submitting a dossier to UCAPT are February 1 for tenure cases; October 15 for promotions not involving tenure; March 15, if possible, for senior appointments from outside USC (associate or full professor). Submit these senior appointments for my approval before a firm offer letter is issued.
- If expedited UCAPT consideration is requested, you must explain to me personally the reason for the urgency, why the dossier could not be submitted earlier, why I should make an exception to our usual processes, and the date by which a decision is requested.
- Other than claims of unfair process, requests for reconsideration may be submitted only on the basis of new evidence and will go forward to me only if there is an affirmative recommendation by the dean.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Deans
FROM: Lloyd Armstrong, Jr.
DATE: October 27, 2003
SUBJECT: UCAPT Dossiers

Enclosed is the second of three sets of guidelines of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure, updating the 2001 edition. This enclosure deals with the preparation of dossiers. Please share these guidelines widely with new and probationary faculty, promotion committee members, and other colleagues. They will be posted at <http://www.usc.edu/policies>. Observing the guidelines will maximize the chances for successful outcomes. Dossiers that don't observe the guidelines will be returned for rectification.

I mention here for emphasis some specific items for which I hold deans responsible.

- When dossiers are prepared, I cannot overemphasize the value of evaluation over advocacy. I expect candor from deans and departments, not an attempt to gloss over issues or select positive referees. If a department and dean neglect to address a problem, UCAPT may well conclude that negative information is being hidden. That would reflect poorly on the department and dean's reputations for judgment and reliability, and require UCAPT to conduct more intense scrutiny. UCAPT members would rather vote yes knowing the candidate's limits, than vote no because they conclude that the academic unit is hiding things and thus cannot trust the dossier. I hold deans personally responsible to give me an analysis of the issues rather than advocacy.

- The list of referees should be reviewed by the dean early enough in the process so there is time to seek additional referees if needed to provide adequate review by external experts suitable for UCAPT's review. 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 consider. Please ensure that there are referees from the broader discipline as well as the sub discipline or specialty that the candidate cultivates.

- For interdisciplinary scholarship, it will maximize the chance of success if

an evaluation of the scholarship is sought from the appropriate other USC department or program (even if from another school) and its assistance is also sought in selecting referees.

- UCAPT values letters from department chairs that explain how a candidate's research and teaching fit into the unit's strategy for excellence.

- Please note that evidence of teaching effectiveness, and use of research-based teaching strategies, are now included among the methods for evaluating teaching.

- The decision can be greatly expedited if later levels do not delay the process by preparing a redundant document summarizing what is already in the file. Focus on what is most persuasive and most problematic.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Deans

FROM: Lloyd Armstrong, Jr.

DATE: October 27, 2003

SUBJECT: UCAPT Senior External Appointments

Enclosed is the third of three sets of guidelines of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure, updating the 2001 edition. The enclosure deals with senior external appointments. Please share these guidelines widely with promotion committee members and other colleagues. They will be posted at <http://www.usc.edu/policies>

For senior appointments from outside USC (associate or full professor), the deadline for submitting dossiers to UCAPT is March 15, if possible.

You must explain to me personally any need to relax our usual letters requirement or the like, on the grounds that a senior lateral appointment is extraordinarily distinguished. Similarly, if expedited UCAPT consideration is requested, you must explain to me personally the reason for the urgency, why the dossier could not be submitted earlier, why I should make an exception to our usual processes, and the date by which a decision is requested.



UNIVERSITY
OF SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA

**GUIDELINES
OF THE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE**

February 28, 2005

University of Southern California

GUIDELINES OF THE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE
2005

Helpful hints for navigating this document. In the web-posted copy of these guidelines, <http://www.usc.edu/policies>, you can locate statements of special interest by using the **find** and **find again** tools within Adobe Acrobat, for example by entering such search terms as "letters" or "teaching." In addition, the web-posted table of contents is clickable to take you to headings and sub-heads.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(1) PROCEDURES	Page
General Provisions.....	1
Provost's Responsibility.....	1
Consistency.....	1
Standards.....	2
Gauges of Quality.....	3
School Clarifications.....	3
Interdisciplinary Scholarship and Teaching.....	4
International Scholarship and Teaching	4
Non-tenure Track Faculty	4
Process.....	5
Informing New Faculty.....	5
Extensions of Tenure Decision Date; Parenting Leaves.....	5
Pre-Tenure Reviews.....	6
Early Review; Promotion to Associate Professor	6
Deadlines for Dossiers.....	7
Supplementing the Dossier.....	7
Confidentiality.....	8
Multiple Levels of Review.....	8
Role of UCAPT and the Provost.....	9
Communicating Decisions.....	9
Finality.....	9

(2) DOSSIERS	Page
Administrative and Faculty Assessments.....	1
The Importance of Candor.....	1
Documenting the Process Fully.....	2
Avoiding Redundancy.....	2
Educating Those Outside the Department.....	3
Dean's Responsibility.....	3
Curriculum Vitae.....	4
Personal Statement.....	4
Teaching Record.....	4
Service.....	6
Referees' Letters of Evaluation.....	7
Solicitation of Letters.....	7
Selection of Referees.....	7
Number of Letters.....	8
Organization of Letter Section of Dossier.....	8
Quoting or Naming Referees in Reports.....	9
Who Contacts Referees.....	9
Honorarium.....	9
Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship or Professional Performance, and Teaching.....	10
Sample Solicitation Letter.....	11
Checklist for Dossier Preparation	

(3) SENIOR EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS	Page
Timing.....	1
Contents of the Dossier.....	2
Alternative Sample Solicitation Letter.....	4

University of Southern California

**GUIDELINES OF THE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE
2005
PROCEDURES**

General Provisions

University policies on criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation and promotion are published in the Faculty Handbook, <http://www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook>. The following guidelines of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (UCAPT) summarize those policies and provide details on their implementation. The Provost will update these guidelines from time to time; this edition updates the previous version published October 27, 2003. There are separate guidelines dealing with (1) procedures, (2) dossiers, and (3) senior external appointments, as well as appendixes with sample referee letters and a dossier checklist. These General Provisions should be read as part of all the separate guidelines.

Provost's Responsibility

Decisions on tenure and promotion and senior appointments are made only by the Provost, under delegation of the authority vested in the President of the University. The decisions are made after a process of review that typically includes faculty committee recommendations at the department, school, and University level, as well as external referees familiar with national and international standards.

Neither advice nor predictions by any USC official except the Provost are definitive. A candidate for promotion or tenure who believes there have been errors in the process should promptly bring them to the Provost's attention as it is the Provost's responsibility to decide what, if any, remedy is appropriate for procedural defects. The Provost may authorize exceptions or waivers to these guidelines or other policies.

Consistency

All those participating in the review should take care to follow the Faculty Handbook and these guidelines, so that actual practice observes the stated criteria. Any exceptions 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 and administrators, when reviewing candidates in disciplines with which they are familiar, will take care to observe the standard tenure processes rather than, for example, seeking external advice not documented in the dossier.

Standards

University standards for promotion and tenure have not changed; the guidelines help clarify our longstanding approach to these decisions. USC does not apply any arbitrary standard like "one of the top five in the cohort" and we set no limit on the number of tenure slots. We would be pleased if every probationary faculty member at USC merited tenure.

The primary criteria are excellence and creativity in both teaching and scholarly research, as documented in the dossier, with outstanding performance required in one (usually research) and at least solid performance in the other.

Teaching includes preparation, advisement and the direction of research. UCAPT looks to evidence of the quality of teaching and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students including, in fields where it is appropriate, successful mentoring of Ph.D. students.

While these guidelines may refer to "scholarship" or "research," that is shorthand for what the Faculty Handbook describes as scholarly research, professional activity, and publication (including performance, production, design, and exhibition.) The Handbook also recognizes that the product of the research effort is publication or its counterpart in the visual and performing arts (performances, exhibitions, and the like).

UCAPT expects a candidate for tenure to have become an independent investigator, with a scholarly focus, and to have grown beyond the doctoral and post-doctoral work that led to initial appointment. It asks what intellectual trajectory can be predicted for the candidate. If the candidate is a frequent collaborator, UCAPT asks whether his or her own contribution is distinguishable and important. It looks for high ratings in national peer-review demonstrated, for example, by the quality of the outlets for the candidate's publications; whether the candidate is known to the leaders in the field, through conferences, editorial boards, colloquia, and the like, as appropriate for the discipline; in fields where a university press book is usual, reviews of the book; and, in fields where external funding is appropriate, by important Federal research grants, with the candidate as principal investigator. The full professor rank requires a higher level of qualification, including important additional scholarship since the previous promotion and achievement of national or international prominence.

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 positive not negative. For promotion to professor, UCAPT asks whether the candidate has fulfilled his or her responsibility to carry out the service functions of the University and to mentor junior faculty.

The academic needs of the academic unit are considered. UCAPT looks to the department to explain how important the candidate's field is within the broader discipline, and values letters from department chairs that explain how a candidate's research and teaching fit into the unit's strategy for excellence.

Gauges of Quality

- It continues to be so, as it has been for many years, that we expect each new appointment and grant of tenure to improve the quality of the appointing department.
- We have long expected our faculty to meet the national and international standards for promotion and tenure applied by peer universities.
- 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 ask whether a promotion candidate is good enough for a lateral, look-over visit, so that internal candidates be considered in the context of the potential pool of external appointments.

We ask whether a candidate for tenure is regarded seriously in the discipline, nationally or internationally. Fundamentally, we want to know whether the candidate has brought new insights, and has made or is likely to make a real impact on the field.

School Clarifications

Each school is encouraged to develop, as needed, published clarifications for particular fields of the criteria and their relative weights, including criteria for assessing contribution to the academic mission of the University, and the types of evidence that are preferable and acceptable (that is, provide examples of both "normal" and "minimum" profiles of evidence). The standard should be whatever is typical for this discipline at leading universities. Disciplines differ substantially, for example, on the relative weight placed on books, articles, and conference proceedings; on assessment of sole-authorship, principal authorship, and other collaboration; on the need for important external funding for research, such as R01's, the National Institutes of Health traditional research grants; and on the importance of citations of the candidate's work by other scholars or professionals in the field.

Any published school clarifications on criteria, relative weights of criteria, and evidence, must be forwarded to the Provost's Office for acceptance and subsequently published by print or web. The following are partial illustrations: "Scholarship is evidenced by creative and excellent work that makes an impact on the field, typically demonstrated in:

- a published university press book, a second such book well underway, 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 R01 awards, if appropriate to the field) " or
- whatever is appropriate for the discipline, as each school itself formulates.

These guidelines as well as any published school clarifications on criteria, relative weights of criteria, and evidence should be provided to each promotion sub-committee when it starts work. Appropriate excerpts may be provided each referee asked for an evaluation. 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.

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, 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. Particularly in inter-disciplinary work, it is important to devise means to evaluate work as co-P.I. or member of a research team. UCAPT and the Provost's office are available to offer assistance to help departments evaluate interdisciplinary work.

International Scholarship and Teaching

Be sure that recognition is given to faculty for their participation in international activities: teaching and research abroad as well as service to 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.

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.

Process

Informing 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 these guidelines (<http://www.usc.edu/policies>) as well as the candidate's Tenure Decision Date.

The department chair or other appropriate administrator should provide each new faculty member with any published school clarifications on criteria, relative weights of criteria, and evidence. He or she should also remind new faculty that the Faculty Handbook and these guidelines are available at <http://www.usc.edu/policies>. In addition, the department chair or other appropriate administrator should discuss with each new faculty member the standards and procedures for tenure, and the time of necessary renewals.

There should be annual consultation between the faculty member and the dean or chair to establish the next year's activity profile. Tenure-track faculty are subject to annual performance reviews on their progress toward meeting tenure standards and are subject to annual reappointment. In addition, there is a particularly thorough review midway in the probationary period (generally in the third year) and a stock-taking the year before the tenure decision (generally fifth year) to decide whether to go forward for tenure evaluation in the academic year of the Tenure Decision Date (generally sixth year).

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

Extensions of Tenure Decision Date; Parenting Leaves

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, 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 grant or deny such requests. It is possible, though rare, for the Provost to extend the Tenure Decision Date on the basis of UCAPT's own consideration.

A tenure-track faculty member who during the probationary period at USC gives birth or fathers a child, or adopts a child under age six, will on timely request to the Provost receive a one-year extension of the Tenure Decision Date under the policies set forth in the Faculty Handbook.

(As provided in the Handbook, the tenure-track faculty member will also receive on request a ten weeks paid leave of absence, which runs concurrently with any paid maternity disability leave; additional unpaid leave may also be a right under the law.)

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.

Pre-Tenure Reviews

Annual merit review is discussed in the University policy on evaluation of faculty, <http://www.usc.edu/policies>, and in school evaluation policy. Annual merit and third-year reports may be included in the dossier, to show how the candidate has responded to suggestions for improvement. Department chairs and deans, third-year and merit review committees, and other colleagues should not seem to convey unalloyed optimism about any candidate's prospects for tenure, as the tenure decision is not the department's but the Provost's. Even if departmental colleagues are optimistic, candidates should seek constructive criticism throughout their probationary period, remembering that external referees and UCAPT will make an evaluation by national standards.

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.)

The year before the tenure decision (generally fifth year), each candidate should discuss the process with the department chair 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.

Early Review; Promotion to Associate Professor

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.

It continues to be the practice that, whether or not there is an early review, a negative decision by the Provost on tenure will result in issuance of a terminal year letter. The candidate should acknowledge this in writing before an early review is begun. Similarly a terminal year letter will be issued if there is a negative decision on promotion to associate professor, when that is considered separately from the grant of tenure either in an individual case or under school-specific policy. Rarely, the Provost may permit a case to be withdrawn and resubmitted by the tenure decision date or other date as the Provost determines.

Deadlines for Dossiers

Information on preparing the dossier is contained in part two of these guidelines. The candidate, on request, may have a hearing by the department or school committee or subcommittee concerning the evidence; if so, a summary will be included in the dossier.

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. 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 part three of these guidelines.) Any dossier that misses these deadlines risks substantial delay at UCAPT.

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 to the Provost personally 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, 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 will be treated as extremely bad management.

Supplementing the Dossier

While a dossier is under consideration, the 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 add the letters or summaries of the conversations to the dossier so that later levels of review can appraise them for what they are worth.

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.

Multiple levels of 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.

For scholarship that has been identified as interdisciplinary, the tenure or promotion committee must include a member from the other discipline(s). In addition, the other department(s) or program(s), even if in another school, must be asked to provide an evaluation concerning the merits of the candidate's interdisciplinary work.

This 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.)

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. In cases where research crosses school lines, it is also possible that tenure be held in the Graduate School. Where tenure is proposed to be held in the school or in the Graduate School, the relevant dean will organize review committees as needed to assure careful consideration of the dossier.

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 not vote on such cases in the later committees. The dean, Provost and President will not vote on promotion and tenure recommendations in their departments.

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) and 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).

Role of UCAPT and the Provost

UCAPT is advisory to the Provost. 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 reads all promotion and tenure dossiers and generally meets personally with the UCAPT panel in tenure decisions. The ultimate responsibility for granting promotion and tenure and for appointing associate professors or professors rests with the Provost, on behalf of the President.

Communicating Decisions

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 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.

For candidates who have been successful, it would often be helpful if the dean or chair, some months later, passed on constructive advice to promote the candidate's improvement. 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 of decisions, and the dean should give similar feedback to the school-level committee.

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. 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.

University of Southern California

**GUIDELINES OF THE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE
2005
DOSSIERS**

Please also see the Procedures guidelines.

A checklist for dossier preparation is attached at the end of this document, and should be used by staff at both the department and school level. When the dossier leaves the department, a copy of the checklist should be faxed to the Provost's office so that the file can be tracked.

The underlying 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 underlying data in the teaching record (part IV), the underlying data in the record of service (part V) and the supporting material on scholarship and teaching (the appendix). The candidate, on request, will have a hearing by a committee (the department or school committee or subcommittee) concerning the evidence; if so, a summary will be included in the dossier. The initial review of the scholarly record is by referees and expressed in their letters of evaluation (part VI). Subsequent administrative and faculty assessments (part I of the dossier) lead to consideration by UCAPT and the Provost's decision.

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

I. Administrative and Faculty Assessments

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

The Importance of Candor

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. Some schools have long done this in their reports, and this type of analysis is a highly positive factor, not a negative one.

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.

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, 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 who judge a promotion or grant of tenure to be unjustified can be most helpful if they submit thoughtful analysis. Colleagues should not try to campaign in opposition or support, and should neither solicit evaluations nor lobby those asked to be referees. Individual faculty members who wish to ensure that their views are adequately represented in the dossier may write directly to the department chair, dean, or Provost with their analysis; these letters will be included in the dossier.

Avoiding Redundancy

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. However, each review needs to reflect what was seen at that level as most persuasive and as most problematic.

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, but simply put down their analysis of the issues in the dossier, present pros and cons and tradeoffs, and set forth the real reasons for their recommendation.

Educating Those Outside the Department; Department Chair's Letter

The department chair and committee should remember that the dossier will be evaluated by colleagues from other departments. It is important to explain the expected qualitative and quantitative standards, and the usual time-table for promotion, typical in the discipline. It is also necessary to explain:

- 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.

Also include a brief description of the candidate's next major project and how it is expected to contribute to the field.

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.

The department chair's letter should describe the department's needs and goals, the candidate's faculty load profile, and how the candidate's qualifications will advance the department's academic plan. UCAPT values letters from department chairs that explain how a candidate's research and teaching fit into the unit's strategy for excellence. The chair should discuss any disagreements with the judgments or procedures of the faculty committee.

Dean's Responsibility¹

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. Of course, the dean need not agree with the recommendations of the school-level committee. Indeed, an honest and independent assessment by all the individuals and committees who participate in the process is central to a meaningful review. School-level committees and deans will of course consider what

¹Discussion of *Interdisciplinary and International Scholarship and Teaching*, which appeared following this location in the 2003 edition, is now located in the Procedures guidelines, page 4.

has been said at lower levels, and if they disagree the higher level should give reasons for the disagreement. The dean's letter should have a final paragraph summarizing the candidate's contributions to the field.

II. Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae and bibliography need to be complete, current, 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.)

Include a bibliography of publications or list of creative works:

- Articles in refereed journals should be separate from other publications;
- Publications should not be mixed with presentations such as invited lectures and seminars; and
- First and last page numbers should be listed for each publication.

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.)

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

III. 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 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 Section I.)

IV. Teaching Record

The teaching record should include the following information:

- A chronological list of classes taught with the contact hours for each.
- Principal courses developed or substantially revised;
- The courses' place in the department's instructional efforts;
- Student and faculty evaluation of instructional effectiveness;

- Summaries of standardized teaching evaluations; and
- A list of graduate students mentored (past and present) showing each one's next career position.

This section should include a memo summarizing and analyzing the student evaluations, if used. It is important to explain the individual's evaluation rankings compared to the baseline of the department and school. For the benefit of those outside the subject, the department may also describe the typical students taking the candidate's courses.

Underlying detail on the teaching evaluation should be placed in Section VII, the appendix, not in this section.

The school promotion committee should clearly state how the candidate's teaching is to be evaluated and what pieces of evidence are needed for appropriate documentation.

At least two, and preferably more, of the following methods should be used:

- (1) Evidence that the candidate's work is learner-centered. Without meaning to limit faculty creativity in devising learner-centered methods, examples would include teachers who emphasize demonstrations of student mastery; harness technology for more responsiveness and flexibility; serve a broader base of students; recognize that different students have different learning styles; promote students' opportunity to collect, integrate, evaluate and use information, as by trying structures other than the traditional lecture format, semester length, student audience, and disciplinary boundaries; mentor undergraduate and advanced students and junior colleagues; conduct service-learning and experiential courses that explore the applied implications of theory and scholarship, and derive fundamental hypotheses and insights from applied experience.
- (2) Evidence of teaching effectiveness, including empirical evidence of increases in students' skills and knowledge beyond that achieved in comparable courses.
- (3) Evidence that the candidate has sought out information on teaching strategies whose effectiveness has been demonstrated in educational research, and applied those strategies in course planning and instruction.
- (4) A program of regular collegial review and focused classroom visitations over a period of years, including forward-looking advice. This is a highly valuable method of evaluation.
- (5) Classroom observations by colleagues close to the time of consideration for promotion. One school has each member of the departmental subcommittee visit at least two classes taught by the candidate, and submit individual written evaluations for consideration by the full department.

- (6) Student evaluation, if used, should be based on a process that seeks 100% participation rate (e.g., one school collects the evaluation form before distributing the final exam.) Such data should be compared to departmental and school baselines. This method, however, is often overrated; it is not sufficient in itself to judge an instructor's teaching effectiveness, and should only be used as one indication among others.
- (7) Course syllabi provided to students are especially useful evidence, if they demonstrate clearly what the teaching approaches are for a given course, what students are expected to be able to do at the end of the course, and how reaching those objectives will be evaluated.
- (8) Departments often evaluate graduate and post-graduate teaching in part by seeking evidence of later success by those students.
- (9) Some departments choose a sample of former students and ask them by interview or letter to evaluate the teaching. These students may not be suggested nor solicited by the candidate. Please explain the selection method and enclose the solicitation letter.

Teaching-related activity can sometimes meet the qualities of scholarly work if it can be documented, can be peer-reviewed, and 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 significance or impact 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.

V. 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.

Probationary faculty should preferably have minimal service obligations. If the candidate has had heavy service responsibilities, 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.

VI. Referees' Letters of Evaluation

Solicitation of Letters

A template letter to solicit an evaluation is attached (along with an alternative template for very senior appointments.) 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 the referee's own institution 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 such evaluations very useful.

Selection of Referees

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.

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. Where the scholarship has been identified as interdisciplinary, help must be requested from other appropriate USC department(s) or program(s), even if in another school, in defining the list of referees.

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 six letters from independent academic referees must be included to explain whether the candidate would qualify for that appointment at their own 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.

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 material that the referee and candidate have met.) Generally, it is desirable that the candidate suggest no more than two or three referees. The candidate should be given the opportunity to list individuals whom the candidate believes to be biased.

A few referees may be important co-authors with the candidate. We expect letters from these referees to address the significance of the sequence of authors and the contribution of the candidate as a co-author. These topics should also be addressed in the committee report.

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 seek additional referees, if needed, to provide a dossier adequate for UCAPT's review.

Number of Letters

There is an expectation of at least ten external letters of evaluation from individuals who are at the top of their fields, at leading tenure-granting academic research institutions. Explain why each was chosen, and enclose a short bio of a few sentences with each letter.

Directory listings or full C.V.'s are not helpful.

Of the ten or more letters in total, there should be a minimum of six letters from academic leaders in tenure-granting major universities, who are independent of the candidate (not suggested by the candidate, and not connected to the candidate by collaboration, friendship, or collegueship at the same institution), who give a substantive analysis and who explain whether the referee believes the candidate's work meets the standards as applied at the referee's own institution 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 of reference” or 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. Supplemental letters may be sought at the request of the dean, or of UCAPT, to ensure that UCAPT has a sufficient basis to evaluate the candidate.

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 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.

In organizing the dossier section on evaluations, place first the letters from independent referees at major universities who answer all the questions asked. Out of the ten or more letters in total, there should be a minimum of six such letters.

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.

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.

Quoting or Naming Referees in Reports

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. While the use of anonymous, indirect quotations or paraphrases is allowed, 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.

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 by individual committee members 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 lobby those asked to be referees.

Honorarium

A department may if it wishes offer an honorarium to referees in recognition that a thorough evaluation takes time and effort. Several departments have found this practice very helpful in obtaining thoughtful and substantive evaluations.

VII. Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship or Professional Performance, and Teaching

Provide in an appendix, in a single copy, samples of recent publications and other works: reprints, accepted manuscripts, and artistic samples. Materials should be carefully chosen to represent the quality of the candidate's best work rather than to emphasize volume. Include also supporting documentation for the evaluation of teaching quality. Send with the dossier a copy of each published book, or accepted book manuscript.

If the appendix material is lengthy, use a second volume (though no more), but selectivity is highly preferred over quantity.

Include all significant published reviews of the candidate's work, as well as reviews that are in-press and comments of publishers' evaluators, if available.

SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER

Dear Professor [*name*]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the Department of [*dept name*] in a frank evaluation of the works of [*faculty member's title and full name*] who is being considered for [*promotion*] [*appointment*] to the rank of {[*Professor*] or [*Associate Professor*]} {[*with tenure.*] or [*without tenure.*] or [*He (or She) already holds tenure.*]}. Please let me know as soon as possible by email at [*email address*] whether you are able to assist us by reviewing the attached documentation for [*title and last name*] and submitting a letter by [*date*].

We have enclosed a copy of [*title and last name*]'s curriculum vitae, personal statement and some relevant publications, [*and relevant portions of our tenure standards*]. If you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please address the following issues:

[Where "scholarship" is mentioned, in appropriate cases add "and performance," "production," "design" or "exhibition" as relevant.]

1. Discuss [*title and last name*]'s specific scholarly contributions and the impact of each on the {[*field*] or [*interdisciplinary specialty*] [*he or she*] works in, as well as on the wider field)}. Please give your appraisal of the quality and potential of [*his or her*] overall scholarship. Please explain whether [*he or she*] is considered a leader in this area and how [*he or she*] ranks nationally among a named cohort of colleagues working in the same area; {*In the case of promotion to full professor, the following item should be added: whether* [*title and last name*] *has published substantial excellent scholarship since* [*his/her*] *promotion to the rank of associate professor.*}
2. Based on your knowledge of [*title and last name*]'s scholarship (and assuming teaching and service expectations have been met) does [*his or her*] work meet the standards applied in your institution for a similar position [*in tenure case, add: and the award of tenure*]. If your answer is less than fully positive, please explain, as your explanation will be of significant value to us in assessing [*his or her*] work in terms of national standards.
3. (a) Describe the context in which you know [*title and last name*]. (b) Provide any information you may have on [*his or her*] teaching ability. (c) Please add any other information you believe would assist us in our evaluation of [*title and last name*]'s academic accomplishments, including [*his or her*] service to organizations outside the university. (d) We would also appreciate it if you include a short biographical sketch of yourself with your letter.

We highly value your candid judgment and analysis of the issues; letters of recommendation or advocacy will not be useful. We appreciate your cooperation in this important task. Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It is intended to be read only by the school and University promotion committees.

Thank you.

University of Southern California
CHECKLIST FOR DOSSIER PREPARATION

For University Guidelines and Forms: <http://www.usc.edu/policies>

A.	<i>Recommendation for Appointment Form or Recommendation for Promotion Form</i> <input type="checkbox"/> [Complete the appropriate form online, print it out and attach.]
B.	<i>Pre-Recruitment and Post-Recruitment Affirmative Action Forms</i> [required only for initial appointment] <input type="checkbox"/>
I.	<i>Administrative and Faculty Assessments</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Dean.</i> Independent assessment and recommendation with a candid explanation of reasons. Do not repeat information already in the dossier. For appointments, explain pro-active outreach.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Note whether the dean approved in advance the list of referees as adequate for UCAPT consideration.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>School Committee.</i> Report of the school faculty committee that advises the dean.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>For Interdisciplinary Candidates:</i> Is assessment by appropriate other USC program included?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Department Chair.</i> Independent assessment with explanation of department needs and strategic goals. Do not repeat information already in the dossier.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Department Faculty.</i> Report of screening or other committee representing department faculty.
II. <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Curriculum Vitae.</i> Include a bibliography of publications or list of creative works and a record of research funding (show P.I. and amount of direct support controlled by candidate.) Articles in refereed journals should be separate from other publications and from non- publications such as invited lectures and seminars.
III. <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Personal Statement.</i> Candidate may include approaches to teaching, research, and service, together with proposals for future work. Often, two or three pages will suffice.
IV. <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Teaching Record.</i> Please place supporting details in Section VII, the appendix.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Memo comparing candidate's teaching quality to department and school norms.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Summary of evidence concerning the candidate's record of mentoring, courses taught, curriculum development activities, and other student interactions.
V. <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Service Record.</i> 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.
VI. <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Referee Letters.</i> Preface each letter with short bio (not full CV or directory entry.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Explain choice of any referees not recognized as top scholars at major universities.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Place first minimum of <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), followed by letters not meeting all those criteria. Total should be at least <u>ten</u> .
<input type="checkbox"/>	Does list include (as appropriate) referees from the broader discipline, and inter-disciplinary referees, including those recommended by appropriate other USC program(s)?
VII. <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship or Professional Performance, and Teaching.</i> Include books and <u>selected</u> reprints, accepted manuscripts, critical reviews, 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.)

University of Southern California

**GUIDELINES OF THE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE
2005
SENIOR EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS**

Please also see the guidelines on Procedures and Dossiers.

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 through the UCAPT process if they are at the associate professor or professor rank, or are with 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.

Timing

Appointment dossiers should be submitted to UCAPT as early as possible to allow due consideration. The school 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 explain to the Provost personally 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.

Dossiers must be submitted for the Provost's approval before a firm offer letter is issued.

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 usual 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 followed promptly 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. Visiting titles should not be used, however, 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.

Contents of the Dossier

- I. 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.
- II. Curriculum Vitae. CV, bibliography, and record of financial support are required as for promotions.
- III. Personal Statement. This may or may not be available.
- IV. 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.
- V. Service. Sufficient information may be available in the CV or from the public record.

- VI. Referees' Letters of Evaluation. If there is good reason to do so, emails or summaries of conversations may be used instead of hard copies. Contact the Provost's office on whether it is appropriate to do so. 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.

If fewer than ten referees' letters are submitted, it would then be all the more important to have at least 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.

Deans may make a request personally to the Provost if there is need to relax further our usual processes on the grounds that a senior lateral appointment is extraordinarily distinguished.

- VII. 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.

Checklist for Dossier Preparation

See the Dossier Checklist in the Guidelines on Dossier.

ALTERNATIVE SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER

Dear Professor [name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the Department of [dept name] in a frank evaluation of the works of [faculty member's title and full name] who is being considered for [a senior full professor appointment] [appointment to the NAMED CHAIR OR PROFESSORSHIP] with tenure. Please let me know as soon as possible by email at [email address] whether you are able to assist us by reviewing the attached documentation for [title and last name] and submitting a letter by [date].

[Where "scholarship" is mentioned, in appropriate cases add "and performance", "production", "design", or "exhibition," as relevant.]

We have enclosed a copy of [title and last name]'s curriculum vitae. If you agree to provide the letter, please address the following issues:

1. Please give your appraisal of the quality of [title and last name]'s overall scholarship, specific scholarly contributions, and impact on the field, including a discussion whether [title and last name] is expected to maintain such scholarly achievement.
2. Based on your knowledge of [title and last name]'s scholarship (and assuming teaching and service expectations have been met) does [his or her] work meet the standards applied in your institution for a similar position.
3. (a) Describe the context in which you know [title and last name]. (b) Provide any information you may have on [his or her] teaching ability. (c) Please add any other information you believe would assist us in our evaluation of [title and last name]'s academic accomplishments, including [his or her] service to organizations outside the university. (d) We would also appreciate it if you include a short biographical sketch of yourself with your letter.

We highly value your candid judgment and analysis of the issues; letters of recommendation or advocacy will not be useful. We appreciate your cooperation in this important task. Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It is intended to be read only by school and University promotion committees.

Thank you.