

University Committee on  
Appointments, Promotions,  
and Tenure

UCAPT MANUAL  
2022



# Table of Contents

<b>1. Standards and Evaluation</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Expectations and Standards for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure .....	3
1.1.1 Candidates for Tenure .....	4
1.1.2 Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor .....	4
1.2 Time Period.....	5
1.3 How UCAPT Assesses Research Quality and Impact .....	5
1.3.1 Overview .....	5
1.3.2 Discipline-specific metrics .....	5
1.3.3 Quantity and Venue of Publications .....	6
1.3.4 Citations .....	6
1.3.5 Artistic and Creative Work .....	6
1.3.6 Honors and Awards .....	7
1.3.7 Conferences, Patents, and Other Forms of Scholarship.....	7
1.3.8 Impact on Practice and Society.....	7
1.3.9 Grants and Fellowships.....	8
1.3.10 Peer Reviews .....	8
1.3.11 Editorial Positions and Leadership in Professional Societies.....	8
1.3.12 Digital Scholarship .....	9
1.3.13 Explanatory Information in the Dossier .....	9
1.3.14 Unfavorable Information.....	10
1.4 Assessing Research Independence .....	10
1.5 Assessing Research Trajectory .....	11
1.6 Assessing Teaching and Mentoring.....	11
1.7 Assessing Service.....	11
1.8 Interdisciplinary Work.....	12
1.8.1 Candidates with Joint Appointments .....	12
1.8.2 Interdisciplinary Candidates without Joint Appointments .....	12
1.8.3 Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (Department and School Level).....	13
1.8.4 Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (UCAPT) .....	13
1.8.5 Mentoring Interdisciplinary Faculty Members .....	13
1.9 International Scholarship and Teaching.....	13
<b>2. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Process</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 Overview of Process.....	14
2.2 UCAPT .....	15
2.3 Deadlines for Dossiers .....	16
2.4 Misconduct Charges .....	17
2.5 Confidentiality.....	17
2.6 Policy and Communication .....	18
2.7 Reconsideration of a Tenure Dossier .....	20
2.8 Interference and Procedural Irregularities.....	21
2.9 Equal Opportunity.....	22
2.10 RTPC Faculty .....	22
<b>3. Information for Tenure-Track Assistant Professors</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Standards for Tenure.....	23
3.2 Timeline for Tenure.....	23
3.3 Pre-Tenure Reviews.....	23
3.4 Year 5 or 6 Review.....	23
3.5 Revising the Tenure Decision Date .....	23
3.6 Early Tenure Review .....	24
<b>4. Information for Full Professor Candidates and Senior Lateral Appointments</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 Standards for Promotion to Full Professor .....	26

4.2	Timeline for Promotion to Full Professor.....	26
4.3	Contents of the Dossier for Full Professor .....	26
4.4	Resubmission of a Dossier After a Negative Decision.....	26
4.5	Information for Senior Lateral Appointments .....	26
4.5.1	Timing and the UCAPT Process .....	26
4.5.2	Contents of the Dossier.....	27
4.5.3	Internal Lateral Appointments .....	27
<b>5.</b>	<b>Information for Special RTPC Designations</b> .....	<b>29</b>
5.1	Clinical Scholar .....	29
5.2	Teaching Professor with Distinction .....	29
<b>6.</b>	<b>Information for Librarians and RTPC Faculty</b> .....	<b>33</b>
6.1	Information for Librarian Promotions and Appointments.....	33
6.2	Information on RTPC Promotions.....	33
<b>7.</b>	<b>The Dossier</b> .....	<b>34</b>
7.1	Dossier Overview.....	34
7.1.1	Responsibilities .....	34
7.1.2	Overview .....	35
7.1.3	The Importance of Candor.....	35
7.1.4	Documenting the Process Fully.....	35
7.1.5	The Departmental Committee Report and Chair’s Memo.....	36
7.1.6	The School Committee Report.....	37
7.1.7	The Dean’s Memo.....	37
7.2	Quantitative Data (Section I-B) .....	37
7.3	Curriculum Vitae (Section II).....	39
7.4	Personal Statement (Section III).....	41
7.4.1	COVID-19 Impact.....	41
7.5	Teaching Record (Section IV).....	41
7.5.1	Teaching Memo.....	41
7.5.2	Teaching Statement.....	42
7.5.3	Teaching Record and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness .....	42
7.6	Service Record (Section V).....	42
7.7	External Reviewer Letters (Section VI).....	42
7.7.1	Template Letter .....	42
7.7.2	Selection of Reviewers.....	43
7.7.3	Method of Contacting Reviewers .....	44
7.7.4	Organization of Reviewer Letter Section of Dossier .....	45
7.7.5	Quoting Reviewers’ Letters .....	46
7.7.6	Unsolicited Letters .....	46
7.8	Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship, Performance, and Teaching (Section VII).....	46
7.8.1	Evidence of Scholarship and Performance (Section VII-A) .....	46
7.8.2	Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (Section VII-B).....	46
<b>8.</b>	<b>Templates for Solicitation Letters for Reviewers.....</b>	<b>49</b>
8.1	Standard Letter .....	49
8.2	Clinical Scholar Candidate .....	50
8.3	Reviewer is a Collaborator.....	51
<b>Appendix</b>		<b>53</b>
	Checklist for Dossier Preparation.....	53
	UCAPT Appointments and Promotions Evaluation Form.....	55

---

# The UCAPT Manual

2022

---

**F**aculty governance, a guiding principle of this University, necessitates that the ultimate recommendation on key personnel decisions is made by faculty committees at the university level.

**Purposes.** These faculty committees seek to ensure that

- candidates for appointments, promotions, and tenure are evaluated fairly,
- standards are consistent across schools and departments,
- the standards are similar to those of peer and aspirational institutions, and the significance and impact of candidates' work are comparable to those of faculty recently promoted at such institutions,
- the quality of each school's faculty progresses over time, thus maintaining the upward trajectory of faculty excellence at the University.

**Committees.** There are three university-level faculty committees on appointments and promotion that serve as the ultimate advisory bodies to the Provost, who retains final authority on behalf of the President.

- The University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (UCAPT) advises the Provost on the grant of tenure, promotion and appointment to tenure-track and tenured Associate Professor and Professor ranks, and the award of the distinctions of Clinical Scholar and Teaching Professor with Distinction.
- The University Committee on Library Appointments, Promotions, and Continuing Appointments advises the Provost on senior librarian ranks.
- The University Committee on Research, Teaching, Practitioner, and Clinical Promotions advises the Provost on promotions within those tracks if a dean disagrees with the recommendation of a faculty committee.

All these groups share this Manual.

**Role of this Manual.** The Faculty Handbook (<https://policy.usc.edu/faculty-handbook/faculty-handbook/>) and this UCAPT Manual are the definitive guidelines of the University's policies and procedures regarding appointments, promotions, and tenure. The Faculty Handbook states the University's fundamental policies and practices. The UCAPT Manual supplements the Faculty Handbook by detailing the appointment, promotion, and tenure criteria and processes.

Candidates for tenure and promotion, and all those who share in decision-making (including committee members, department chairs, and deans) are encouraged to peruse this Manual to understand the criteria UCAPT applies, and the University's process.

The UCAPT Manual serves to demystify the faculty promotion and appointment process. Each edition adds public answers to important questions that have come up since the prior edition. While the details on individual decisions are necessarily confidential, UCAPT strives to make both the process and the criteria as transparent as possible. For additional transparency, the lists of committee members and statistics on decisions are published periodically.

**Outline.**

- Section 1 of this Manual details the University's standards for appointment, promotion, and tenure and the criteria for evaluation of the faculty member's research, teaching, and service.
- Section 2 gives an overview of the appointment, promotion, and tenure review process, and explains when and by whom the dossier is reviewed.
- Sections 3 through 6 provide information relevant to specific tracks or ranks: assistant professors on the tenure track, candidates for full professor and senior lateral appointment candidates, candidates for Clinical Scholar, Teaching Professor with Distinction and similar designations, librarians, and those on research, teaching, practice, and clinical (RTPC) tracks.
- Finally, section 7 explains each of the dossier components, and section 8 includes templates for the external reviewer letters.
- The appendix includes an updated dossier checklist (a succinct reference listing of all the necessary dossier components) and the form UCAPT members use when evaluating dossiers.

# 1. Standards and Evaluation

## 1.1 Expectations and Standards for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The primary factors considered in appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions are excellence and creativity in both scholarly research and teaching, as documented in the dossier, with outstanding performance required in one—almost always research—and strong performance in the other.

The University values scholars who have made important and original contributions, who have had an impact on their field, and whose work shows a clear arc of intellectual and creative development.

Every appointment, promotion, and grant of tenure should meet the national and international standards of the leading institutions, as well as improve the overall stature of the academic unit. The candidate should be viewed as instrumental in advancing the academic needs of their unit.

Each candidate is considered individually. Multiple candidates from the same department or similar disciplines are not compared to each other. USC does not have quotas restricting the number of tenured appointments.

The University welcomes innovative approaches to scholarship and encourages faculty members to stay at the cutting edge of their fields. It recognizes and supports a variety of styles of scholarship, both independent and collaborative.

Expectations for scholarship do not primarily concern quantity, although the University shares with other leading institutions expectations about productivity. Expectations and metrics for productivity vary by field. For example,

- In fields that emphasize book production, candidates should have a book or books published or in press by a university press or press of equivalent standards and reputation (preferably with published reviews).
- In article-producing fields, candidates should have a sufficient mass of articles in high-impact journals.
- In grant-funded fields, candidates should have an independent research program as principal investigator with a sustained record of substantial peer-reviewed external funding from federal agencies.

Schools and departments are expected to submit for Provost approval field-specific metrics (see Section 1.3.2).

### 1.1.1 *Candidates for Tenure*

A candidate for tenure is expected to have produced significant original scholarly contributions (that are explained in the dossier). The candidate should have produced a substantial body of work, given the expectations of the field. The work should have had a significant impact on the field. The arc of scholarship should show promise of continued productivity. Overall, the record of scholarly contributions should be on par with the accomplishments at the tenure stage of the discipline's leading scholars.

A candidate should have a program of scholarship independent from their Ph.D. supervisor or post-doctoral mentor. If the bulk of the candidate's research is done jointly (especially if it is done with senior and more established scholars), the record should provide evidence of the candidate's important original contributions.

The University aims to tenure those individuals who show *promise of becoming* nationally and internationally recognized during their careers. A candidate must be a good teacher and a good university citizen, but it is primarily upon the significance and influence of the candidate's research, as well as their promise of continued productivity that suitability for tenure will be judged.

### 1.1.2 *Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor*

Promotion to full professor is based on achievement rather than promise. The candidate should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment and impact in their field and made substantial contributions beyond those that earned tenure. The post-tenure body of work is examined alongside the pre-tenure body of work to discern the candidate's career trajectory and to evaluate whether they will continue to produce research at a rate and of a quality commensurate with leaders in the field.

The candidate for full professor should have achieved recognition and distinction in their field at a national and international level. The candidate's work should be comparable in significance and impact to the work of newly promoted full professors at leading departments where work of the same type is undertaken.

Candidates for full professor (and tenured faculty members as a group) have special responsibilities for mentoring junior faculty and special responsibilities for leadership in service and governance on the departmental, school, and university levels. They are expected to excel as teachers and mentors of students. In many fields, that includes successful mentoring of Ph.D. students

In some disciplines, leadership in application of research to societal needs may be an important part of the evidence presented.

Recognizing the University's support of interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarship, associate professors (and candidates for full professor) 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. This freedom also allows for more risk-taking and

creativity in scholarly activities. Although such innovative efforts are not required, they are considered a positive as the University seeks to encourage creative research.

## **1.2 Time Period**

UCAPT considers the individual's entire body of work. For candidates already at USC, it looks especially at work completed since the individual was appointed or previously promoted at USC.

In unusual instances, an outstanding new faculty member may be recommended for tenure or promotion during or at the end of their first year. In this case, the original dossier may be resubmitted with clear evidence of continued achievement and collegial activity.

## **1.3 How UCAPT Assesses Research Quality and Impact**

### *1.3.1 Overview*

The most critical factor in appointment, promotion, and tenure cases is the quality and impact of a candidate's work. UCAPT and reviewers at other levels base their assessments of quality and impact on a variety of factors, including direct reading of the work, the quality of publication venues, the quantity of work, the influence shown by citations, the external peer review expressed in scoring and funding decisions by Federal agencies and organizations known to have high standards, and confidential reviews by external scholars.

Supplemental evidence can consist of editorial appointments or leadership in professional societies, awards and honors, and reviews published in scholarly outlets and important popular media.

There is no formula by which these factors are combined, and assessments of quality and impact cannot be reduced to a number, such as number of publications or citations. Reviewers consider the record as a whole, giving weight to different factors as is appropriate to the case.

### *1.3.2 Discipline-specific metrics*

Each school or department is expected to propose school- or department-specific measures and expectations of productivity to be taken into account in appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. These metrics and expectations should match those of leading institutions. To be official, they must be approved by the dean and Provost, and they must not contradict the UCAPT guidelines. They should be made available to candidates and included in the dossier after formal approval from the dean and Provost.



Internal reviewers at all levels, from a candidate's department to UCAPT, base their assessment in part on *direct examination* of the work. For example, in a field where research is typically disseminated through journal articles, internal reviewers read a selection of articles. Most departments and schools utilize a faculty committee to produce a report that summarizes the nature and importance of the candidate's research.

### 1.3.3 *Quantity and Venue of Publications*

**How productivity is considered.** All dossiers should include information on the quantity of work produced by a candidate and the venues where that work is published. The nature of the information provided should be appropriate to the field. For example, in fields where research is commonly published in scholarly journals, the number of articles should be reported. In some fields, it is useful to differentiate publications in leading journals from less-respected journals.

Appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions are not a matter of meeting numeric targets. However, contribution and impact generally benefit from cumulative quantity. The arc of productivity is helpful evidence of future promise. The amount of intellectual output plays a role in tenure and promotion decisions because it is indicative of productivity and stature in the eyes of peer reviewers. If there is less than the usual quantity of work, questions are raised.

**Quality of peer review.** Evidence of editorial peer review is highly salient and publication in a field's most respected venues is an indicator of the quality of work. UCAPT considers the quality and selectivity of journals or publishers in developing a picture of the quality of the intellectual output of a candidate.

**Caveat on time management.** While publications by the candidate in the form of book reviews, encyclopedia and review articles, edited volumes, and chapters in edited volumes may add to the candidate's visibility, they are not regarded by UCAPT as significant evidence of scholarship, and they are usually not the best use of the candidate's energies unless their special significance is explained.

### 1.3.4 *Citations*

In fields where citations are viewed as an indicator of research impact, the dossier should include information on the candidate's citation frequency, and contextual information on citation norms in the field. This would be the case for most social and natural science fields, as well as many humanities fields. In fields where citations indexes (such as the H-index) are believed to be an indicator of impact, that information is also considered.

### 1.3.5 *Artistic and Creative Work*

For candidates in artistic fields, scholarly production often takes the form of creative work. The dossier should demonstrate that the candidate's creative work is widely perceived among their peers as outstanding. In artistic fields, the candidate's creative products should gain recognition equivalent to the expectations of scholarship in other disciplines.

Additionally, the dossier should detail discipline-specific standards, practices, and measures of impact. Artistic exhibitions and cinema festivals, for instance, typically have their own

forms of peer review; departments should supply detailed information about the peer review process.

The dossier should also provide information on the quality, selectivity, and stature of a candidate's performance venues, where appropriate.

The candidate's reputation in the field can be documented through invited talks, shows, performances, and the like, as appropriate for the discipline.

Overall, the evidence should show that the candidate's artistic output is comparable in quality, originality, and stature to those recently granted tenure in similar genres in the top departments in the nation.

#### *1.3.6 Honors and Awards*

Most fields honor individuals or specific research contributions. Examples include best paper prizes for journals or conferences, and emerging scholar awards or career awards from professional societies or Federal agencies. Such information can be an important factor in assessing quality and impact of research. In order to put honors and awards in context, the dossier should explain the importance of a candidate's awards, how exclusive they are, how the winners are selected, and so forth.

#### *1.3.7 Conferences, Patents, and Other Forms of Scholarship*

The significance of conferences varies from discipline to discipline. Presenting papers at conferences can be useful in publicizing emerging research, establishing one's reputation in the field, and other worthwhile goals. Similarly, invitations to present talks to faculty groups at other universities indicate interest in the candidate's research by outside experts. Computer science is recognized as a special case where many scholars regard published conference papers from top conferences as equivalent to journal articles, but most fields do not rate them as highly.

While patents cannot replace peer-reviewed publications in a candidate's dossier, they are a sign of impact and productivity and will be considered accordingly.

#### *1.3.8 Impact on Practice and Society*

In some disciplines, evaluation of the impact of publications and scholarly work can include not just the impact on other scholars, but also the impact on the practice of the profession, public policy, or the workings of institutions. Sometimes the candidate's work results in new organizations or new products and services. These activities are not a substitute for peer-reviewed publications, but they can be evaluated as additional measures of the impact of the candidate's scholarly contribution.

That a candidate's research was featured or widely discussed in popular media may be documented in the dossier, but in itself may not be useful evidence of impact.

### *1.3.9 Grants and Fellowships*

For faculty members in grant-funded fields, information on the type and amount of external funding can be a useful indicator of the quality of work. The number of dollars awarded in grants and the type of indirect cost recovery are not themselves significant. Rather, it is the rigor of the peer review of the funding sources that is significant. The dossier should explain if foundations and other funding sources have peer review processes of comparable rigor to federal agencies.

It would be a significant sign of merit if a federal grant proposal received an excellent score, even if it was not funded because the agency appropriation was limited. On the other hand, even a very large grant that is awarded without equivalent peer review provides less useful information.

In many fields, of course, grants are not relevant. However, in some areas grants are necessary to provide the resources needed to conduct research. In medical fields, for example, it is usual to consider such questions as: Has the candidate received an R01 (or equivalent grant) as P.I.? Has the candidate had consistent federal funding?

Grant expectations vary by field; departments and schools can indicate the typical expectations by field through the dossier cohort analysis and can explain to UCAPT its significance.

### *1.3.10 Peer Reviews*

All dossiers contain confidential letters from external reviewers who are leading experts in the candidate's field. See Section 7.8 for information on how those reviewers are selected. These letters are an important factor in assessing the quality and impact of a candidate's work, as well as the candidate's external reputation.

For books and creative work, published reviews in leading outlets can provide useful information on the quality and impact of work. The fact of being reviewed in a leading outlet itself can be an indicator of quality or importance, and the lack of reviews in leading outlets may suggest the work is of limited importance. Most important is the substance of the review. If books appear late in the probationary period, there may not be enough time to obtain reviews.

### *1.3.11 Editorial Positions and Leadership in Professional Societies*

In many fields, an appointment to serve as editor or on the editorial board of a leading journal indicates that a candidate is viewed by their peers as a leading expert. Such information plays a role in assessment of quality and impact of work, and of a candidate's reputation in the field. Assessments based on such information take into account the prestige of the journal, the selection process, and the specific editorial role.

Similarly, appointment or election to a leadership position in a professional society may also be an indication that a candidate is viewed by peers as a leading expert, and such information can play a role in assessing quality and impact of a candidate's research to the extent that the appointment is based on research accomplishments.

### 1.3.12 *Digital Scholarship*

“Digital scholarship” refers to all forms of research, analysis, and publication that are conducted in digital formats and distributed via the Internet or by similar means. No single definition of digital scholarship can encompass all forms of activity. Digital scholarship can range from new ways to publish otherwise traditional texts to “born digital” multimedia and interactive works that are impossible to publish in print form. The term may also cover digital databases or repositories; platforms enabling the conduct or publication of research; the infrastructure enabling access, searching, analysis, and publication; cloud computing; meta-analyses across multiple databases; distance collaborations; and many other forms of scholarship that have been made possible by digital technologies.

UCAPT welcomes innovative approaches to scholarship and strives to evaluate digital scholarship through evidence of contribution, impact, peer review, and creativity.

It reviews “born digital” scholarship by viewing the work in its context and taking into account the contribution of the work’s medium or form.

### 1.3.13 *Explanatory Information in the Dossier*

Mentors and those responsible for assembling dossiers should ensure that a faculty member’s creativity and impact within the field are demonstrated within the context of the field. For venues where the peer review process and impact factor are not evident, 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 reviewers or editors, and any other measures of the influence of the venue. For example, if a digital publication is not itself peer-reviewed, its quality might be evaluated, for instance, through any peer-reviewed funding it receives or its connections with significant publications in peer-reviewed scholarly journals. Other evidence of the work’s impact might be its inclusion in university syllabi, electronic archives, and recognition networks.

When the significance and impact of items in the candidate’s dossier may not be immediately apparent to UCAPT, the department should supply additional information about these items. For instance, if a candidate’s creative work is selected for a certain prize or festival, the department should supply information as to the ratio of submissions to acceptances, the stature of the judges, and the stature of other winners or participants. If a candidate publishes in non-peer-reviewed venues, the department should detail the ratio of submissions to acceptances, the stature of the editors or reviewers, the stature of other authors in that venue, and measures of the venue’s impact.

Discipline-specific standards and practices should also be explained. The significance of the sequence of authors in collaborative publications, for example, varies by field. In many fields, it is assumed that first and senior authors should receive the most credit; unless specific information is provided, there may be an assumption that other authors have not made major contributions. For candidates who engage in collaborative research, departments should explain the field’s practice for the sequence of authors.

### 1.3.14 *Unfavorable Information*

Those preparing the dossier should avoid any temptation to suppress unfavorable information out of concern that UCAPT will not understand it or give it too much weight. Instead, the information should be presented candidly along with an explanation. Candor gives assurance to UCAPT that previous levels have made a balanced evaluation.

## 1.4 **Assessing Research Independence**

### 1.4.1 *Relation to Ph.D. and Post-doc work*

Candidates for appointment, promotion, and tenure must demonstrate a program of scholarship independent of their Ph.D. supervisors or post-doctoral mentors, and their record must provide evidence of original intellectual contributions to collaborative projects.

In some fields, the new faculty member's early publications will be outgrowths of the Ph.D. dissertation. In such cases, there should be publications that show the candidate's further intellectual growth.

### 1.4.2 *Grants*

It is usually assumed on grants that the intellectual leadership is provided by the principal investigator (or, when explicitly recognized by the granting agency, equal co-principal investigators). The investigator responsible for a separately scored portion of a large grant is typically credited with that portion.

### 1.4.3 *Collaborations*

The University supports both independent and collaborative work. In some fields collaborative work is the norm. In evaluating a dossier with collaborative work, UCAPT looks to distinguish the intellectual contributions of the candidate.

If the preponderance of a candidate's research is collaborative, one way that the nature of the candidate's independent contribution is assessed is through confidential letters from collaborators. The candidate's personal statement can also play an important role in identifying the nature of the candidate's independent contribution to joint work. Candidates are encouraged to provide this information in the personal statement if some of their work is collaborative.

For collaborative work in multidisciplinary teams, a candidate should demonstrate evidence of their unique and original contribution to multidisciplinary teams. The National Institutes of Health criteria state that participants in team research can demonstrate this evidence through "independent publication of methodological or seminal contributions to the candidate's specific research area; where possible, explicit in-print acknowledgment 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...”

A candidate who undertakes collaborative research should make clear in the personal statement and on the CV what their specific contributions were to the collaborative work.

## 1.5 Assessing Research Trajectory

Another factor in appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions is the trajectory of a candidate’s research. The university seeks to appoint, promote, and tenure scholars who will continue to produce high quality and impactful research and maintain a strong professional reputation in the future.

There is no required profile for work over time, but large gaps in the production of research may raise questions. A slowing of research activity over time, or a sudden burst just before the tenure decision, may also raise questions. A candidate should use the personal statement to anticipate and address any questions that might arise about their research trajectory.

## 1.6 Assessing Teaching and Mentoring

All candidates for appointment, promotion, and tenure are expected to be **strong** teachers. The candidate’s teaching must demonstrate commitment to students, and in some fields successful mentoring of doctoral candidates is expected.

Demonstrated excellence and creativity in teaching is important for tenure candidates. However, devotion to teaching and mentoring should not be allowed to create imbalance with the time necessary to establish a profile of scholarship, publications, and research funding, as discussed above.

Candidates for the full professor rank must provide evidence of excellence and creativity in teaching and mentoring.

Teaching quality is assessed based on a number of factors. The best evidence comes from peer assessments, demonstration of students’ learning achievements, utilization of exemplary teaching methods, and inspection of syllabi and class materials. Other evidence may include when appropriate, teaching awards and honors, and the candidate’s personal statement. Student ratings and comments in end-of-course evaluations may be considered as indicators of student engagement, but the well-known limitations of those evaluations should be remembered.

As with other assessments, no single factor is determinative, and assessment involves a thoughtful weighing of multiple factors as appropriate to the case.

## 1.7 Assessing Service

### 1.7.1 *Assistant Professors*

For tenure candidates, a limited amount of internal service is desirable to demonstrate the candidate’s ability to contribute to the collective academic enterprise. And in some fields,

certain types of external service are a sign of the candidate's scholarly reputation in the discipline.

**Caveat on time management.** However, for tenure candidates neither internal nor external service should be allowed to take away the time necessary to establish a profile of scholarship, publications, and research funding, as discussed above.

### 1.7.2 *Associate Professors*

Candidates for the full professor rank are expected to provide evidence that they (like all tenured faculty) are sharing in the responsibility for managing the academic enterprise.

## 1.8 **Interdisciplinary Work**

### 1.8.1 *Candidates with Joint Appointments*

The University welcomes work that spans traditional disciplines. For candidates with *substantive* joint appointments (defined for these purposes as greater than “zero percent”), UCAPT will assume the candidate's work is interdisciplinary. However, assistant professors on the tenure track are discouraged from having joint appointments of more than zero percent, because the evaluation at the first stage will be in a single home department.

For candidates with substantive joint appointments it is desirable that:

- the departmental and/or school committees should include one or more appropriate members from the secondary department or school.
- advice should be sought from these colleagues on the selection of reviewers from other disciplines, as well as reviewers who share the candidate's interdisciplinary focus, and that in addition,
- one or more appropriate senior members in the other discipline be asked to provide letters of evaluation concerning the candidate's interdisciplinary work.

All evaluations from other departments or schools should be included in the dossier before its final consideration by the home department, so that the home department may take them into consideration.

The secondary department or school does not vote on the tenure, promotion, or appointment dossier, and the candidate does not have to satisfy the requirements of two departments or schools.

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

### 1.8.2 *Interdisciplinary Candidates without Joint Appointments*

If a candidate without a substantive joint appointment wishes to be identified as interdisciplinary, either the individual or the home department may send a memo to the dean requesting that the candidate be identified as interdisciplinary in the tenure, promotion, or appointment process. This memo should be sent before the beginning of preparation of the dossier. If the dean agrees, he or she should alert the Provost's Office that the dossier is

interdisciplinary.

### *1.8.3 Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (Department and School Level)*

Department and school committees evaluating interdisciplinary work should strive to value appropriately publications outside the home discipline and its usual journals. In evaluating the candidate's teaching and mentoring activities, they should consider interdisciplinary graduate teaching and co-teaching, as well as advising or co-advising graduate students outside the home department. The committees should make special effort to understand other disciplines' customs on co-authorship, sequence of authors, and the use of conferences, journals, or monographs as premiere outlets.

### *1.8.4 Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (UCAPT)*

UCAPT will use appropriate flexibility in reviewing interdisciplinary dossiers, assigning a dossier to a disciplinary panel, a mixed panel, or an ad hoc committee, or using ad hoc members, as needed.

### *1.8.5 Mentoring Interdisciplinary Faculty Members*

It is desirable that an interdisciplinary candidate have mentors in all appropriate units, who work together to give the candidate a consistent message about research and publications, as well as guidance on how to avoid excessive burdens of teaching and service. For candidates with appointments in more than one unit, a Joint Appointment Checklist must be approved so that workload expectations are clear.

It is also 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 appointment, or early in the candidate's probationary period.

The mid-probationary period review committee for interdisciplinary candidates should include a member from the other discipline(s) (see section 3.3).

If interdisciplinary work requires a substantially longer start-up time than research in a single discipline, a request may be made to the Provost, early in the probationary period, to consider an extension of that period (see section 3.5). Such a request should include the recommendations of each of the relevant department chairs and deans.

## **1.9 International Scholarship and Teaching**

Department and school committees should consider faculty members' 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, especially if the work is in a language other than English. Nevertheless, such efforts should be evaluated and accorded reasonable weight in promotion, tenure, and appointment decisions.



## 2. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Process

### 2.1 Overview of Process

#### 2.1.1 *Path Example*

Appointment, promotion, and tenure processes involve multiple levels of review. An example of a path for a tenure case in a departmentalized school is:

- First stage: review and vote on a recommendation by the tenured faculty in the candidate's department (after a report from a department faculty reviewing committee); schools without departments employ a school-level faculty committee for the first recommendation.
- Second stage: review and recommendation by the dean (after a report from a school level faculty reviewing committee), and
- University stage: final decision by the Provost (advised by a recommendation from a UCAPT panel). The Provost issues the final decision letter.

While details of the internal process may differ from one school to another, each process must be consistent with Faculty Handbook 4-H(2). Involvement of reviewers at multiple levels helps ensure that a dossier is thoroughly reviewed and that decisions are based on careful consideration of all the evidence.

#### 2.1.2 *"Two no rule"*

If a candidate receives *either* a favorable vote by a majority of the faculty eligible to vote at the stage of the first recommendation (some academic units require in addition a supermajority of those voting) *or* receives a favorable recommendation by the dean at the second stage, the case is forwarded to the university level faculty committee for an ultimate recommendation to the Provost.

If a candidate does not receive a favorable faculty vote at the first stage *and* does not receive a favorable recommendation from the dean (i.e., two "no"s), then promotion or tenure is denied. **The case documentation is sent to the Provost office; for tenure cases forwarded, the Provost then issues the final decision letter.**

If a candidate retracts his or her case from consideration for promotion or tenure, the dossier is not forwarded to the university-level faculty committee and the Provost.

#### 2.1.3 *Review committees*

To align with the core values of faculty governance and peer review, review committees should be composed of tenured faculty for tenured and tenure-track faculty reviews, and RTPC faculty for RTPC faculty reviews. For special RTPC designations like Clinical Scholars or Teaching Professors with Distinction, review committees can have a mixture of both tenured and RTPC faculty. Committee members should be at or above the rank sought for the candidate's promotion or appointment. Committees can include faculty with appropriate expertise from other schools.

#### 2.1.4 *Authority*

The authority to make faculty appointments is vested by the University Bylaws in the President. Unlike the situation in many other universities, the USC trustees have disclaimed any role in these academic decisions. The President has delegated authority to the Provost to grant tenure, as well as to promote to or appoint associate professors and professors with tenure or on the tenure-track. Deans have been delegated authority to make other appointments and promotions. The President, Provost and deans are advised by faculty committees as explained in the Faculty Handbook and this Manual.

#### 2.1.5 *Recusal*

**Committee members.** Faculty members who serve on a school-level or university-level review committee do not participate and vote within the committee on cases involving candidates in their own department (or another department where they have voting rights). They do participate and vote at the departmental level. The dean, Provost, and President do not vote within their departments on appointment, promotion, and tenure cases.

**Collaborators.** Faculty who have co-authored publications or collaborated on grants with a candidate may not serve on a promotion committee that would provide an evaluation of the candidate's research because that would entail a review of the faculty member's own work. If the collaborative work comprises a *material* part of the candidate's record, the collaborating faculty member will not attend the departmental faculty discussion in order to avoid influencing the discussion of the work by other faculty. (If the materiality of the collaborative work is in question, the dean will ask the designated Vice Provost\* to decide whether the collaborating faculty member should be exempt from this paragraph.) The collaborating faculty member may provide input into the deliberations by a memo included in the dossier, including explanation of the candidate's contribution to the joint work. Because external reviewers may not be candid in evaluating the candidate's work if their comments will be read by the collaborating faculty member, the collaborating faculty member may not read the external letters and any portions of other documents that discuss the external assessments of the collaborative work. The collaborating faculty may vote in writing at the department level, after reviewing the other portions of the dossier.

## 2.2 UCAPT

### 2.2.1 *Membership*

UCAPT members are designated by the Provost after consultation with the Academic Senate leadership, on the basis of a record of distinguished scholarly or creative achievement and experience in evaluating dossiers, with consideration for the intellectual, disciplinary, and demographic diversity of the committee. UCAPT generally consists of at least six panels of five to eight faculty members in related disciplinary areas. UCAPT members are a rotating group of outstanding scholars, educators, and creative artists, diverse by field, intellectual approach, ethnicity, and gender. UCAPT membership has included colleagues whose

---

\* As of 2022, the Executive Vice Provost fulfills the role of Vice Provost mentioned in this Manual, while in other years the relevant person may be designated Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs or Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs

achievements have been recognized by the Nobel Prize, University Professorships, Distinguished Professorships, National Academy memberships, and other marks of distinction. UCAPT also uses ad hoc members as needed to evaluate dossiers properly. At the end of each academic year, the University makes public the names of UCAPT members from the past two years.

### *2.2.2 Evaluations*

UCAPT advises the Provost and President. For each dossier, written evaluations by individual UCAPT panel members, and notes on the panel's deliberation and recommendations, are reviewed by the Provost and are available to the President. (See the appendix for a sample evaluation sheet.) The Provost gives careful consideration to all tenure and promotion cases and to the recommendations of the UCAPT panel. The final decision is made only by the Provost on behalf of the President.

In addition to reviewing tenure dossiers, promotions for tenured faculty, and appointments at the associate professor or professor level for tenured or tenure-track faculty, UCAPT also reviews candidates for Clinical Scholar, Teaching Professors with Distinction, and similar designations.

### *2.2.3 UCAPT questions*

When UCAPT panel members raise questions about the completeness of a dossier at a panel meeting or in advance, the Provost's Office will contact the dean to provide an opportunity to submit supplemental material.

## **2.3 Deadlines for Dossiers**

In order to allow UCAPT and the Provost sufficient time to carefully consider each case, dossiers must be received by the Provost's Office no later than the following dates:

### **UCAPT Deadlines**

- October 15: Promotion dossiers not involving tenure
- February 1: Tenure dossiers
- March 15: Senior lateral appointment dossiers (associate or full professor)

Dossiers not received by these deadlines risk substantial delay at UCAPT. The dean should take steps to see that departments and school committees observe a schedule such that the complete dossier is submitted in a timely manner.

As an extremely late dossier submission to UCAPT risks being interpreted negatively, it is important that dossiers submitted with significant delay contain a clear explanation of the origins of the delay. A promotion dossier not involving tenure submitted long after the

October 15 deadline may be returned for resubmission the following year.

It is not permissible for a department or school to purposefully submit a tenure dossier after the Tenure Decision Date.

### *2.3.1 Early decisions*

If there is a need for an early decision, the dean should let the Provost's Office know as much in advance as possible. The department or school should not prolong consideration and then request immediate UCAPT action. 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 the reason for the urgency, why the dossier could not be submitted earlier, why the Provost should make an exception to the usual processes, and the date by which a decision is requested.

## **2.4 Misconduct Charges**

### *2.4.1 Charges under investigation*

If charges of violation of University policy are pending or arise while the tenure, appointment, or promotion process is underway, the charges will not be investigated or considered by university-level committees or department or school committees. Instead, the charges will be considered under the usual processes, such as, but not limited to, those indicated in chapter 6 of the Faculty Handbook or the policy on research and scholarship misconduct (<https://policy.usc.edu/research-and-scholarship-misconduct/>).

If the charge is sufficiently serious that, if it were sustained, it would affect the personnel decision, the Provost may delay the personnel decision until the charges are resolved, extending the tenure decision date if needed.

### *2.4.2 After a finding*

Upon a finding that a University policy was violated, the Committee on Professional Responsibility (CoPR) may determine sanctions including termination, postponement of consideration for promotion or tenure, or modification of the length of a terminal appointment.

With or without such a CoPR action, if charges are sustained, the findings will be provided to the Provost along with the university-level committee's recommendation on the merits of the dossier and the Provost will decide how to weigh the findings in the personnel decision. The Provost may also decide on a modification of the length of the terminal appointment if the tenure decision is negative.

## **2.5 Confidentiality**

### *2.5.1 Protecting the dossier*

Departments and schools must take all necessary steps to maintain confidentiality, including during the physical preparation of the dossier and dossier storage. Broad electronic distribution of the dossier must be avoided; instead, password-protected web sites can be

used. All paper copies of the dossier should be shredded after use, while being sure to maintain in the electronic files the official copy of the record.

### 2.5.2 *Respecting confidentiality*

Internal and external evaluations in the dossier are treated as confidential to the full extent the law permits. This is important to encourage frank and candid evaluations.

Only the voting faculty, the dean's office, and the provost's office, may read the dossier. This includes, for example, reviewer letters, reports prepared by committee members, and other ratings, reports, and records obtained in connection with the process of appointment or promotion to a higher rank or to tenured or continuing appointment status.

The candidate's CV and publications are publicly available documents.

All USC faculty members or administrative staff participating in the dossier preparation process at any stage must respect its confidentiality and not reveal votes, the names or views of reviewers, the contents or tenor of discussions, and the contents of the dossier to anyone. Intentional or continuing breaches of confidentiality will be considered serious misconduct and may be the basis of disciplinary actions.

## 2.6 **Policy and Communication**

### 2.6.1 *Adherence to Policy*

All those participating in the review must take care to follow the policies stated in the Faculty Handbook and this Manual.

**Variations.** The Vice Provost may approve requests to extend deadlines, change the language of template letters, limit the number of expected letters for candidates of great distinction or authorize use of emails in lieu of hard copy letters in appropriate cases, or abridge the process when considering an RTPC promotion or the appointment of someone previously tenured at USC.

**Waivers.** The Provost, and only the Provost, may authorize other exceptions or waivers to this Manual or other policies, and before doing so in material matters will consult with the chair of UCAPT.

### 2.6.2 *Changes in Editions of UCAPT Documents*

**Applicable guidelines.** The candidate may write to the dean before the start of the mid-probationary period review process, or before the start of preparation of the tenure dossier, requesting that the review be conducted under the UCAPT Manual guidelines in force when the individual was first appointed. The candidate should specify the relevant difference between the current and former guidelines.

The chair's memo should mention which edition of the UCAPT Manual pertains to the case

if it is not the current one and specify the relevant difference.

**New editions.** New editions of the UCAPT Manual are issued by the Provost after advice of a committee of UCAPT.

### *2.6.3 Predictions and Advice*

Neither predictions, evaluations, nor advice from any USC official except the Provost is definitive.

Even if colleagues or administrators give unalloyed praise in annual reviews, mid-probationary reviews, or mentoring, candidates for tenure and promotion should nevertheless be sure to seek constructive criticism, and to remember that external reviewers and UCAPT will eventually evaluate dossiers by national standards, and that the final decision is made by the Provost.

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

### *2.6.4 Communicating Decisions*

The Provost informs the dean of the decision. The dean or the dean's representative should promptly inform the candidate in a confidential manner, followed by a memo. In case of a negative decision, the dean can convey to the candidate the summary reasons stated in the Provost's memo.

Whether candidates have been successful or unsuccessful, the dean or dean's representative should pass on constructive advice, gathered from the school's review of the dossier, to improve the candidate's later work. While preserving the confidentiality of external reviewers and comments, this advice can summarize perceptive criticisms. Knowledge of these judgments might help an individual produce better scholarship, research, or collaborative work in the future.

In addition, UCAPT may provide constructive advice and feedback about either a successful or an unsuccessful candidate's dossier to the dean. In this case, the dean should convey UCAPT's advice to either the candidate or the department chair. If the advice from the dean or UCAPT is conveyed in writing, the memo should be approved by the Vice Provost prior to sending.

### *2.6.5 Providing Fuller Explanation of a Negative Decision*

An unsuccessful candidate may seek additional information beyond the summary reasons stated in the Provost's memo. Upon request, candidates who received a negative decision will be provided in writing a fuller explanation of the reasons for the negative decision. This explanation should be prepared by the dean together with the Vice Provost so as to reflect the analysis at both UCAPT and earlier levels. This fuller written explanation should be provided to the candidate by the dean or dean's representative in a face-to-face meeting. The confidential advice to the Provost from the department chair and dean and the names and individual views of reviewers will not be disclosed.

## 2.7 Reconsideration of a Tenure Dossier

When tenure has been denied by the Provost on behalf of the President (or was denied because both the faculty and dean were negative at the first and second stages of decision) that is a final action, except as provided in this section.

### 2.7.1 *Extraordinary and unexpected new evidence*

In rare circumstances, where *extraordinary and unexpected* new evidence emerges in the months following a tenure decision, reconsideration of the decision may be requested. A reconsideration is not a re-adjudication of the judgment on the original evidence, but rather provides a process by which important new evidence can be considered.

The new evidence must be unexpected because tenure decisions are made taking into account normal expectations of a candidate's career evolution. For example, if a candidate has a paper under advanced review at a journal with favorable signals from the editor, the likelihood of eventual publication of that paper is taken into account at the time of the tenure decision, so its subsequent publication is not unexpected and therefore not grounds for reconsideration.

### 2.7.2 *Requesting reconsideration*

Either the individual or dean may request reconsideration. If a candidate wishes to be reconsidered, they must submit a letter to the Vice Provost by September 15 of the terminal year, making this request and stating the evidence to be used as grounds for a reconsideration. The Vice Provost will then meet with the candidate to discuss the original dossier, the new evidence, and the timeline for submitting new materials to their dean.

### 2.7.3 *Role of the dean*

Requests for reconsideration based on new evidence will always be considered first by the dean, who will include in the supplement of the dossier a recommendation as to whether the dean believes extraordinary circumstances exist and tenure should be granted. The Provost will consider requests whether or not there is an affirmative recommendation by the dean. The updated dossier may be submitted as soon as it is ready and must be submitted by the dean to the Provost's Office by February 1 of the terminal year (unless advance permission is obtained for a later submission).

### 2.7.4 *Supplement to the dossier*

A supplement to the original dossier will be prepared under direction of the dean that adds the new evidence, documenting the basis of the reconsideration. The supplement should indicate that the new evidence is unexpected, in the sense of not having been considered as part of the tenure decision. The new evidence may be either new information about the candidate's accomplishments or new accomplishments since the original tenure decision.

The dean or the Provost may request recommendations from committees, reviewers, or others beyond what is provided in these guidelines (such as soliciting additional external reviewers on the full array of scholarship). The individual may submit a concise additional

statement. All such material will be included in the supplement, which will be attached to the original dossier.

The dean or the Provost may request recommendations from external or internal reviewers who were negative during the initial consideration. If a positive recommendation was made initially by the department or department chair, the school committee, or individual external reviewers, there is no need to seek their views again on a request for reconsideration. If there is new evidence, any of those participants who made a negative recommendation during the initial consideration should be given the opportunity to consider the new material and make an updated recommendation as appropriate. If personnel have changed, it is the current incumbents who review the request for reconsideration.

#### *2.7.5 Other reconsiderations*

There are two other situations in which reconsideration may be requested:

**Reconsideration by permission.** The first is where the Provost gave permission during initial consideration to resubmit the dossier by the original Tenure Decision Date or by a revised Tenure Decision Date, as determined by the Provost (in such cases, the normal tenure standard applies rather than the extraordinary circumstances standard.)

**Claim of procedural defect.** Reconsideration may also be requested on a claim of procedural defects (see below, section 2.8)

#### *2.7.6 Decision on reconsideration*

Upon resubmission to the Provost, the Provost may make a decision with or without additional UCAPT consideration. Unless the Provost decides that tenure should be granted, the original negative decision remains undisturbed and no second terminal year appointment is allowed.

## **2.8 Interference and Procedural Irregularities**

### *2.8.1 Lobbying*

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, the University's process, or the candidate's work. Both the confidentiality of the process and the prohibition against lobbying seek to provide protections against interference.

### *2.8.2 Procedural irregularities*

If the candidate believes there have been procedural irregularities that had a material effect on the decision, he or she should promptly write to the Provost. It is the Provost's responsibility to decide what remedy, if any, is appropriate for procedural defects. For example, the Provost may decide that procedural irregularities at earlier stages were fully



remedied by the independent evaluation and recommendation provided by UCAPT, or that procedural irregularities did not have a material effect on the final decision given the weight of the evidence.

If the candidate believes that their rights have been violated, he or she has a right to a grievance hearing, as detailed in Faculty Handbook, chapter 7. A grievance against the decision to deny tenure must be filed through the Academic Senate on the appropriate form within nine months of the original decision; requesting reconsideration does not extend that deadline. The Faculty Handbook provides that in considering grievances related to promotion or tenure the grievance panel shall not substitute its judgment on the substantive merits of the decision, including the requirements of the academic unit or a candidate's professional qualifications, for that of the appropriate faculty body or bodies and administrators. If the grievance panel concludes that the grievant's claim of a violation of rights is proven, it will recommend reconsideration by the appropriate faculty body or bodies and administrators.

## **2.9 Equal Opportunity**

All UCAPT panels are diverse by gender and race.

UCAPT's recommendations are made individually on a merit basis. Protections against discrimination apply with full force to the appointment, promotion, and tenure process, and the criteria for decisions are consistent across candidates with different personal characteristics, such as race, gender, disability, age, national origin, and other characteristics protected by law.

Over the period from academic year 2006 through academic year 2020, 86% of the 439 tenure-track faculty who completed the UCAPT process were granted tenure, 14% or 61 total were denied. There were no statistically significant differences based on gender, race, or provosts. The proportion of women receiving tenure was not different from that of men, and those who self-identified as Black, Latino/a, Indigenous American, or as an Asian American did not have different tenure rates from those who identified as non-Hispanic white. This statistical analysis is repeated periodically and updated in editions of this Manual.

## **2.10 Research, Teaching, Practitioner and Clinical Faculty**

Individuals without tenure-track appointments are not eligible for consideration for tenure through the promotion process or by transfer. They may apply for appointment to an open position, tenured or tenure-track, on an equal basis in competition with the national pool of candidates.

### **3. Information for Tenure-Track Assistant Professors**

#### **3.1 Standards for Tenure**

Standards and expectations are discussed in Section 1.

#### **3.2 Timeline for Tenure**

The offer letter should provide each newly appointed tenure-track faculty member with a Tenure Decision Date, as detailed in Faculty Handbook 4-D(1). The Tenure Decision Date is one year before the end of the probationary period.

#### **3.3 Pre-Tenure Reviews**

In all reviews, it is desirable for department chairs, deans, and faculty committees to include constructive criticism rather than conveying unalloyed optimism about a candidate's prospects for tenure. The Provost, not the department or school, decides on tenure.

##### *3.3.1 Annual reviews*

Tenure-track faculty members undergo regular performance reviews concerning progress toward meeting tenure standards and annual reappointment. Because they are appointed on a series of one-year contracts, tenure-track faculty members may be non-reappointed in any year, with notice as detailed in Faculty Handbook 4-F(3). If it appears in any year that an individual is unlikely to meet the standards for tenure, not renewing the contract is fairer to the candidate and better for the department.

##### *3.3.2 Mid-probationary review*

There is a particularly thorough review midway through the probationary period (in the third year for most schools). One purpose of this review is to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments to date and prospects for tenure, in order to determine if the candidate is making progress toward tenure sufficient to have their contract renewed through the mandatory Tenure Decision Date. This internal review is similar to the review completed at the time of tenure consideration. While it has not been customary to use external reviewers, a department may do so if this would be useful.

By the time of the mid-probationary period review, the candidate should submit to the department a brief statement describing the intended focus or contribution of their research and scholarship, including any substantive or methodological cross-disciplinary aspects. Departments and schools should forward the mid-probationary period review to the Provost's Office in May of the year in which it was conducted

#### **3.4 Year 5 or 6 Review**

##### *3.4.1 Non-reappointment*

Schools are asked to consider the question of non-reappointment especially carefully in

the year before the tenure decision (generally the fifth year.) The school may decide that year (generally the fifth year) to issue a terminal year letter. Similarly, if the school decides to do so early in the tenure decision year, it may issue a terminal year letter (for the following year.) In either of those cases, there is no full tenure review.

### **3.4.2** *Counseling*

The year before the tenure decision (generally the fifth year), or early in the year of the tenure decision (generally the sixth year), each candidate should discuss the process with the department chair or dean in order to consider whether the candidate should go forward for tenure evaluation or seek other career paths. If the school offers advice to the candidate at this time it is necessarily based on the evidence available and, whether encouraging or not, does not demonstrate bias. If the case goes forward, advice given at this meeting should not be included in the dossier.

### **3.4.3** *Withdrawal*

The candidate may decide that they do not wish to be considered for tenure, or may withdraw from consideration at any point in the review process before the tenure or promotion decision. In either case, the candidate must notify the dean of this decision in writing, and the tenure review process is concluded.

## **3.5** **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 if the individual believes there is justification for 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 they are considered by the Committee on Probationary Deadlines and Leaves, which advises the Provost. Only the Provost, on the President's behalf, has authority to change the Tenure Decision Date. See Faculty Handbook 4-D(1).

A tenure-track faculty member may also apply for an extension of their Tenure Decision Date due to parenting or primary caregiver responsibilities. This request is submitted by the individual through the department chair and dean to the Provost, as provided in the Faculty Handbook.

## **3.6** **Early Tenure Review**

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

Whether a review is conducted early or at the usual time, a negative decision on tenure by the Provost will result in the issuance of a terminal year letter. A candidate who chooses to request consideration for tenure prior to the Tenure Decision Date should make this request in writing to their chair and dean. In the request, the candidate should also acknowledge that

a negative decision will result in a terminal year letter. This memo must be submitted before the candidate's early review has begun. Rarely, the Provost may permit a case to be withdrawn and resubmitted by the Tenure Decision Date or another 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.

## **4. Information for Full Professor Candidates and Senior Lateral Appointments**

### **4.1 Standards for Promotion to Full Professor**

Standards and expectations are discussed in Section 1.

### **4.2 Timeline for Promotion to Full Professor**

Number of years in rank is not part of the requirements for promotion to full professor. The timing is individual, and expectations vary by discipline. A dossier put forward for promotion earlier than usual does not need to meet any enhanced standard.

### **4.3 Contents of the Dossier for Full Professor**

See section 7 of this Manual for a detailed description of dossier contents.

### **4.4 Resubmission of a Dossier after a Negative Decision**

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.

### **4.5 Information for Senior Lateral Appointments**

#### *4.5.1 Timing and the UCAPT Process*

Senior lateral appointments use the same basic dossier format and UCAPT process as promotions, but some abbreviation and modifications of the process are permissible, as detailed below.

All tenure-track appointment offers require approval by the Provost through the UCAPT process if they are at the associate professor or professor rank, with or without tenure. The Provost's approval must be obtained before a firm offer letter is issued. (In contrast, visiting, and RTPC appointments at any rank, and tenure-track assistant professor appointments, are made by the dean, as detailed in Faculty Handbook 4-A.)

The department should notify the office of the Vice Provost as soon as the senior lateral tenure-track appointment is in the pipeline, and the dossier should reach UCAPT by March 15, to ensure a decision by the end of the academic year.

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

Preferably, the school should submit the dossier to UCAPT before extending any letter of offer to the candidate. If time does not permit going through UCAPT first, a conditional offer may be made to the candidate. Such a letter must state 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.

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 the UCAPT process has been completed.

#### *4.5.2 Contents of the Dossier*

See section 7 of this Manual for a detailed description of dossier contents. For senior lateral appointments only, certain sections of the dossier may be modified as follows:

- **Administrative Assessments:** Department and school custom may allow the use of different committees for appointment than for promotion. Lateral appointments require documentation of the position posting or the pre-hire posting waiver from the Provost's Office. Assessments should describe the measures taken to ensure that there was proactive outreach and that searches were conducted in a manner consistent with USC policy.
- **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.
- **External Reviewers:** If there is good reason to do so, and with the approval of the Vice Provost, emails may be used for evaluation rather than letters. For scholars of great eminence, a somewhat smaller number of reviewers may suffice, and the evaluation may be more limited in focus. If the dean would like to include a smaller number of reviewers or deviate from the template, he or she should obtain approval from the Vice Provost in advance.

#### *4.5.3 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 or school is proposed for a tenured appointment in a different USC department or school.

In this case, the timing need not conform to the usual schedule. The contents of the dossier are abridged upon consultation with the Vice Provost. Generally, a current CV will be sufficient. External letters are not requested. Recommendations from the new department or school's faculty and dean are required, as is the approval of the Provost. Generally, no consultation with UCAPT is necessary before the Provost makes a decision about the new appointment. The changed status will then be updated in the contract system.

When an individual formerly held a tenured appointment at USC but does not currently, the regular process for considering an external appointment is followed. However, the dossier

can be abbreviated if approval in advance is obtained from the Vice Provost. Since the needs of the school may change over time, and the caliber of appointments improves, it is not necessarily so that a previously tenured individual will receive tenure again.

A tenured offer to someone who is currently a visiting faculty member is considered an external appointment. There must be an open, posted search either before the visiting appointment or at the time of the proposed regular appointment.

## **5. Information for Special RTPC Designations**

### **5.1 Clinical Scholar**

The designation “Clinical Scholar” is awarded by the President of the University after a recommendation by UCAPT. It is intended to confer the same honor and dignity as tenured status, though without the employment guarantees of tenure. The University policy on Academic Titles (<http://faculty.usc.edu/>) provides that Clinical Scholar and similar titles are for individuals who have gained high scholarly distinction in their fields, primarily engaged in clinical, creative, or professional practice, teaching, or research, but whose effort profile or type of research differs from that of tenured faculty.

For Clinical Scholars, excellence in research, teaching, and clinical service, and at least strength in other areas of service, is required. 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 P.I. of R01s).

A candidate for the Clinical Scholar designation at the associate level should be recognized at the national level and esteemed by experts in their 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. Candidates for the Clinical Scholar designation at the full professor level should be recognized not only nationally but also internationally.

A candidate for Clinical Scholar should also have demonstrated expertise in a particular area (e.g., a long track record of developing treatments for a particular disease or developing new and novel procedures for specific surgical problems).

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

As provided in the *University policy on Academic Titles*, the Provost may approve similar titles for non-clinical disciplines.

### **5.2 Teaching Professor with Distinction**

A full-time RTPC teaching faculty member can be considered for this honor after the individual has been promoted to full Professor (or equivalent lecturer rank), and if the dean can demonstrate continuing programmatic need and financial support for the position. All full-time RTPC teaching faculty are eligible for this status; however, it is not intended to be a routine or expected promotion, but rather a recognition for exceptional performance.

The designation “Teaching Professor with Distinction” can be granted by the President of the University, through the Provost, after review and recommendation by the school’s faculty and dean, and the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure. Teaching faculty members achieving this status will have a unique title, adding the modifier



“with Distinction” to their official title (e.g., “ Professor ( Teaching) of Discipline>, with Distinction”).

### *5.2.1 Standards for Promotion*

University expectations for this honor include demonstrated teaching excellence, pedagogical impact and innovation, and educational leadership, as well as the expectation of continued excellence and growth in performance and expertise. The criteria for demonstrating that these expectations are met will vary by school and field. Therefore, each school will need to produce a document outlining the criteria by which the school defines excellence in teaching and pedagogical impact.

A University-level definition of Excellence in Teaching at USC has been developed by CET through consultation with multiple faculty groups, and includes criteria that apply to most types of pedagogies (<https://cet.usc.edu/about/usc-definition-of-excellence-in-teaching/>). Schools may wish to consult the criteria in this definition as they develop their own discipline-specific definition of excellence in teaching. Schools may also wish to consult CET for measures to assess these criteria.

It is recognized that schools employ different modalities of teaching from lectures in the humanities to laboratory oversight in the sciences, and from studio reviews in fine arts to one-on-one instruction in music, and from rounds in the medical school to seminars for graduate-level education. The different pedagogies used should be explained and the metrics of what constitutes excellence in each should be detailed. Once this document has been reviewed by the school’s appropriate faculty bodies, and approved by the dean, it will be submitted to the Provost for his approval.

This document must also delineate the types of external validation by which excellence and impact in teaching will be measured, e.g., arm’s length review of teaching practice and course design; University-level impact on teaching practices, support, or course design; adoption of faculty pedagogical practices by outside programs or professional associations; leadership in the student or teaching components of externally-funded grants; recognition by professional associations for pedagogical work; publication of pedagogical contributions; letters from external experts. Once the Provost has approved the document, the school can elect to nominate exceptional full-time RTPC teaching full professors for the award of Teaching Professor with Distinction.

### *5.2.2 Process for Promotion*

When a school identifies an outstanding teaching faculty member for nomination, the process should follow the school’s internal guidelines for promotion of RTPC faculty, utilizing departmental or school review procedures that would involve both tenured and RTPC faculty. Detailed assessments from department chairs and a faculty review committee will summarize how the faculty member meets the standards set out above.

Evidence of external validation, including external letters, should be collected in a timely fashion in order to provide enough time for faculty review groups to include them in their deliberations and discussions before proceeding to the dean. As with all promotions, both faculty and decanal assessments must provide a balanced evaluation of the candidate’s

qualifications, not merely build a positive case. The assessments most useful to UCAPT and the Provost are those that carefully analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the case.

Once the dossier has reached the decanal level, the dean shall provide an independent assessment of the merits of the case for promotion. In addition, the dean will provide a detailed statement demonstrating the continued programmatic need and financial support for this position.

If either the faculty or the dean's recommendation is positive, the Dean's Office will submit the entire dossier to the Provost's Office in the form of one electronic copy. The dossier will then be reviewed by UCAPT, which will make a recommendation to the Provost, who makes the final decision on behalf of the President.

A negative decision does not preclude a new submission in a later year. The same rules on confidentiality apply as with tenure dossiers and discussions.

### 5.2.3 *The Dossier*

The dossier should resemble those developed for promotions of tenure-track faculty, but focused on teaching achievements – providing evidence that the candidate:

- Has a record of demonstrated excellence in teaching, and contributes significantly to the department/ school's curriculum and academic program growth and development,
- Has made a significant and demonstrable impact on student learning,
- Uses effective research-based teaching strategies and makes pedagogical innovations,
- Provides leadership in support of the University's education mission, and excellent service to the department, school, University and profession,
- Is expected to continue to excel and grow in performance and expertise.

The faculty committee report should discuss the evidence and provide a balanced appraisal of how the candidate meets the standards for teaching professor with distinction. Administrative assessments should explain the nature and extent of the faculty member's accomplishments, and how these compare to the norms of the field, as well as the department or school.

The faculty member should provide a personal statement (no longer than five pages) of teaching philosophy. The dossier should include a chronological list of classes taught with contact hours and enrollment size for each, along with a list of courses created, developed, or substantially revised. If Ph.D. or post-doc supervision is in the faculty member's profile, placement information on those supervisees should be included. Any awards for teaching should be detailed and the importance of each award and the society or group that awarded the distinction explained.

Schools should follow the guidance provided later in the Manual about evidence of teaching effectiveness (Section 7.8.2). In order to establish teaching excellence, the dossier should include observation of the faculty member's teaching by faculty peers, demonstrated application of effective teaching strategies, syllabi review, and a discussion of impact on

student learning from the department chair or appropriate school official. Other materials in accordance with the school's approved criteria may be included.

If the school finds them useful, evaluation letters from a sample of former students may be included, but only if solicited by the department/school review committee (see 7.8.2(c)).

If the faculty member has also conducted disciplinary research, those contributions and metrics of impact should be included, as well. The dossier should detail significant mentoring by the faculty member of students and other faculty. Department and University service and leadership roles should be described and their importance explained.

Finally, the dossier should include indicators of external validation (such as those described above) of the excellence and impact of the candidate's contributions to teaching.

## **6. Information for Librarians and Research, Teaching, Practitioner, and Clinical Faculty**

### **6.1 Information on Librarian Promotions and Appointments**

For librarians, the President receives the advice of the University Committee on Librarian Appointments, Promotions and Continuing Appointments (see Faculty Handbook 4-H (1)). Librarians must possess a strong service commitment along with a conceptual, broadly-based, understanding of how information is created, organized, disseminated, accessed, preserved, and recast to encourage new discoveries.

The primary emphasis in promotions and the grant of continuing appointments to librarians is on excellent professional performance in discharging the librarian's responsibilities. Librarians demonstrate excellence by having a significant impact on the development and implementation of high-quality collections and services.

Unlike promotions for faculty on the tenure track, letters of evaluation should be sought from a set of reviewers who are both external to and internal to USC, including faculty members and other librarians, to assess both excellence in librarianship and the impact that the candidate has had on the wider field of librarianship or information science.

### **6.2 Information on RTPC Promotions**

For RTPC promotions, the President receives the advice of the University Committee on Research, Teaching, Practitioner, and Clinical (RTPC) Promotions (see Faculty Handbook 4-H (1)). The committee includes RTPC faculty, both full and part-time. An appropriate ad hoc panel will be appointed for each case, which may include members of the standing committee, ad hoc members, or both.

When a dean concurs with the advice of a faculty committee on a RTPC track promotion, that is a final decision under the authority delegated by the President (see Faculty Handbook 4-A). When a dean does not concur with the advice of a faculty committee on a RTPC track promotion, the file will automatically be referred to this committee for its recommendation, and the Provost will then decide.

School guidelines on RTPC promotions should explain the weight and metrics for scholarship, teaching, and service, and must be approved by the Provost after consultation with the Executive Board of the Academic Senate (see Faculty Handbook 4-G).

Contact the Vice Provost for approval of appropriate modifications of the usual UCAPT process and criteria.

## 7. The Dossier

### 7.1 Dossier Overview

A checklist for dossier preparation is provided in the appendix of this UCAPT Manual. Details about each section are provided in the materials that follow. Potential modifications for senior lateral appointment dossiers are noted in section 4.5. If questions arise in dossier preparation, the Provost's Office is available for consultation.

The Recommendation for Appointment or Recommendation for Promotion form should be included in the front of the dossier.

Included below is a sample summary of both the candidate's portions and the department/school's portions of the dossier. However, candidates should check with their schools, as responsibilities for dossier components may vary by school.

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

Dossiers contain the following ratings, reports, and records obtained in connection with the process of appointment or promotion to a higher rank or to tenured or continuing appointment status.

#### 7.1.1 Responsibilities

Candidate's portion of dossier evidence:

- Curriculum vitae
- Personal statement
- Teaching statement
- Teaching record (unless information is provided by department/school)
- Service statement (optional)
- Service record (unless information is provided by department/school)
- List of suggested reviewers, or list of potential reviewers who may be biased, or both (see section 7.7.2)
- Candidate's portion of appendix

Department/school's portion of dossier evidence:

- Quantitative data
- Teaching memo
- Any portions of teaching record that are not the candidate's responsibility
- Any portions of service record that are not the candidate's responsibility
- Department/school's portion of appendix

## Administrative and Faculty Assessments, and External Letters of Review

- Letters of review
- Reports prepared by committee members (these may include department committees, department faculty, school committee, etc.)
- Reports and ratings by department chair (if applicable) and dean

### 7.1.2 *Overview*

The administrative and faculty assessments should include the: (1) dean's memo, (2) school committee memo, (3) department chair's memo (if applicable), (4) department faculty committee memo (if applicable), as well as any other faculty committee reports.

If higher-level reviews (such as the dean's memo) adopt the reasoning of a lower-level report, the reviews can agree with the report without having to summarize and repeat it.

This Manual and any school- or department- specific measures and expectations of productivity, which have been approved by the Provost (see section 1.3), should be provided to the candidate and each committee member, chair, and dean evaluating the dossier. Other discipline-specific standards and practices should be explained in the administrative assessments.

### 7.1.3 *The Importance of Candor*

Administrative reports should provide a balanced analysis of the case, rather than advocating for a certain decision. Departments and schools should not retake votes so that they appear unanimous, nor skew the selection of reviewers to achieve some desired outcome, nor exclude from the dossier information they fear later levels may misinterpret. Instead, they should append explanations of what they believe is the appropriate significance of all the available information.

Administrative and faculty assessments are of greatest use to UCAPT if they analyze issues rather than argue for a conclusion. Those who support a candidate should realize that the greatest aid is provided by a balanced analysis. Negative evidence must be weighed as conscientiously as positive evidence. If the assessments do not present a balance analysis, UCAPT will regard them as less useful in informing its judgment.

Faculty committees should try to anticipate and discuss questions that may be raised later in the process, and they should particularly consider the weaker elements in the dossier. Split votes or dissenting views should never be suppressed. The dossier is strengthened, not weakened, if negative views expressed in discussions or in the reviewers' letters are discussed in the report. UCAPT expects to see a summary of all sides of the discussion, presenting pros and cons.

### 7.1.4 *Documenting the Process Fully*

All information relied upon to make decisions must be documented in the dossier.

All committee reports, data on all votes, and all letters and summaries of conversations with those asked to be reviewers must be included in the dossier. If a committee votes twice, or a second committee is appointed, the earlier information should be included along with an explanation of the process.

It is not necessary to discuss annual, mid-probationary or fifth/sixth year reviews unless the school believes it would help UCAPT understand the candidate's progress.

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

If a dean or chair, or any individual faculty member involved in the process, has reason to question the accuracy or integrity of any of the information in the dossier, a memo 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.*

An individual faculty member in the department or on a school committee who wishes to ensure that their views are adequately represented in the dossier may, if necessary, write directly to the department chair, dean, or Provost with an additional analysis at the time their level submits its report. That letter would then be included in the dossier.

If those responsible for conducting the review receive letters or information on the decision outside the usual process, they should forward the letters or summaries of the conversations to the dean or Provost; however, unsolicited communications are not included in the dossier.

If new dossier evidence (e.g., a new publication, the score of a submitted proposal, etc.) is received after the dossier is submitted to UCAPT, it should be added to the dossier. Contact the Office of the Vice Provost to submit the new evidence.

#### 7.1.5 *The Departmental Committee Report and Chair's Memo*

Schools with departments should provide assessments both from the department faculty (or a committee thereof) and the department chair. See Section 7.1.3 on the importance of candor.

The department report should address the following topics:

- The typical qualitative and quantitative standards (books, articles, grants, creative works, etc.) in the discipline.
- Whether the candidate's quantitative measures (see section 7.2) are consistent with the qualitative judgments provided.
- The quality of the journals and presses in which the candidate published, as well as the conferences at which he or she presented. For candidates in creative fields, the report should describe the quality of the venues in which the candidate performed, exhibited work, etc., as well as other appropriate metrics.
- The level and type of peer-reviewed external funding that is desirable in the discipline, and how the candidate compares to those recently promoted at peer and aspirational institutions.
- Whether citation frequency is important and how the candidate compares to those

- recently promoted at peer and aspirational institutions.
- The significance of co-authorships, and of first or last authorship, in the discipline.
- Analysis of doubts or qualifications contained in the reviewer letters.
- The candidate's next major project (a brief description is sufficient) and how it is expected to contribute to the field.
- The significance of the candidate's field within the broader discipline.

The department chair's report should provide a summary of the departmental discussion and votes, including an explanation of issues, disagreements, and minority views.

In addition to the summary, the chair's memo should include:

- Any disagreements the chair may have with the judgments or procedures of the faculty committee.
- The department's needs and goals and an analysis of whether the candidate will advance the department's academic plan and fit into the unit's strategy for excellence.
- For appointments, the proactive outreach used to assure equal opportunity.
- For an interdisciplinary candidate, the standards for interdisciplinary excellence in the particular case. (If interdisciplinary work is addressed in other department- or school-specific documents, the appropriate documents should also be attached.)

#### *7.1.6 The School Committee Report*

The school-level committee should present its independent analysis of the issues manifested in the dossier as to research, teaching, and service. The committee's report should detail pros and cons of each category while setting forth the reasons for its recommendation. The school committee vote should be included in the report.

School-level committees will also consider the departmental discussion and report and comment on any issues shown at that level. If the committee disagrees with the department report, it should explain its reasons. (There is no need to summarize information already presented in the dossier at the department level.)

#### *7.1.7 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. Candor is an essential responsibility of the dean. The dean should consider what has been said at previous stages. If the dean agrees with the previous reasoning, there is no need to summarize and repeat evidence already included in the dossier. If the dean disagrees with a lower-level committee, the dean should provide reasons for the disagreement.

The dean should include a statement specifying whether they approved the external reviewer list. If the dean modified the reviewer template letter (after approval by the Vice Provost), that should be indicated as well.

## **7.2 Quantitative Data (Section I-B)**

UCAPT requests that discipline-appropriate quantitative data be included in all dossiers. Quantitative data can be valuable, though data cannot substitute for judgment. The



department memo should discuss whether the candidate's quantitative measures are consistent with the qualitative judgments offered.

The following quantitative data are expected in the dossier. (More detailed explanations of these items is given below).

In all cases, a cohort analysis appropriate to the field is required.

Departments may explain if they believe that any of the other items listed below are not salient. For candidates in creative fields, departments should submit equivalent information.

- A cohort analysis.
- A table showing the candidate's number of publications per year. If it would be helpful, separate top journals from other journals.
- Citation counts for the candidate's publications.
- Journal impact factors.
- A list of grants (if applicable).

If the department or school believes that other quantitative data would be more relevant to the discipline or more effective in demonstrating significance and impact, it should provide those data, along with information detailing their relevance.

### *7.2.1 Cohort analysis*

UCAPT requests that all dossiers contain a cohort analysis, including both data and explanatory text. The cohort analysis should compare the candidate with an appropriate peer group, considering all measures applicable to the discipline, such as number of publications, citations, and journals where published. (In creative fields, the items for comparison will likely vary.) The department, school, or dean should comment on the cohort analysis in their assessments.

The appropriate peer group is about five to ten scholars who were recently granted a similar promotion or appointment (e.g., given tenure, promoted to full professor) at departments the University regards as of equal or greater stature. It is often advisable to include individuals from departments mentioned in the reviewer letters as leaders in the candidate's area.

The department or school should state the definition of the comparison group (e.g., every person tenured in the last two years at departments rated higher than USC), and it should include all the individuals falling in that group. If the usual cohort analysis is inapplicable, the department or school should provide other information demonstrating how the candidate compares to others in the field.

To outline a typical cohort analysis:

- Explanation of the comparison group;
- Explanation of the measures applicable to the candidate's discipline that are included (e.g., the top tier journals versus other journals, citations, grants, or awards, etc.);
- Comparison chart (separating work since the date the candidate was appointed or last promoted and highlighting top tier venues, if applicable.)

### 7.2.2 *Citation counts*

Citation counts provide some evidence of the impact of the work (unless the department explains why it believes citation counts are inapplicable to the discipline). The department should use the citation index (e.g., Web of Science, Google Scholar) that is most appropriate for the discipline. Please include a statement explaining why the source used is the most accurate.

The department should provide a summary of how it obtained the citation count results. The department or school should also do a careful analysis of the citations. (Are they survey articles? How and why is the work cited?) The external reviewers are asked to comment on the quality of the journals and this can facilitate the differentiation of the various citations.

There should be a separate analysis of work since the candidate was appointed or last promoted. Self-citations should be excluded.

### 7.2.3 *Journal impact factors*

In many disciplines journal impact factors are appropriate metrics for the influence of publication venues. If journal impact factors are not appropriate to the discipline, departments should submit information that indicates the relative significance of the venues in which the candidate publishes, performs, or otherwise distributes their work (such as the ratio of submissions to acceptances, the stature of others who publish in that venue, etc.).

### 7.2.4 *Table of grants*

For candidates in grant-funded fields, the dossier should include a table showing the following for all grants. Please separate external grants from USC funding.

- whether the candidate was P.I. co-P.I., recognized by the agency as equal co-P.I., or Investigator
- granting agency,
- type of grant (e.g., R01)
- grant number,
- start and end date
- candidate's percentage of time on grant
- grant amount (direct costs).

If the candidate is responsible for part of a Center or Project grant, please note the amount of direct costs the candidate managed and whether that portion of the grant was independently scored.

## 7.3 **Curriculum Vitae (Section II)**

The curriculum vitae needs to be complete, current, dated, and accurate. The candidate is personally responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the CV and should check it carefully if others have helped prepare it. Misstatements on the CV are taken very seriously.

Exact dates of academic degrees, previous employment, and publications are essential, as are exact faculty and staff titles (and explanations of positions or tenure-track status if the information is unclear). Candidates should use the CV format that is standard for the school or discipline (or see suggestions at [cet.usc.edu](http://cet.usc.edu)), with the following adjustments or additions.

### 7.3.1 *Concerning publications*

- Articles in refereed journals should be separated from non-refereed publications (e.g., invited contributions to journals, non-refereed chapters in edited books). For articles, include first and last page numbers, as well as date. The most recent work should be listed first.
- Publications should be separated from conference and other presentations (invited lectures, seminars).
- Edited work should be differentiated from authored work; co-authored or co-edited work differentiated from solo work; mass market or author-subsidized book publishers differentiated from university or comparable presses.
- Correct titles of journals and publishers should be used.
- If there are joint authors of publications, the name of the senior author for each publication should be underlined, and the candidate's name should be **boldfaced**. If one of the co-authors is the candidate's student or post-doc, that name should be highlighted with an asterisk\*. Any special meaning to the candidate's location within a series of middle authors should be explained.
- A book or article can be listed as "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 reviewers should be completely accurate in specifying work that is actually published or in press. Other work can be listed separately with notations as under contract, revise and resubmit, etc.. The candidate should realize that such work is not regarded as finished.

### 7.3.2 *Concerning grants*

For candidates in grant-funded fields, the CV should include the information specified in 7.2.4 for all grants. Please separate external grants from USC funding.

### 7.3.3 *Concerning service*

The CV should list both internal and external service.

## 7.4 **Personal Statement (Section III)**

The personal statement is important, but need not be more than five pages long. The candidate is provided this opportunity to convey to others the research questions addressed and the excitement and importance of their scholarly work thus far, as well as plans for the future. Approaches to research and research accomplishments should be explained, and future work should be mapped out. (The candidate should include comments about their teaching in the teaching statement in section IV of the dossier. An additional statement on

service may be included in section V of the dossier.)

All candidates who engage in collaborative research should include an explanation of the kinds of collaborations they have undertaken, their own original and creative contributions for each work in these collaborations, and the significance and impact of such collaborations on scholarship in their own fields and other fields involved. Candidates engaging in interdisciplinary work should also include explanations of the scope, significance, and impact of their work

#### *7.4.1 COVID-19 Impact*

USC recognizes that the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted faculty workloads and faculty productivity in multiple ways including the closure of research facilities, restrictions on travel, the challenges of shifting to new teaching modalities (remote & hybrid), the necessity of providing additional support to students, and delays in supplies and equipment. The University also recognizes that this has had disproportionate impacts on certain categories of faculty, including but not limited to faculty who have significant caregiving responsibilities at home.

Therefore, faculty have been provided with the option of including a COVID-19 impact statement within their personal statement. If provided, this will be sent to external reviewers with other materials.

### **7.5 Teaching Record (Section IV)**

#### *7.5.1 Teaching Memo*

This section should begin with a memo by the department or school's leadership that:

- explains where the candidate's teaching fits within the unit's instructional mission
- compares the candidate's teaching to school and department norms, and
- summarizes and analyzes the evidence of teaching effectiveness presented in the dossier, covering both strengths and weaknesses. (The recommended evidence of teaching effectiveness is detailed in sections 7.5.3 and 7.8.2)
- If a probationary faculty member has heavy teaching responsibilities, the teaching memo should explain the circumstances. For the benefit of those outside the subject, the department may also describe the typical students taking the candidate's courses.

#### *7.5.2 Teaching Statement*

The candidate is provided the opportunity to convey to others their approach to teaching and teaching accomplishments.

#### *7.5.3 Teaching Record and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness*

The following information should also be included in the teaching section of the dossier:

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

UCAPT asks that additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (syllabi, student evaluations, notes from classroom observations by senior colleagues, etc.) be included in section VII of the dossier (Appendix). See section 7.8.2.

## **7.6 Service Record (Section V)**

### *7.6.1 Service Statement (optional)*

The candidate may include a statement explaining their approach to service and detailing service experience.

### *7.6.2 Service Record*

The service record should include University, professional, and community service activity related to the candidate's field, such as journal editorial boards or federal grant review panels. Since merely being a committee member provides little information about contribution, the service record should assess the quality and the effectiveness of the candidate's service contributions.

## **7.7 External Reviewer Letters (Section VI)**

### *7.7.1 Template Letters*

Template letters to solicit reviewer evaluations are included in section 8. Please use the versions of the template letters included in this UCAPT Manual. If the department or school wishes to rephrase the letter, the dean must obtain approval in advance from the Vice Provost and mention this approval in the dean's memo.

### *7.7.2 Selection of Reviewers*

Reviewers' 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.

The list of reviewers, and the reasons for any unusual choices, should be reviewed by the dean early enough in the process so that there is time to make adjustments or seek additional reviewers, if needed.

**Selecting reviewers.** The most useful external reviewers are academic leaders in tenure-granting major universities who are arm's-length. UCAPT *requires* at least five such arm's-length letters in the dossier. These five letters must include substantive evaluation and analysis of the candidate's work.

- Reviewers should be included from the broader discipline as well as the subspecialty. Evidence from the broader discipline gives UCAPT a feel for the significance, impact, and originality of the work.
- If a reviewer is not a leading scholar at a major research university, the department or school should explain why the reviewer is an expert whose judgment is significant for the dossier. UCAPT understands that some universities, while not necessarily in the top tier, have individuals who are widely considered leaders in the field.
- Some of the letters may be from non-academic reviewers when the candidate is from a non-academic background or works in an area that is performance-based, creative, or affects public policy and practice. Nevertheless, such dossiers still require a minimum of five substantive letters from arm's-length, academic reviewers, as described above.
- It would be unusual to seek the judgment of faculty holding a lower rank than the rank proposed for the candidate, or to seek the judgment of a non-tenured faculty member on a question of tenure.

**Arm's-length.** The great majority of reviewer letters in the dossier should be from reviewers who have not been suggested by the candidate and who are arm's-length. Arm's-length reviewers are not connected to the candidate by collaboration, friendship, commercial ties, or current or former collegueship at the same institution. These reviewers may have met the candidate at conferences and through other professional activities. (This is especially true for candidates for full professor.) However, arm's-length reviewers have not, for instance, overlapped with the candidate at the same institution (even in graduate school); collaborated on a project, article, or grant with the candidate; or engaged in a mentoring relationship with the candidate.

**Candidate input.** Generally, it is desirable that the candidate suggest *no more than two* reviewers. (Some candidates regard it as advantageous not to suggest reviewers, as those they suggest will not be regarded as arm's-length.) The candidate should also be given the opportunity to list individuals whom they believe would be biased. If letters are obtained from any of those individuals, the candidate's belief will be taken into account.

**Number.** In order to receive the required five substantive letters from arm's-length reviewers, it is common to solicit ten such letters. This number makes it likely the department or school will receive five that meet all the criteria.

**Collaborators.** If much of the candidate's work is co-authored, co-created, or otherwise produced collaboratively, then the dossier should also include a few reviewer letters from these collaborators. The collaborator reviewers must be *in addition* to the five arm's-length reviewers. Letters from collaborators should address the significance of the sequence of authors and the original, creative contribution of the candidate as a co-author.

**Joint appointments.** For candidates with joint appointments, reviewers should be sought from the secondary discipline(s) as well, after advice from the secondary department.

**Digital scholarship.** If the candidate's dossier includes digital scholarship, then letters should be sought from individuals with experience in evaluating or producing digital scholarship.

**Internal letters.** Internal letters of evaluation are generally not as informative as letters from arm's-length, external reviewers. Internal letters are desirable when they are from members of the secondary department in interdisciplinary cases (see section 1.8), or when they are from collaborators explaining the candidate's contribution to joint work. If there are internal letters, they are *in addition* to the expected number of external letters.

### 7.7.3 *Method of Contacting Reviewers*

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

Supplemental evaluations may be sought by the dean, UCAPT, or the Provost, and all such communications must be fully documented in the dossier. If the dean consults with additional reviewers after the dossier leaves the department and goes to subsequent reviews, the communications should be fully documented as part of the dean's memo. If UCAPT members request supplemental evaluations, the dean will contact the reviewers.

**Phone calls.** Phone calls to reviewers concerning candidates for promotions or lateral appointments are discouraged; however, if a phone call is necessary, the dean should follow a similar process to that of soliciting written reviewer letters. After consulting the Vice Provost, the dean should e-mail the reviewer to schedule an appointment for a phone conversation. If the reviewer agrees to the appointment, the dean should send the candidate's materials and solicitation letter, just as he or she would for a written reviewer letter. The questions included in the solicitation letter should then be the template for the phone conversation. All parts of such communications must be documented in the dossier.

**Timeliness.** It is preferable that letters of evaluation be solicited in one period of time (to avoid some letters being much older than others) and that the dossier be submitted in a timely manner. If submission of a dossier is delayed, the candidate will not have the benefit of having their most recent work considered by the reviewers. If, nevertheless, the dossier is delayed, at least some of the letters must be new enough to confirm the trajectory of the candidate's work. If the letters were received over a year before the submission of the dossier, departments and schools must request that the reviewers update their previously submitted letters in regard to any new work. Both the original letter from the reviewer and the updated letter should be included in the dossier.

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

**Honorarium.** While some units do not allow honoraria, a school may if it wishes offer an honorarium to reviewers in recognition that a thorough evaluation takes time and effort, or in recognition of the inconvenience of the timing of the request.

#### 7.7.4 *Organization of Reviewer Letter Section of Dossier*

The reviewer letter section of the dossier should be divided into:

- the sample solicitation letter;
- a table of reviewers approached;
- arm's-length letters meeting all the criteria stated in section 7.7.2 (section VI-A);
- other letters (section VI-B), as described below; and
- decline correspondence

**Table of reviewers:** Preface the set of letters with a table, showing for each reviewer:

- who suggested the reviewer;
- whether the reviewer is arm's-length or has ties of friendship, collegueship, collaboration, etc. with the candidate; and whether the reviewer answers all the questions in the letter of request in a substantive manner, including the question asking whether the candidate's work meets the standards of leading institutions for a similar position (or for award of tenure.)

The table should include ALL reviewers approached, including those who decline for lack of time or any other reason and those who were only communicated with by telephone. The reasons for declining should be included in the table. Provide copies of all letters and e-mails of substantive commentary received from reviewers (including reviewers who declined and their reasoning), as well as notes on any phone calls with them. Simple correspondence including reminders or confirmations resulting in a letter can be omitted.

**Explanations.** Please explain if an unusual number of external reviewers decline to provide letters. Explain why each reviewer was chosen, with a short bio of a few sentences summarizing the significance of the reviewer. Do not enclose a full CV or a directory listing.

**Section VI-A: Arm's-Length Letters.** Arm's-length letters meeting all of the criteria stated in section 7.7.2 (substantive, arm's-length letters from academic leaders independent of the candidate) should be placed in part VI-A of the dossier. There should be a minimum of five such letters in this section.

**Section VI-B: Collaborator and Other Letters.** Letters from key collaborators and reviewers suggested by the candidate should be placed in section VI-B. In addition, letters that do not meet all of the criteria for the arm's-length letters in section VI-A should be placed in section VI-B. Decline correspondence can be placed in this section after other letters.



### 7.7.5 *Quoting Reviewers' Letters*

**The administrative assessments and reports should *not* quote verbatim from reviewers' letters or give their names.** What is helpful is an informed interpretation of key phrases and of ideas that run through the letters, as well as analysis of any key issues flagged in one or more of the letters.

### 7.7.6 *Unsolicited Letters*

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 members outside of those provided for in this manual.

## 7.8 **Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship, Performance, and Teaching (Section VII)**

### 7.8.1 *Evidence of Scholarship and Performance (Section VII-A)*

Please provide selected samples of the candidate's recent publications and other works: reprints, accepted manuscripts, artistic works. The candidate's best work should always be included. Include along with the dossier a copy of each published book or accepted book manuscript, both in digital and hard copies, if possible.

This section should also include:

- All published reviews of the candidate's work (scholarly or artistic), as well as reviews that are in press.
- Evaluations of the candidate's work from publishers' reviewers, if available.
- Summary statements of pending grants.
- Abstracts, samples, and photographs of creative work, with succinct descriptions of date, source, and significance.

### 7.8.2 *Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (Section VII-B)*

As noted in section 7.5, additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (beyond the material requested in the Teaching Record section of the dossier) should be included here. The Center for Excellence in Teaching provides resources on Peer Review and Evaluation which departments are encouraged to consult: <https://cet.usc.edu/resources/instructor-course-evaluation/>

- (a) UCAPT finds that the most useful evidence in evaluating teaching effectiveness is the following:
  - 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 reviews are even more valuable if they include classroom visitations over a period of time. (Some schools have each member of a committee visit at least two classes taught by the candidate; these individuals then submit written evaluations for inclusion in the promotion dossier or mid-year review.

- 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. Particularly compelling is the use of research-based teaching strategies endorsed by the candidate's discipline, as a best practice in addressing the unique learning challenges of that field of study.
- Other evidence that the candidate's teaching is effective such as protocols through which students demonstrate their mastery in a public forum or data on student learning outcomes compared to students of similarly situated teachers.
- Course syllabi and instructor's teaching materials provided to students, descriptions of the instructor's approach to grading and providing feedback, as well as peer review of these documents and practices, for a few courses that the candidate considers most indicative of their approach to teaching.

(b) While student evaluations provide useful information on patterns of student engagement, departments should be cognizant of the research questioning their usefulness. However, summaries and recent data are helpful in tracking growth and change:

- Summaries of student evaluations for all of the candidate's courses, as well as complete student evaluations for the candidate's most recent courses (approximately the last two years). All individual student evaluations should be readily available upon request. If summaries of evaluations are presented based on USC's standard questionnaire, UCAPT suggests that the candidate's average scores should be compared to the distribution of departmental scores for comparable courses or faculty. It would be most helpful to include a summary of any notable and verifiable patterns found, as well as documented growth and change faculty have made in response to feedback received in student evaluations.

(c) The following evidence may also be used if the department finds it helpful:

Information on the candidate's (1) use and assessment of information technology or multi-media that promote student engagement and learning or that adapt course materials to students' needs; (2) the accommodation of different learning styles among students; (3) 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 (4) the use and assessment of work produced by students in service-oriented or experiential settings outside classroom walls.

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. The department or committee chair or dean organizes the contacting of students whose opinions are solicited. 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. Templates for Solicitation Letters for Reviewers

**8.1 For promotion or appointment as associate professor or full professor, whether or not involving the grant of tenure. (If the reviewer is a collaborator, please use the collaborator letter template instead.)**

Dear [reviewer's title name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the [Department/School] in a frank evaluation of the scholarship [or artistic work] of [candidate name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [ ] professor [with/without tenure] [**Or** he/she/they already holds tenure.]. I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, and sample of publications [or other scholarly or creative product].

Would you please let me know as soon as possible if you will be able to provide a review by [date] at [contact information]? (If you would like copies of [her/his/their] additional publications beyond the sample we have enclosed, please let me know.)

We are seeking your assessment as to whether [candidate name]'s scholarship [or artistic work] has demonstrated excellence and creativity, made important and original contributions, had an impact on the field, shows a clear arc of intellectual and creative development, and is widely perceived as outstanding. Every promotion [and grant of tenure] is expected to meet the national and international standards of the leading institutions as well as improve the overall stature of the [department/school]. [For those engaged in digital scholarship, if appropriate: Please include an analysis of the intellectual and creative contributions of [his/her/their] digital scholarship in particular. Has it had a significant impact on the field? Please give concrete examples of such impact.]

Please understand that we seek your evaluation at an early stage in our process and that we have not yet made a decision. We seek your frank and candid assessment. We are requesting an analytical evaluation, rather than general praise or advocacy. We very much appreciate the time and effort involved in providing a review. [**If appropriate:** In evaluating [candidate name]'s productivity, please take into account that [his/her/their] tenure clock was extended by [number] years, but research productivity was not expected to increase commensurately.] [**If appropriate:** In recognition of your effort, we would like to acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$ \_\_\_\_.] If you are able to provide a letter of evaluation, please include a short biographical sketch about yourself, and describe any professional and personal relations you have had with the candidate.

We also request that you identify the leading departments of [candidate name]'s field, and give us your candid judgment on whether [candidate name]'s scholarly [or artistic] work would meet the standards for promotion [and tenure] in those schools (assuming an opening existed and that teaching and service was acceptable). Our reviewers would find your answer especially valuable if the candidate is compared to some individuals at a comparable career stage.

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. [**If applicable:** It will not be read by any member of our faculty who is [a collaborating author][a co-investigator] with the candidate.] It will be studied closely by tenured faculty in

the department and university promotion committees and officials, and it is intended to be read by no one else.

Thank you for considering this request and for your efforts to help the university make an informed decision in this important matter.

## **8.2 For promotion or appointment as a Clinical Scholar at the associate or full professor level.**

Dear [reviewer's title and name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the [Department/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 the designation of Clinical Scholar. If you are able to provide a letter of evaluation, please include a short biographical sketch about yourself, and describe any professional and personal relations you have had with the candidate.

The Clinical Scholar designation, which is not a tenure-track or tenured position, is a high honor awarded by the President of the University. The designation requires a review process as rigorous as the process used for tenure decisions, though with different criteria which are indicated by the questions we ask below.

Please let me know as soon as possible whether or not you are able to assist us by reviewing the enclosed materials and submitting a letter of evaluation by [date] at [contact information]. [***If appropriate:*** In recognition of your effort, we would like to acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$\_\_\_\_.]]

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, our definition of "Clinical Scholar," and a sample of publications. We are requesting an analytical evaluation, rather than general praise or advocacy.

Please also know that we seek your evaluation at an early stage in our process and that we have not yet made a decision. We seek your frank and candid assessment of whether [candidate's name] is recognized at the national or international level for leadership in important translational or clinical research?

Examples of the information we seek, as appropriate to this case:, Has [he/she/they] provided substantial intellectual input and leadership to large collaborative research efforts or clinical trials? Has the candidate been a member of NIH study sections or advisory boards?) Are [candidate's name]'s scholarly peer-reviewed publications of appropriate quality and quantity for the proposed rank, and have they had an impact on the field? Has [candidate's name]'s clinical or translational research or have his/her/their] clinical trials been recognized by significant funding support from appropriate sources over a period of years (e.g., pilot studies or large multicenter studies funded through peer-reviewed federal or non-federal sources)? Has [his/her/their] research funded by contract with companies resulted in significant publications in peer-reviewed journals? Has [candidate's name] demonstrated leadership at the national or international level in improvement of clinical care (e.g., has [he/she/they] established residencies or fellowships for advanced practice, or has [he/she/they] been a member of consensus panels, task forces, or the U.S. Public Health

Service to establish and publish guidelines for patient care management, diagnostic criteria for new diseases, standards for clinical testing, etc.?

***[If the reviewer is a collaborator, the following item should be added:***

As you have collaborated with [candidate's name], please help us to understand [his/her/their] particular contribution(s) to the collaborative work.]

Based on your knowledge of [candidate's name]'s work and accomplishments, can you give examples of institutions (you may include your own) where [he/she/they] would be judged to have met the criteria for the award of the most similar type of appointment or promotion? What aspect of [candidate's name]'s work leads you to this conclusion?

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 it is intended to be read by no one else. Please help us reach an informed decision about whether USC should offer [candidate's name] this [appointment/promotion].

*Revised 2022*

### **8.3 For use when the reviewer is a collaborator.**

Dear [reviewer's title and name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the [Department/School] 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 you are able to assist us by reviewing the enclosed materials and submitting a letter of evaluation by [ ]. ***[if appropriate:*** Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes, we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$\_\_\_\_.]

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 and appointment committees would like to understand [candidate's name]'s contributions to your joint work. Please describe the circumstances in which you know the candidate and came to work together, as well as any other professional or personal relationships you have had.

Please help us to understand [candidate's name]'s contributions to collaborative work, in particular what contributions can be attributed to the candidate, and what leadership did the candidate provide to the work? Also, if any future collaborations are planned, please inform us of what those projects will be and how [he/she/they] will contribute to them.

Finally, at times outside evaluators have direct knowledge about other aspects of a candidate's academic role—including teaching, professional service, public service. If you have this direct knowledge, please add your evaluations of [candidate's name]'s accomplishments in these areas.

We value your frank and detailed judgments highly. We are requesting an analytical evaluation, rather than general praise or advocacy. Please understand that we seek your evaluation at an early stage in our process, and that we have not yet formed a judgment.

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 it 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 2022*

## Appendix

School \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Candidate \_\_\_\_\_

### CHECKLIST FOR DOSSIER PREPARATION

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Recommendation for Appointment form or Recommendation for Promotion form.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>For appointments only: Documentation of position posting or waiver of requirement to post position.</b> Include summary of proactive outreach to ensure equal opportunity. [Only the Provost's Office can waive the requirement to post a position. The offer letter does not need to be included in the dossier.] Please omit any salary information.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>I-A. Administrative and Faculty Assessments</b> (see section 7.1). [Include all applicable assessments from the list below.]
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Dean.</b> Independent assessment and recommendation with a candid explanation of reasons.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>School committee.</b> Report of the school faculty committee that advises the dean. Include vote information.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Department chair.</b> Independent assessment with explanation of department needs and strategic goals. Summary of faculty discussion.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Department faculty.</b> Report of faculty and/ or any committee representing department faculty. Include vote information.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>For interdisciplinary candidates:</b> Any additional evaluations from appropriate departments/ schools. (The second department/ school does not vote.) Note: this is typically only applicable for candidates with joint appointments greater than 0% (see section 1.8).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>I-B. Quantitative Data</b> (see section 7.2). [Include all applicable assessments from the list below.]
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Cohort analysis.</b> Include explanation of how the cohort was chosen.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Chart showing number of candidate's publications or creative works per year.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Citation counts for candidate's publications.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Journal impact factors</b> (or other measures of the candidate's publications, creative work, performance venues, etc.).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>List of grants.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>II. Curriculum Vitae</b> (see section 7.3).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>III. Personal Statement</b> (see section 7.4).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>IV. Teaching Record</b> (see section 7.5). Note: additional evidence of teaching effectiveness should be included in the Appendix (section VII-B).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Teaching memo from department/school.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Teaching statement from candidate.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Chronological list of classes taught, with contact hours and enrollment size.</b> Include independent studies supervised.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>List of principal courses developed or substantially revised.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>List of graduate students and post-docs mentored.</b> Show each advisee's next career position, if available.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>V. Service Record</b> (see section 7.6).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Service statement from candidate (optional).</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Service record.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>VI. External Reviewer Letters</b> (see section 7.7).

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Sample solicitation letter.</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Reviewer chart.</b> Chart should show who suggested the reviewer, the reviewer's relationship to the candidate, and whether the reviewer answered all of the questions. Include all individuals who declined to be reviewers, as well as reasons for declining. Explain the choice of any unusual reviewers.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Reviewer bios.</b> Include a brief reviewer bio before each reviewer letter.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Section VI-A: Substantive letters from arm's-length reviewers.</b> The dossier should include at least five substantive, arm's-length letters.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Section VI-B: Other letters (collaborator, non-arm's-length, non-substantive, etc.).</b> Include all correspondence to and from reviewers who declined.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>VII. Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship, Performance, and Teaching</b> (see section 7.8).
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Section VII-A: Evidence of Scholarship and Performance.</b> Include sample of candidate's recent publications and other scholarly or artistic works. Send books and accepted book manuscripts along with the dossier in digital form. Section VII-A may also include: published reviews of candidate's work, publishers' reviews of candidate's manuscripts, "pink sheets" of pending grants, abstracts and samples of creative work.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Section VII-B: Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness.</b> Include selected course syllabi, student evaluations, classroom observations, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Updated 2022



**University of Southern California  
UCAPT Evaluation Form**

**Name of Candidate:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Appointment/Promotion?** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date of Mandatory Decision of Tenure:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Proposed Rank:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Tenure:** \_\_\_\_\_

**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. Letters of Reference.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. Evidence of Research/Scholarly/Creative Activity...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation of Candidate**

	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; width: 100%;"> <span>Low</span> <span>High</span> </div>									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Please rate this candidate on the scale by marking the appropriate box:										
<b>Teaching</b> .....	<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"/>
<b>Research/Scholarly/Creative Activity</b> .....	<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?

Yes  No  
(if yes, please comment on the reverse of this page)

**Overall Evaluation** .....

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

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

**Reviewed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Overall assessment of the case, main strengths and weaknesses</b>
<b>Assessment of work based on direct examination</b>
<b>Assessment of teaching</b>
<b>Other considerations</b>
<b>Assessment of dean's letter</b>
<b>Assessment of previous level reviews</b>
<b>Assessment of external reviewers</b>
<b>Is the nature of the candidate's contributions adequately explained?</b>
<b>Other comments</b>