This document serves as a guideline for faculty, administrators and staff in the School of Engineering who are involved with appointments, promotions, and tenure. In particular, this document should be read by the department chairs, by faculty members serving on faculty appointment and promotion committees, and by the members of the School of Engineering Appointments, Promotions and Tenure (APT) Committee. It is meant to supplement the University Faculty Handbook. In the event of any conflict between the policy described in here and that described in the Faculty Handbook, the Faculty Handbook shall take precedence.
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1.0 Overview of the APT Process

1.1 General

The faculty of the School of Engineering consists of regular faculty and of non-tenure-track faculty. Regular faculty is comprised of tenure-track and tenured (to be collectively referred to as TT) faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty is comprised of Research Professors, Adjunct Professors and Lecturers (to be collectively referred to as NTT). They have full-time or part-time appointments of a fixed term. This document details the procedures established in the School of Engineering for appointments, promotion, and tenure both of regular (TT) and of non-tenured-track (NTT) faculty. It describes the responsibilities of the department, including the roles of the department chair and the department committee, and of the faculty as a whole. The roles of the School's APT Committee, its chair and the APT subcommittees are also presented.

1.2 Appointment and Promotion Decisions

The decision to appoint or promote a NTT faculty member, or to appoint a faculty member to a non-tenured position, but in the tenure track (Assistant or Associate Professor without tenure) in a primary department or to jointly appoint in a secondary department (joint appointment) or to appoint a Visiting Professor in the School of Engineering is made by the Dean.

The decision to appoint a faculty member to a tenured position or to promote a non-tenured faculty member to a tenured position (Associate Professor or Professor with tenure) or to appoint to the status of Emeritus Professor in the School of Engineering is made by the Provost. An appointment to a tenured position cannot be extended formally to a candidate until the Provost has approved the appointment.

In all cases, the opinion of the faculty of the School on the suitability of the appointment or the promotion is important. It is solicited through a review procedure, which typically occurs at two different levels, the department level and the school level.

1.3 Role of the SoE Faculty on Appointments and Promotions

The following describes the general procedures followed. Faculty evaluation of the candidate occurs at two levels.

(i) Review and evaluation at the department level

- In all cases, appointments and promotions are initiated at the department level. The department reviews all appointments and promotion cases, including appointments to Emeritus Professor status, Visiting Professor appointments, joint appointments in which the department is the secondary department, and part-time appointments.

- The first step involves the preparation of the candidate’s dossier. Detailed instructions on how to assemble the dossier are given in Section 3.2. The departmental committee, in collaboration with the department chair, are responsible for assembling the dossier. The composition and rules of the committee are described in Section 2.1 The departmental committee reviews the dossier, evaluates the candidate and makes a recommendation.
Regarding the appointment or promotion, for all cases except for the appointment of part-time lecturers, whose appointment is decided by the department chair. The committee review and evaluation requires at least a meeting of the entire committee.

- For all cases, except for appointments of a Visiting Professor or a part-time lecturer, the regular faculty of the department, of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion, reviews the committee’s recommendation, evaluates the case and votes by a closed vote on the appointment or promotion. The review and vote require a separate meeting of the department faculty. Part-time lecturer appointments are decided by the department chair and do not require review by the department committee or by the faculty of the department.

- The department chair reviews the committee’s recommendation and the faculty vote and offers his/her own recommendation. The recommendation of the chair is advisory. For the case of a Visiting Professor appointment, the recommendations of the departmental committee and of the chair are directly forwarded to the Dean, bypassing the previous step as well as the APT review step described below.

- For the case of an appointment to a non-tenured Assistant Professor position, appointment to the status of Emeritus Professor, or for all part-time appointments of Research Professors or Adjunct Professors, the departmental recommendation is directly forwarded to the Dean, bypassing the APT review step described below.

- For the case of a part-time lecturer appointment, the chair’s decision is the final step.

(ii) Review and evaluation at the school level

- The review and evaluation of appointment and promotion cases at the School level are conducted by the School’s APT (Appointment, Promotion and Tenure) Committee. Its composition and governing rules are described in Section 2.2.

- The APT Committee evaluates all full-time appointments and promotions, except appointments to a non-tenured Assistant Professor position, appointments to Emeritus Professor, Visiting Professor appointments and joint appointments in which the School is both the primary and the secondary unit. Also, it does not review part-time appointments.

- Members of the APT Committee of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion evaluate the candidate’s dossier, after the case has been evaluated at the department level. The dossier that reaches the APT Committee includes the findings of the department committee, the vote of the department and the recommendation of the chair.

- For appointments or promotions to a tenured position, the dossier is reviewed by the subset of the APT committee, consisting of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion, following the procedure described immediately below.
• For promotion to a tenured position of an internal candidate, a three-member subcommittee of the APT, consisting of faculty members outside the candidate’s own department, and of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion, is appointed by the APT chair. The subcommittee evaluates the dossier of the candidate and makes a recommendation to those members of the APT committee, whose rank is higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion. At least one meeting of the full subcommittee is required. The members of the APT committee, whose rank is higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion, subsequently discuss the findings of the subcommittee and vote by a close vote, on the appointment or promotion, during one of the scheduled APT meetings. The APT chair summarizes the discussion and the findings of the APT committee in a memo to the Dean. The results of the vote, the subcommittee findings and the APT chair’s memo constitute the final APT recommendation.

• For appointments to a tenured position of an external candidate, the members of the APT committee, whose rank is higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment, evaluate the dossier and subsequently vote on the appointment or promotion. The specific form used for this purpose is given in Appendix B. In such cases, no meeting of the APT committee is required, unless at least one member makes such a request. The results of the vote constitute the final APT recommendation.

• For appointments or promotions of a NTT faculty or for joint appointments, the dossier is reviewed only by the three-member APT Executive Committee, the composition and governing rules of which are described in Section 2.2. The results of this review constitute the final APT recommendation. The specific form used for this purpose is given in Appendix A.

• The final APT recommendation is forwarded to the Dean. The decision of the APT is advisory to the Dean.

Taking into consideration the recommendation of the above faculty bodies, the Dean makes the final decision for appointment or promotion cases that do not involve the granting of tenure. For cases involving the granting of tenure, the Dean forwards to the Provost the candidate’s dossier, which now contains in addition the APT findings and recommendations and a memo by the Dean containing his/her own evaluation. The Provost in consultation with the UCAPT Committee makes the final decision on the case.

As noted above, for appointments to Emeritus Professor status and for Visiting Professor appointments, the review and evaluation occurs at the department level only and consists of the following:

• The appointment is initiated at the level of the department (secondary in the case of joint appointments).

• As in the case of a primary appointment, the first step involves the preparation of the candidate’s dossier. For the case of Visiting Professor appointment or for appointments to the status of Emeritus Professor, the dossier needs not be as extensive as for the other appointments, and may consist only of the candidate’s curriculum vitae. The department
chair and a departmental (usually, a three-member) committee are responsible for assembling this dossier.

- The departmental committee evaluates the dossier and makes a recommendation regarding the appointment.
- With the exception of Visiting Professor appointments, the full-time regular faculty of the department reviews the committee’s recommendations and provides a final vote on the appointment.
- The department chair reviews the committee’s recommendation and the faculty vote and offers his/her own recommendation.

The recommendation of the department is forwarded to the Dean, who makes the final decision on the appointment.

2.0 COMPOSITION, CHARGE AND GOVERNING RULES OF THE COMMITTEES

2.1 DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE

A. Membership

For appointments to a primary department, the departmental committee consists of three members, of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion. If the appointment is to a tenured or tenure-track position, only regular faculty (tenured or tenure-track) can serve in the committee or participate in the vote. For appointments or promotion to a tenured position, only tenured faculty can participate in the committee. In the case of appointments to a non-tenured, but tenure-track, position (Assistant Professor or Associate Professor without tenure), the departmental committee can be de facto the search (faculty recruitment) committee. If the appointment is to a non-tenure-track position, the committee may also include NTT faculty, however, the majority of the committee members must be regular (TT) faculty members.

For the case of secondary appointments to a tenured or tenure-track position, the committee members must be tenured and the majority must be of a rank higher than or equal to that of the candidate. For the case of secondary appointments to a non-tenure-track position, the majority of the committee members must be regular faculty members, and the same or a different majority must be of a rank higher than or equal to that of the candidate.

The committee membership is dictated by the following rules:

1. The nature of the appointment or promotion places constraints on the rank and title of the members of the committee, as described above. These constraints must be obeyed.

2. Depending on the culture and history of the individual department, committee members are either appointed by the chair or elected by the faculty.
3. A member of the committee usually serves for a two-year term. In case the member is unable to complete the term, he or she must be replaced by another.

4. Committee members may not serve for more than two consecutive terms.

5. When the committee is de facto the search (faculty recruitment) committee, as described above, committee membership is determined by the department chair or as the specific department policy otherwise dictates.

6. Faculty members who hold administrative appointments at the same time (such as department chair, associate department chair, dean, or associate dean) may not serve in the committee.

7. Any individual holding an appointment on the APT Committee cannot be simultaneously a member of the department committee.

8. The department chair designates one of the members of the committee as the committee chair.

In practice, exceptions to the above rules may be unavoidable. For example, in the case of small departments, due to scarcity of faculty in the required rank, it is possible that some committee members may serve for more than two consecutive terms or that the same individual may also serve in the APT Committee. For the case of large departments with a heavy load in appointment, promotion and tenure decisions, the committee term may be shortened to one year only. Whenever existing, these mitigating circumstances must be documented.

B. Committee Charge

The departmental committee is charged with the following:

- Assembling the candidate’s dossier, in collaboration with the department chair. The guidelines for assembling the dossier are described in Section 3.2.

- Reviewing the dossier and evaluating the candidacy for the appointment or promotion. Guidelines for such an evaluation are provided in Section 3.1.

- Providing a written report of their evaluation and their recommendation, including minority opinions, if any, to the department chair.

- As previously noted, the committee review and evaluation requires at least a meeting of the entire committee.

The regular faculty of the department, of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion, evaluates the dossier, which now includes the committee’s recommendation, and votes by a closed vote on the appointment or promotion. The review and vote require a separate meeting of the department faculty. The department chair provides a written memo to the Dean, summarizing the discussion of the departmental faculty and vote and
providing his/her own recommendation. The candidate’s dossier containing the departmental assessments is forwarded to the APT Committee.

C. Governing Rules and Procedures

In all deliberations for appointments or promotion, confidentiality is central to the proper and effective functioning. Specific guidelines are described in Section 3.3.

In all voting procedures, Robert's Rules of Order is followed. A quorum of the Department faculty is defined as a minimum of 2/3 of the eligible voting membership. A faculty member serving in the APT Committee or the UCAPT Committee may vote in the departmental meeting but cannot vote in the respective meeting of the APT or the UCAPT. The Dean does not vote in his/her departmental meeting. Absentee ballots are allowed, but are recorded as such. A member casting such a ballot is also included as part of the quorum. All votes are secret. Faculty serving as a proxy for a member shall not be included as part of the quorum for faculty promotion cases, but will be included as part of the quorum for faculty appointment cases.

D. Department Activity Schedule

The following table is the recommended schedule for the processing of appointment and promotion cases of internal candidates to tenured positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assemble dossier (including letters of reference)</td>
<td>Spring semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental committee report submitted to the department faculty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For promotion of tenured faculty</td>
<td>mid-August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For promotion of non-tenured faculty</td>
<td>early October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental report and candidate’s dossier (one original and three copies) submitted to the APT Committee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For promotion of tenured faculty</td>
<td>September 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For promotion of non-tenured faculty</td>
<td>November 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important that the schedule of activities be adhered to as closely as possible, as the Dean’s recommendation needs to reach the Provost’s office by specific deadlines, as described below. In all cases, early submission of dossiers to the APT is strongly encouraged. For the appointment of NTT faculty, a specific timetable does not need to be followed.

E. Special Considerations Involving Promotion to a Tenured Position

One of the most significant promotion decisions is the granting of tenure. At the time of appointment the maximum probationary period (and its associated Tenure Decision Date (TDD)) must be determined. This may range from seven years (in the case of no prior full-time professor appointment) to four years (with three or more years prior full-time professor appointment). The
maximum probationary period is seven years. Tenure review may, of course, occur earlier than the year when the TDD is scheduled.

Sometimes it may be difficult to determine when a candidate is considered as having started his/her academic career. If there is a question about the starting time of the “tenure clock”, the department chair should request a written clarification from the Dean. This should be done before the candidate's dossier is submitted to the APT Committee.

If the candidate would like to request that his/her TDD be changed, the candidate must request in writing that the department petition the Dean. The Dean forwards this request to the Provost and his/her designated committee. It should be noted that such requests are not always approved.

The candidate must be informed about the tenure decision prior to the TDD, so as to permit the candidate to remain as a SoE faculty member at least one additional year, without violating the maximum probationary period in the event that a negative decision is reached. For example, in case the probationary period is seven years, the candidate must be notified before the end (commencement) of the sixth year whether he or she is to be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure or whether a terminal one-year contract will be issued. This further implies that the department must begin to consider the case at the latest at the end of year five, with the dossier submitted to the APT committee at the latest by November 1 of the candidate's sixth year.

Generally, an Assistant Professor is considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in his/her sixth year of service. A candidate can only be recommended for “early” promotion if he/she has an excellent chance of approval.

It is important that the department forwards to the APT Committee a complete dossier (including letters of reference), even if the department vote is negative. AAUP guidelines specify that every candidate is entitled to a full review and that he/she may be denied tenure only if two or more of the three levels of University reviews return negative results. If the candidate provides a written request that the Department not prepare a dossier, the Department may grant such a request.

If the candidate receives a negative decision, at any level, he/she may file a written appeal directed to that level. The appeal must state clearly why a reconsideration of the case is warranted. Typical reasons include overlooked materials or errors in the evaluation process. The appeal will be forwarded through the department (if applicable) and the Dean to the Provost. If approved, the case is reevaluated. In either case, the file is forwarded to the next higher level for review. If, at the end of the process, a final negative decision is reached by the Provost, the candidate is informed of the decision in writing by the department chair, after the latter’s consultation with the Dean.

2.2 APT COMMITTEE

A. Membership

The APT committee consists of 9 Professors, representing the nine departments of the School, and of 5 Associate Professors at-large. The committee is formed every academic year. The terms of service of the APT members is two years. An individual holding an appointment on the UCAPT cannot be a member of the School of Engineering APT Committee at the same time.
The Full Professors are elected from the faculty of each of the following departments: Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering-Electrophysics, Electrical Engineering-Systems, Industrial and Systems Engineering, and Materials Science. They are elected using the following guidelines:

1. The regular faculty of each department elects a Professor as a representative of the department to the APT Committee. In case the elected representative is unable to complete his/her term, another representative is elected to complete the term.

2. The department chair may not serve.

3. The representative may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

The five Associate Professors (also known as at-large members) are elected by the entire regular (TT) faculty of the School, based on nominations received from the departments and/or from any faculty member. The at-large members are elected in a process conducted by the Dean’s office. In case an at-large member becomes promoted during his/her term of service, he/she must be replaced by another at-large member, elected by the faculty of the School.

B. Committee Charge

The APT Committee is charged with the following:

- Reviewing the dossier of a candidate for appointment or promotion, after the departmental review and evaluation, and evaluating the candidacy for the appointment or promotion. Guidelines for the evaluation are the same as for the departmental evaluation and are provided in Section 3.1.

- Providing a written record of their evaluation and their recommendation, including minority opinions, if any, to the Dean.

- The recommendation of the APT is advisory to the Dean.

In addition, the APT Committee is charged with

- Reviewing the recommendations of the departments to the Dean regarding the annual faculty merit evaluations.

The committee charge is delivered to the APT by the Dean, at the beginning of the academic year, during the first APT committee meeting.

While the membership of the committee expires at the end of the academic year, faculty appointments do occur during the summer months. In such cases, special sessions of the APT Committee or its Executive Committee may be necessary.

C. Committee Organization
In the first meeting of the APT Committee, which takes place at the beginning of the academic year, the committee elects:

- the Executive Committee, consisting of three members at the rank of Full Professor, and
- the Merit Review subcommittee, consisting of four members of any rank. Its function is described in Section 2.2F below.

The prior chair of the APT Committee, or its most senior member, in case the chair has completed his/her term, serves as the interim chair during the first meeting. The new chair of the APT Committee is appointed by the Dean from the three elected members of the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee serves the Dean in an advisory capacity on APT matters, which do not require the consideration of the full committee. This is intended to relieve the full committee of burdens, which are not central to its primary role.

The chair is responsible with the following:

- Calling the committee meetings.
- Assigning subcommittees, including a subcommittee chair, to evaluate and review appointment and promotion cases.
- Meeting with the APT Executive Committee on matters of its jurisdiction.
- Summarizing in a memo to the Dean the findings of the APT Committee for each appointment and promotion case.
- Interfacing with the academic departments and the Dean’s office, through the office of the Dean for Academic Affairs.

D. Governing Rules and Procedures

As noted previously, the procedures are different for the promotion to a tenured position of an internal candidate, the appointment to a tenured position of an external candidate and the appointment or promotion of a full-time NNT faculty member. These are detailed below.

Promotion to a tenured position of an internal candidate

Upon the notification by the department to the Dean’s office of a pending promotion case, the chair of the APT Committee appoints a three-member APT subcommittee (including a subcommittee chair), whose members are of a rank higher than that of the candidate, and who do not belong to the same department as that of the candidate. Each member of the subcommittee is given a copy of the dossier for review and evaluation. The Administrative Assistant for Academic Affairs at the Dean’s office arranges for the subcommittee members to receive the dossier. The subcommittee reviews and evaluates the candidacy and provides a written and signed report of its recommendations to the APT chair, for the consideration of the APT Committee. At least one meeting of the full subcommittee is required. Guidelines to be followed
during the evaluation are given in Section 3.1. The subcommittee should endeavor to report their findings within two (2) weeks of its formation. If the subcommittee has not completed its task within 30 working days, the APT Chair may appoint a new subcommittee.

Upon receipt of the subcommittee’s written report, the APT chair calls for a meeting of the APT members, of a rank higher than the candidate’s. These members are required to review and evaluate the candidate’s dossier in advance of the meeting. The findings of the subcommittee become available to the APT committee during the meeting, when the report is distributed to all attending members. Following a discussion of the case, a vote is taken. In voting, Robert's Rules of Order is followed. A quorum of the APT Committee is defined as a minimum of 2/3 of the eligible voting membership, namely:

- 2/3 of the eligible Professors (8) is 6
- 2/3 of the entire APT Committee (14) is 10

Absentee ballots are allowed, but are recorded as such. A member casting such a ballot is also included as part of the quorum. All votes are secret. Faculty serving as a proxy for a member shall not be included as part of the quorum for faculty promotion cases, but will be included as part of the quorum for faculty appointment cases. If any of the members serving on the APT subcommittee for a candidate cannot be present to vote at the meeting, they will be required to submit an absentee ballot, prior to the vote.

The APT chair summarizes the discussion of the APT committee and the resulting vote in a written memo to the Dean. The dossier, including now the APT subcommittee’s report and the APT chair’s memo, is forwarded to the Dean for his/her evaluation.

Appointment to a tenured position of an external candidate

Upon the notification by the department to the Dean’s office of a pending case for the appointment to a tenured position of an external candidate, the members of the APT Committee of a rank higher than or equal to that of the candidate are notified. Each member is required to review and evaluate the dossier, which is available in the Dean's office, within a fixed period, usually not exceeding one week. The evaluation will be formal and requires completing the evaluation form shown in Appendix B. Provided that a quorum of written responses are received by the due date, the following actions are taken:

(a) If no reviewer has requested a meeting, the vote would be summarized in a letter written by the chair of the APT Executive Committee, and forwarded to the Dean. No meeting would be held.

(b) If at least one reviewer has requested a meeting, then the dossier would be discussed at an APT meeting to be held on the first Monday following the request. A formal discussion, followed by a secret vote would be taken at that time. A letter summarizing the APT discussion and vote would be written by the APT chair and forwarded to the Dean.

In the event that a quorum of responses is not received by the due date, the due date will be extended until a quorum is reached.
Appointment or promotion of a full-time NNT faculty member

Upon the notification by the department to the Dean’s office of a pending case for the appointment or promotion of a full-time NNT faculty member, the APT Executive Committee is notified. The candidate’s dossier is reviewed by the APT Executive Committee, as soon as practicable. Their recommendation is the final report of the APT Committee, unless the Executive Committee decides to present the case to the full APT Committee for a vote. Following the decision of the Executive Committee (or the APT Committee, depending on the case), the APT chair will prepare and submit an appropriate recommendation memorandum to the Dean. The guidelines for appointments to the ranks of Research faculty require a level of research distinction in the field equivalent to the comparable tenure-track faculty appointments.

E. APT Activity Schedule

The following table is the recommended schedule for the processing of appointment and promotion cases of internal candidates to tenured positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental report and candidate’s dossier (one original and three copies) submitted to the dean’s office for APT review:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For promotions of tenured faculty</td>
<td>September 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT recommendation forwarded to the Dean by October 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s recommendation forwarded to the Provost by October 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For promotions of non-tenured faculty</td>
<td>November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT recommendation forwarded to the Dean by December 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s recommendation forwarded to the Provost by February 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For appointments to tenured positions of external candidates or for appointments of NNT faculty, dossiers will be evaluated as they arrive at the APT committee. In all cases, early submission of dossiers is strongly encouraged.

F. The Merit Review Subcommittee

The Merit Review Subcommittee reviews the annual faculty merit evaluations presented by the departments to the Dean. The membership of the subcommittee consists of four members from at least three different departments, drawn jointly from the APT and the EFC (ideally including members who happen to serve simultaneously in both faculty bodies). The charge of the subcommittee is to review the procedures followed in the annual faculty merit recommendations suggested to the Dean by the department, and to assess whether or not due process, as stipulated in the various departmental, school and university procedures and guidelines, was indeed followed. The subcommittee elects a chair, who arranges for the subcommittee to meet individually with all department chairs, after all merit reviews have been finalized. A member of the subcommittee who belongs to the same department as the department chair interviewed is excused from that meeting. The committee summarizes its findings in a confidential report to the
Dean, with copies to the APT and EFC chairs. A non-confidential summary of the report (that excludes specific mention of department names) is distributed to the APT and EFC members. If the report identifies a violation of due process by a specific department, the EFC representative of the affected department is notified by the EFC chair of the contents of the report pertaining to that department, and is asked to disseminate this information confidentially to the departmental faculty for their information.

3.0 GUIDELINES ON EVALUATION OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CASES AND ON DOSSIER PREPARATION

3.1 GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

This section is verbatim taken from the Provost’s guidelines. If an addition is made that specifically pertains to practices of the School of Engineering it is included as a Remark.

General Provisions

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

Provost's Responsibility

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

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

Consistency

All those participating in the review should take care to follow the Faculty Handbook and these guidelines, so that actual practice observes the stated criteria. Any exceptions should be authorized by the Provost. Protections against discrimination apply with full force to the appointment, promotion and tenure process and the criteria for decisions are consistent over time among candidates with different personal characteristics—such as race, gender, disability, and
national origin. Consistency in criteria does not mean, however, that a dossier is compared to the weakest case recently approved; each action is judged by national standards and should aim at improving the average quality of the department.

Committee members and administrators, when reviewing candidates in disciplines with which they are familiar, will take care to observe the standard tenure processes rather than, for example, seeking external advice not documented in the dossier.

Standards

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

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

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

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

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

University and community service are supplementary, not primary, criteria. UCAPT looks for evidence that the candidate for tenure makes a contribution to the collective academic enterprise and that it is positive not negative. For promotion to professor, UCAPT asks whether the candidate has fulfilled his or her responsibility to carry out the service functions of the University and to mentor junior faculty.
The academic needs of the academic unit are considered. UCAPT looks to the department to explain how important the candidate's field is within the broader discipline, and values letters from department chairs that explain how a candidate's research and teaching fit into the unit's strategy for excellence.

Gauges of Quality

- It continues to be so, as it has been for many years, that we expect each new appointment and grant of tenure to improve the quality of the appointing department.
- We have long expected our faculty to meet the national and international standards for promotion and tenure applied by peer universities.
- We have long asked how the candidate ranks nationally among the cohort of colleagues working in the same area, because a comparative judgment is an essential part of a grant of tenure to one person to the exclusion of others who might be sought instead. Similarly we continue to ask whether a promotion candidate is good enough for a lateral, look-over visit, so that internal candidates be considered in the context of the potential pool of external appointments.

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

School Clarifications

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

These guidelines as well as any published school clarifications on criteria, relative weights of criteria, and evidence should be provided to each promotion sub-committee when it starts work. Appropriate excerpts may be provided each referee asked for an evaluation. They should be quoted in the committee reports as a reference point in evaluation of the individual's teaching and scholarship.

Please explain and justify any dossiers that deviate significantly from-established standards.

Process

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

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

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

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

**Extensions of Tenure Decision Date; Parenting Leaves**

If a tenure-track faculty member believes the Tenure Decision Date was not properly set according to the Faculty Handbook, or the individual believes there is any other reason that justifies an extension or revision of the Tenure Decision Date, it is important that the individual make a written request promptly, as soon as the reason arises. Such requests are submitted by the individual through the department chair and dean to the Provost, and are considered by the Committee on Probationary Deadlines, which advises the Provost. Only the Provost, on the President's behalf, has authority to grant or deny such requests. It would be rare for the Provost to extend the Tenure Decision Date on the basis of UCAPT's own consideration.

A tenure-track faculty member who during the probationary period at USC gives birth or fathers a child, or adopts a child under age six, will on timely request to the Provost receive an one-year extension of the Tenure Decision Date under the policies set forth in the Faculty Handbook. (As provided in the Handbook, the tenure-track faculty member will also receive on request ten weeks paid leave of absence, which runs concurrently with any paid maternity disability leave; additional unpaid leave may also be a right under the law.)

**Pre-Tenure Reviews**

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

The year before the tenure decision (generally fifth year), each candidate should discuss the process with the department chair and take stock, to consider whether the candidate should go forward for tenure evaluation or should seek other career paths. The candidate may notify the dean in writing that he or she does not wish to be considered for tenure, or the school may decide to issue a terminal year letter.

A dossier put forward for promotion or tenure earlier than usual does not need to meet any enhanced standard; number of years in rank is not a part of our requirements. It continues to be the practice that, if there is an early review, a negative tenure decision by the Provost will usually result in issuance of a terminal year letter though, rarely, the Provost may permit a case to be withdrawn and resubmitted by the original or revised Tenure Decision Date as the Provost determines.

**Deadlines for Dossiers**

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

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

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

An extremely late dossier submission to UCAPT risks being interpreted as a sign that the candidate is not serious about an academic career, that the department had doubts so troubling that they were unwilling to make a timely recommendation, or alternatively that there has been extremely bad management. It is important, therefore, that dossiers submitted with a significant delay contain a clear discussion of the origins of the delay. A promotion dossier not involving
tenure, which is submitted extremely late after the October 15 deadline, may be returned for re-submission the following year.

It is not permissible for a department or school to plan to submit a tenure dossier after the Tenure Decision Date. Such a delay will be treated as extremely bad management.

Supplementing the Dossier

While a dossier is under consideration, the department or dean can supplement it with new information. If those responsible for conducting the review receive letters or information on the decision, outside the usual process, they will add the letters or summaries of the conversations to the dossier so that later levels of review can appraise them for what they are worth.

Confidentiality

All USC faculty participating in the process at any stage must respect its confidentiality, and not reveal votes, the names or views of referees, the contents of discussions, or the contents of the dossier.

Multiple levels of review

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

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

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

Role of UCAPT and the Provost

UCAPT is advisory to the Provost. UCAPT's panels seek to assure that there is appropriate consistency in standards across units, that candidates' performance meets the standards of national peer institutions, and that the quality of a school's faculty progresses over time. When UCAPT panel members raise questions about the adequacy of the dossier at the panel meeting or in advance, the Provost's office will contact the dean to give him or her an opportunity to submit supplemental material.
The Provost reads all promotion and tenure dossiers and generally meets personally with the UCAPT panel in tenure decisions. The ultimate responsibility for granting promotion and tenure and for appointing associate professors or professors rests with the Provost, on behalf of the President.

Communicating Decisions

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

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

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

Finality

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

3.2 Dossier Preparation

This section contains a description of the dossier format for an appointment or promotion case. It should be followed as specified.

The dossier should be placed in a three-ring binder, with sections in the order shown below, and with tabs for easy identification. Prepare 4 dossiers, 1 original and 3 copies. The department may also want to copy 1 additional dossier for their files. All dossiers should be hand-delivered to the Dean’s office (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs). The dossier should consist of the following:

(Items I through VII below are verbatim taken from the Provost’s guidelines issued on February 14, 2001. If an addition is made that specifically pertains to practices of the School of Engineering, it is included as a Remark.)
I. Administration and Faculty Assessments

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

The Importance of Candor

The committees should try to foresee and discuss what questions may be raised later in the process, and should particularly consider whatever is least strong in the dossier. Explain the reasoning of both the majority and minority, and explain the committee's responses to negative views expressed in discussions or in the referees' letters. UCAPT expects to see a summary of all sides of the discussion, presenting pros and cons and tradeoffs. Some schools have long done this in their reports, and this type of analysis is a highly positive factor, not a negative one.

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

Documenting the Process Fully

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

Copies of all subcommittee and committee reports, data on all votes, and all letters and summaries of conversations with those asked to be referees must be included in the dossier. If a dean or chair, or any individual faculty member involved in the process, has reason to question the usefulness, accuracy, or integrity of any of these items, memos explaining that conclusion may be included in the dossier, but the questioned material should not be removed or altered. For example, if a committee votes twice, or a second subcommittee is appointed, the earlier information should be included along with an explanation of the process.

Departments and schools should not attempt to exclude from the dossier information they fear later levels may misinterpret, retake votes so they appear unanimous, or skew the selection of referees to achieve some desired outcome. Instead they should append explanations of what they believe is the appropriate significance of all the available information. Faculty colleagues on school and university committees will be as able as the department is to assess the information properly, as long as the department includes appropriate explanation.
Those colleagues who judge a promotion or grant of tenure to be unjustified can be most helpful if they submit thoughtful analysis, and they should not try to campaign in opposition. Individual faculty members who wish to ensure that their views are adequately represented in the dossier may write directly to the department chair, dean, or UCAPT with their analysis; these letters will be included in the dossier.

Avoiding Redundancy

Often dossiers can be shortened without loss of substance. If higher review levels within the school adopt the reasoning of a previous report, they can just say that. However, each review needs to reflect what was seen at that level as most persuasive and as most problematic.

There is no need for committees or deans to repeat or summarize what is already in the file, including referees' letters and career summary. The decision can often be greatly expedited if later levels do not delay the process by preparing a redundant document, but simply put down their analysis of the issues in the dossier, present pros and cons and tradeoffs, and set forth the real reasons for their recommendation.

Educating Those Outside the Department

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

- The quality of the journals and presses published in, or conferences presented at,
- The significance of co-authorships and of first or last authorships, in that discipline,
- What level and type of peer-review external funding is desirable.
- Whether citation frequency is important.

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

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

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

Dean's Responsibility

The dean's personal decision in promotion and tenure cases is the most important exercise of judgment and strategic thinking of all his or her responsibilities and, of course, the dean need not agree with the recommendations of the school-level committee. Indeed, an honest and independent assessment by all the individuals and committees who participate in the process is
central to a meaningful review. School-level committees and deans will of course consider what has been said at lower levels, and if they disagree the higher level should give reasons for the disagreement. The dean's letter should have a final paragraph summarizing the candidate's contributions to the field.

**Interdisciplinary and International Scholarship and Teaching**

If a candidate's scholarship is interdisciplinary, the department and school should take special care to evaluate the work properly. If work does not match the departments' priorities, but does further school or University priorities, that should be explained. The evaluation of quality and quantity should be distinguished from discussion of how the work fits strategies for excellence. Material on interdisciplinary evaluation would usually be included in the dossier by the department chair or departmental committee.

It will be very helpful to UCAPT if the department requests an evaluation of inter-disciplinary scholarship from the appropriate other USC department(s) or program(s), even if from another school. (See also the section below on selection of referees.)

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

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

**Remark:** The remainder summarizes the key aspects of administration and faculty assessments, pertaining to the School of Engineering:

1. The department committee report should reflect:

   (a) The critical assessment of the candidate's qualifications for teaching and scholarship;

   (b) A description of the screening process (include identification of the persons who conducted the review); and

   (c) The substantive arguments in a division of opinion.

2. The department chair should:

   (a) Describe the department's needs;

   (b) Identify the candidate's qualifications to advance the academic plan;

   (c) Report the faculty vote;
(d) Discuss any disagreement with the screening committee's judgments or procedures.

3. The School of Engineering APT Committee statement should reflect:

(a) The critical assessment of the candidate's qualifications for teaching and scholarship;

(b) A description of the APT review process (include identification of the persons who conducted the review); and

(c) The substantive arguments in a division of opinion.

4. The report of the APT Committee chair should summarize the views of the APT Committee concerning the candidate's qualifications. The vote of the Committee should be reported, and the discussion in the report should reflect this vote.

This section should also include the Recommendation for Promotion or Appointment Form. Be certain to include the mandatory tenure decision date or the date when tenure at USC was granted, whichever is applicable. When available, a copy of the appointment letter (with salary deleted) and current contract showing the Tenure Decision Date (for cases involving tenure) should be included. Copies of all the candidate's annual faculty records should be included if the dossier is for promotion and the candidate is a USC faculty.

II. Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae and bibliography need to be complete, current, and accurate. Exact dates of academic degrees, previous employment, and publications are essential, as are exact faculty and staff titles with modifiers (and explanation of tenure-track status if it is unclear.)

Include a bibliography of publications or list of creative works:
- Articles in refereed journals should be separate from other publications;
- Publications should not be mixed with presentations such as invited lectures and seminars; and
- First and last page numbers should be listed for each publication.

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

The difficulty of obtaining funding in some fields and the inappropriateness of funding in other fields is recognized by those reviewing the dossier.
Remark: For SoE dossiers, the following are also applicable.

Education:
• School, degree earned, year

Employment History:
• Title, place of employment, period of employment

Publications:
• Refereed journal articles
• Books (excluding edited works)
• Edited works (such as journals and proceedings)
• Chapters in books
• Refereed conference proceedings
• Technical reports
• Other scholarly publications

Within the publications category, items that have not yet appeared should clearly be marked either as "accepted - to appear" or "submitted." Manuscripts in preparation should not be listed. Briefly outline the contribution of the candidate in each publication.

• Research grants (list all Co-Investigators)

In the description of the research funding activity, please describe title, funding agency, funding amount, funding duration, co-PIs and the specific role of the candidate in the research funding.

Teaching:
• Doctoral students
  - Graduated (list graduation dates)
  - Currently in a doctoral program

III. Personal Statement

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

IV. Teaching Record

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

The teaching record should next include the following information:

• A chronological list of classes taught with the contact hours for each.
Principal courses developed or substantially revised;
The courses' place in the department's instructional efforts;
Student and faculty evaluation of instructional effectiveness;
Summaries of standardized teaching evaluations; and
A list of graduate students mentored (past and present) showing each one’s next career position.

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

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

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

1. Evidence of teaching effectiveness, including empirical evidence of increases in students' skills and knowledge beyond that achieved in comparable courses.

2. Evidence that the candidate has sought out information on teaching strategies whose effectiveness has been demonstrated in educational research, and applied those strategies in course planning and instruction.

3. A program of regular collegial review and focused classroom visitations over a period of years, including forward-looking advice. This is a highly valuable method of evaluation.

4. Classroom observations by colleagues close to the time of consideration for promotion. One school has each member of the departmental subcommittee visit at least two classes taught by the candidate, and submit individual written evaluations for consideration by the full department.

5. Student evaluation, if used, should be based on a process that seeks 100% participation rate (e.g., one school collects the evaluation form before distributing the final exam.) Such data should be compared to departmental and school baselines. This method, however, is often overrated; it is not sufficient in itself to judge an instructor’s teaching effectiveness, and should only be used as one indication among others.

6. Course syllabi provided to students are especially useful evidence, if they demonstrate clearly what the teaching approaches are for a given course, what students are expected to be able to do at the end of the course, and how reaching those objectives will be evaluated.

7. Departments often evaluate graduate and post-graduate teaching in part by seeking evidence of later success by those students.

8. Some departments choose a sample of former students and ask them by interview or letter to evaluate the teaching. These students may not be suggested nor solicited by the candidate. Please explain the selection method and enclose the solicitation letter.

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

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

V. Service

Include available evidence of University, professional and community service activity related to the candidate's field, such as journal editorial boards. Assess the quality and the effectiveness of the contributions.

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

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

VI. Referees’ Letters of Evaluation

Solicitation of Letters

A template letter to solicit an evaluation is attached (along with an alternative template for very senior appointments.) If the department wants to rephrase the letter, the dean must consult with the Provost’s office in advance. Requests for letters of evaluation must always ask the appropriate version of the question whether the candidate’s work meets the standards for a similar position at the referee's own institution. If letters are submitted that do not address this question, a supplemental request must be made by mail or email, explaining that our committees find such evaluations very useful.

Selection of Referees

If a referee is not a leading scholar at a major research university, please explain why he or she is an expert whose judgment is important to us. We understand that some universities, while not necessarily in the top tier, have individuals who are widely considered first class.

Include referees from the broader discipline as well as the subspecialty. For interdisciplinary scholarship, the lists of external referees should include experts from the other discipline, as well as experts in the individual's own type of interdisciplinary scholarship. It will be particularly valuable to UCAPT if help is requested from other appropriate USC department(s) or program(s), even if in another school, in defining the list of referees.

Some of the letters may be from the profession when the candidate is from a non-academic background, is being considered for a position where performance or other creative activity is key, or works in an area where impact on policy and practice is a legitimate criterion for influence on the field. Nevertheless, even in such cases a minimum of six letters from independent academic referees must be included to explain whether the candidate would qualify for that appointment at their own institutions.
It would be unusual to seek the judgment of faculty holding a lower rank than that proposed for the candidate, or to seek the judgment of non-tenured faculty on a question of tenure.

Internal letters of evaluation are generally not as informative as letters from eminent external referees.

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

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

The list of referees, and the reasons for unusual choices, should be reviewed by the dean early enough in the process so there is time to seek additional referees, if needed, to provide a dossier adequate for UCAPT’s review.

**Number of Letters**

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

(Directory listings or full C.V.’s are not helpful).

Of the ten or more letters in total, there should be a minimum of six letters from academic leaders in tenure-granting major universities, who are independent of the candidate (not suggested by the candidate, and not connected to the candidate by collaboration, friendship, or colleagueship at the same institution), who give a substantive analysis and who explain whether the referee believes the candidate's work meets the standards for a similar position as applied at the referee's own institution. Substantive analysis necessitates penetrating evaluation of a candidate's scholarly or creative contributions (usually requiring at least two single-spaced pages.)

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

**Organization of Letter Section of Dossier**

Preface the set of letters with a chart, showing for each referee who suggested the name, whether the referee has ties of friendship, colleagueship or collaboration with the candidate, and whether the referee’s letter answers all the questions in the letter of request.
The chart should include all referees approached, including all those who decline for lack of time or any other reason. The reasons for declining should be included.

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

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

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

Provide copies of all letters and e-mail received from referees and notes on all phone calls with them. Please explain if an unusual number of referees decline to provide letters.

**Quoting or Naming Referees in Reports**

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

**Who Contacts Referees**

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

**Honorarium**

A department may if it wishes offer an honorarium to referees in recognition that a thorough evaluation takes time and effort.

*Remark: For SoE dossiers, the following are also applicable.*
No preliminary communication with potential referees, for example to "feel them out," is permitted. All letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Letters to the referees should include the candidate's curriculum vita that conforms to the format presented above. In general, appointments that do not include a request for tenure may contain a minimum number of letters (at least three).

The dossier must include a discussion of the qualifications of the referee for each name solicited. It is highly recommended that the discussion include a published biography (from such sources as Who's Who in Engineering, American Men and Women of Science, etc.) whenever available, and as many details which document the research and academic qualifications of the referee as possible. The credibility of a recommendation is only as good as the documented qualifications of the referee.

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

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

Remark: The above guidelines pertain to all appointment and promotion cases involving tenure. For the appointments or promotions of NTT faculty, the components of the dossier pertaining to teaching (for the case of appointments of Research Professors) or research (for the case of appointments of Lecturers) are not necessary. The evaluation criteria for appointments to the ranks of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor or Research Professor require a level of distinction in the research field of the candidate equivalent to the comparable tenure-track appointments. Likewise, appointments to Lecturer or Senior Lecturer require a level of distinction in the teaching field of the candidate equivalent to the comparable tenure-track appointments.

To facilitate the flow diagram of the dossier preparation for the consideration of the Provost, a checklist is attached in Appendix D.

3.3 Confidentiality

Confidentiality is central to the proper and effective functioning of the APT Committee. For the candidate and the School, it is essential that the appointments, promotion and tenure process adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity, which require that complete confidentiality be maintained throughout all steps of the process. The following should be kept in mind.

1. With the exception of information the mission of the APT Committee dictates must be distributed, all information must be held in the strictest confidence, and not be distributed without unanimous consent of the APT Committee.

2. It is mandatory that the letter of the APT chair records the vote of the APT Committee on the candidate's case, and that it does not contain names, affiliations or other attributes of members of the APT Committee other than the Chair. This letter is to be delivered by the Chair of the APT Committee (as part of the candidate's file) to the Dean's Assistant to the APT Committee and nowhere else.
3. It is mandatory that the APT subcommittee report letter does not contain names, affiliations or other attributes of members of the APT Committee, with the possible exception of members of the candidate's subcommittee and the chair of the APT Committee. This report is to be addressed to the chair of the APT Committee who will deliver it (as part of the candidate's dossier) to the Dean's Assistant to the APT Committee and nowhere else.

4. The APT Committee will from time to time distribute other information, for example, procedural memos, organizational memos, or position papers. In all cases, this information is to be distributed in the form of a letter from the chair of the APT Committee to the Dean's Assistant to the APT Committee. In all cases, it should not contain names, affiliations or other attributes of members of the APT without their specific consent.

5. In addition to the above, it is understood that the chair of the APT Committee may have the need to communicate with the Dean's Assistant to the APT Committee about a variety of issues. However, these discussions should not concern substantive issues about specific cases considered by the APT Committee, nor should these discussions contain names, affiliations or other attributes of members of the APT Committee without their specific consent.

6. Except as allowed for the above, members of the APT Committee may not communicate about APT Committee business outside of APT Committee meetings or APT initiated subcommittee meetings. For example, members should not inform candidates, their department chair, or others about the results of a case, the vote in a case, deliberations in a case or even the time when a case is being considered.

4.0 JOINT APPOINTMENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Three types of faculty appointments are possible:

1. **Primary** (normal) appointment to a department in which the faculty member belongs and holds tenure, or is on the tenure track.

2. **Secondary** (joint) appointment to another department involving some rights, such as teaching and directing graduate students, but with agreed upon restrictions such as budgetary support and voting rights, and without tenure, but with possible tenure-track, considerations.

3. **Courtesy** (joint) appointment to another department in recognition of an individual's scholarly contributions to a discipline encompassed by that department so as to enhance the reputations of both the individual and the department. No other obligation on the part of either the faculty member or the department need be specified.
The primary thrust of this policy is that a written contract (or checklist) be mutually agreed upon and signed by the faculty member and by both departments involved, clearly delineating the rights and the responsibilities of all the parties. This document and the accompanying checklist (Appendix E) discuss guidelines for joint appointments. Any agreed upon deviations should be spelled out clearly in the signed contract.

The definitions, checklist-contract, policy statements and procedures given below apply to full-time, tenure-track or tenured regular faculty having joint appointments involving two or more departments where at least one department is in the School of Engineering. The faculty member can have a joint appointment consisting of one, and only one, primary appointment with one or more secondary appointments and/or one or more courtesy appointments.

The guidelines given here do not apply to research or other non-regular faculty and do not apply to non-teaching units such as Organized Research Units (ORU). In cases where the joint appointment is between a program and an academic department, the guidelines given here may not be suitable and may be replaced by ones which are more appropriate. In such a case, a substitute checklist must be devised by the program and/or department, and the issues addressed in the checklist must be addressed in the replacement list. The replacement list must have the same approval signatures as specified on the present list.

The policies given here also do not apply to faculty members who were given joint appointments before this document was made official. Whatever understandings that were reached between such individuals and their various departments will remain in force. However, if such a relationship is to be renegotiated, the policies given here should be followed.

4.2 DEFINITIONS: PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND COURTESY APPOINTMENTS

A. Primary Appointments

1. Teaching Load

The faculty member normally carries at least 50% of his/her teaching load in the department in which the primary appointment is held, unless otherwise agreed upon. It is expected that the joint appointee's overall teaching obligations will not exceed the normal university teaching load.

2. Budgetary Obligations

The primary department carries an obligation for that portion of the faculty member's salary that is budgeted within the primary department. In addition, if the joint appointment is discontinued for any reason, the primary department is responsible for bringing the faculty member into that department full-time (see Joint Appointments Checklist for details).

3. Faculty Meetings and Voting

The faculty member attends faculty meetings and votes in the primary department.
4. Merit Evaluations

The primary department is responsible for conducting the faculty member's merit evaluations. The responsibility for making available all teaching evaluations and relevant research information from the secondary department to the merit review committee of the primary department in a timely manner falls on the faculty member.

5. Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Tenure is held in the primary department only (even in the case of a 50-50 salary split with a secondary department). The primary department conducts promotion and tenure reviews. The responsibility for making available all teaching evaluations from the secondary department to the relevant review committees of the primary department in a timely manner falls on the faculty member. The faculty member is responsible for insuring all relevant scholarly information relating to the field of the secondary unit is also made available to the relevant committees. The faculty member should make sure that the chair of the secondary department is aware that a review is being initiated.

6. Office Space and Secretarial Support

The primary department provides office space and secretarial support.

7. Service Responsibilities

The primary department is the department in which the faculty member has his/her major service responsibilities.

8. Guidance and Dissertation Committees

The faculty member is always considered an “internal” member of guidance and dissertation committees within the primary department.

9. Renegotiation

A joint appointment is subject to review and renegotiation at the end of the period specified in the Joint Appointments Checklist (Appendix E). In addition, the appointee may request a renegotiation at any time. In any renegotiation, all parties in the two departments must be consulted, just as they were consulted at the time of the initial appointment and a new checklist must be prepared and signed.

10. Indirect Cost Recovery on Grants

The revenue center of the primary department automatically receives indirect cost recovery from grants, unless specific arrangements are made with the secondary department for sharing. In cases where the secondary department is providing resources to facilitate research, special arrangements should be specified.
11. Appointment Procedure

See Section 4.3.

B. Secondary Appointments

1. Teaching Load

The faculty member may carry some part of his/her regular teaching load in the secondary department (but usually not more than 50%). It is expected that the joint appointee's overall teaching obligations will not exceed the normal university teaching load.

2. Budgetary Obligations

The secondary department carries an obligation for that portion of the faculty member's salary that is budgeted within the secondary department. In addition, if the joint appointment is discontinued for any reason, the secondary department (if different from that of the primary department) will be obliged to release the relevant funds to the primary department for the remaining period of the agreement.

3. Faculty Meetings and Voting

Attendance and voting at faculty meetings in the secondary department are subject to negotiation and should be specified in the Joint Appointments Checklist.

4. Merit Evaluations

Merit evaluation in the secondary department may be subject to negotiation. Generally, the secondary department will conduct its own evaluation and will forward the evaluation to the primary department. If the secondary department pays a portion of the salary, then it may conduct its own review and make recommendations for salary changes for its portion of the salary. This arrangement must be specified in the checklist; otherwise, salary changes are determined solely by the primary department.

5. Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Tenure will not be held in the secondary department (even in the case of a 50-50 salary split). With regard to promotion and tenure reviews, the secondary department must accept the primary department's verdict unless specified to the contrary on the checklist. The views of the secondary department should be submitted to the primary department and should be included as part of the dossier at the time that promotion is being considered.

6. Office Space and Secretarial Support

Office space allocation and secretarial support is subject to negotiation; if any is provided, it should reflect the faculty member's participation in the secondary department.
7. Service Responsibilities

Service responsibilities in the secondary department are subject to negotiation. In general, service expected of the faculty member in the two departments should not exceed that expected of a faculty member with a single appointment.

8. Guidance and Dissertation Committees

The faculty member is always considered an “internal” member of the guidance and dissertation committees in the secondary department and can, therefore, chair committees in that department.

9. Renegotiation

A joint appointment is subject to review and renegotiation at the end of the period specified in the Joint Appointments Checklist. A reasonable period might be six years or less, although exceptions are expected, particularly where appointments are between different revenue centers. In addition, the appointee may request a renegotiation at any time. In any renegotiation, all parties in the two departments must be consulted, just as they were consulted at the time of the initial appointment. The checklist is then updated.

10. Indirect Cost Recovery on Grants

The secondary department will generally not be a beneficiary of indirect cost recovery from grants unless some other arrangement is specified in the checklist.

11. Appointment Procedure

See Section 4.3.

12. Listing of Secondary Appointments

In departmental and university listings of faculty (brochures, posters, etc.), secondary appointments should be listed as regular department faculty.

C. Courtesy Appointments

1. Basis

A Courtesy Appointment usually is made to enhance the reputation of the individual or to increase the prestige of the department offering such an appointment. It recognizes contributions by the individual to the scholarly field represented by that department. It can only be extended to full-time members of the USC faculty whose academic affiliation (or in the case of a joint appointment affiliation) lies outside the department. It differs from an adjunct appointment, which is reserved for individuals who are not full-time members of the USC faculty.

2. Teaching Load

Typically the faculty member will not teach in the department in which he/she holds the courtesy appointment (henceforth the 'courtesy appointment department').
3. Budgetary obligations

None.

4. Faculty Meetings and Voting

In general the faculty member will not attend faculty meetings and vote in the courtesy appointment department. If any other arrangements are to be made they should be clearly specified at the time of appointment by being typed on the Recommendation for Appointment form.

5. Merit Evaluations

Not relevant.

6. Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Not relevant.

7. Office Space and Secretarial Support

None.

8. Service Responsibilities

None.

9. Guidance and Dissertation Committees

The faculty member is always considered an “external” member of guidance and dissertation committees within the courtesy appointment department.

10. Renegotiation

A courtesy appointment will remain in force for a period of six years, at which point it will automatically terminate unless it is renegotiated. The initiative for renegotiation at the appropriate time must come from the faculty member.

11. Indirect Cost Recovery on Grants

The courtesy appointment department receives no indirect cost recovery.

12. Additional Obligations

If the parties to this agreement wish to extend or otherwise amend the guidelines given here, they should consider making the joint appointment a Secondary Appointment rather than the Courtesy Appointment being described here.
13. Appointment Procedure

A courtesy appointment in a department or program can only be extended to full-time members of the USC faculty whose academic affiliation (or in the case of a joint appointment affiliation) lies outside the department. It differs from an adjunct appointment, which is reserved for individuals who are not full-time members of the USC faculty. A courtesy appointment does not require completion of the checklist (Appendix E). The appointment procedure is outlined in Section 4.3.

14. Listing of Courtesy Appointments

In departmental and university listings of faculty (brochures, posters, etc.), courtesy appointments should be given under the following separate heading: "Associate Faculty with Titles in Mechanical Engineering," or whatever is the appropriate department.

4.3 PROCEDURES FOR INITIATING JOINT APPOINTMENTS

1. The candidates, the primary department and the secondary or courtesy department negotiate the terms of the joint appointment. Any of these parties can take the initiative to open the negotiations. The checklist then is completed and the candidate and the chair of the primary department sign the document. (The chair of the primary department may first want to consult the faculty of his/her department.)

2. For either a Secondary or a Courtesy Appointment in the School of Engineering, the secondary or courtesy department should prepare a short dossier justifying the reason for the joint appointment and delineating its conditions. This dossier should contain:

   (a) The candidate's *Curriculum Vitae*.

   (b) Statement by the candidate explaining why the joint appointment should be made.

   (c) Statement by the chair of the secondary or courtesy department also justifying the appointment.

   (d) The checklist filled out and signed by both the candidate and the chair of the primary department is required for Secondary Appointments only.

   (e) The inclusion of representative publications, an endorsement from the primary department, or other materials is completely optional.

3. The members of the secondary or courtesy department should review the dossier and vote on the appointment. A meeting to discuss the matter before the vote is taken may be desirable, but it is not necessary. (If the candidate is at the Assistant Professor level, all members of the department vote. If he/she is at a higher rank, only those of equivalent or higher rank should vote.) The Department Chair then records the outcome of the vote in the dossier. He/she may also add additional information at this time resulting from the discussion at a departmental meeting. The Chair then signs the checklist if this is part of the dossier.
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4. The dossier is then given to Academic Affairs Dean of the School of Engineering who, in turn, passes it on to the APT Executive Committee of the School of Engineering, for review by the APT Committee and for their recommendations. This is only necessary if the candidate is not already a faculty member in the School of Engineering. The APT Executive Committee, at their discretion, may want to involve the entire APT Committee in the deliberations, but this is not necessary. The APT Executive Committee writes up its recommendations, inserts them into the dossier, and returns the dossier to the Academic Affairs Dean for final action.

5. The joint appointment process can be initiated at any time during the candidate's career, including at the time of his/her initial appointment. In the latter case, the dossier referred to above will be the complete initial appointment dossier augmented by the joint appointment checklist (for secondary appointments only) and by the statement by the chair of the secondary or courtesy department. The primary department will process this appointment by its normal procedure as it would if no joint appointment was being considered. The secondary or courtesy department will process the dossier as described in 2. above. They determine only if the appointment, if approved by the primary department, will be a joint appointment.

6. This joint appointment procedure should in no way compromise the integrity of the appointments and promotions processes as dictated by the University and stated in the Faculty Handbook and as practiced by the schools involved in the joint appointment.
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APPENDIX A

APT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT EVALUATION FORM FOR CANDIDATES TO A NON-TENURED FACULTY POSITION
Appointment of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

APT Executive Committee Chair

Comments

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Approved_____ Not Approved_____ Signature _______________________ Date _______

APT Executive Committee Member

Comments

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Approved_____ Not Approved_____ Signature _______________________ Date _______

APT Executive Committee Member

Comments

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Approved_____ Not Approved_____ Signature _______________________ Date _______
APPENDIX B

APPOINTMENT EVALUATION FORM FOR EXTERNAL CANDIDATES TO A TENURED FACULTY POSITION
NAME OF CANDIDATE ________________________________________________

DEPARTMENT ______________________________________________________

APPOINTMENT ______________________________________________________

PRESENT RANK (IF ALREADY AT USC) ____________________________________

PROPOSED RANK ____________________________________________________

**Evaluation of Dossier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Administrative/faculty assessments</th>
<th>ADEQUATE FOR EVALUATION</th>
<th>INADEQUATE FOR EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Curriculum vitae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Teaching record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Service record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Letters of reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Evidence of research/scholarly/creative activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of Candidate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>LOW (If yes, please comment on the reverse of this page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research/scholarly/creative activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If either teaching or research/scholarly/creative activity is less than outstanding, do you find the supplementary criterion (such as professional activity, grant support, or university/public service) to be strong to merit exceptional consideration?

Overall Evaluation

What is your advice as to the panel’s recommendations for action?

- Approve
- Disapprove
- Request more evidence (as noted in “adequacy” section)
- Discuss at a panel meeting

SIGNATURE ___________________________ DATE ___________________________

PRINT NAME ________________________________________________________

PLEASE USE THE REVERSE OF THIS PAGE FOR COMMENTS
APPENDIX C

TENURE/ TENURE-TRACK FACULTY
SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER ADDRESSED TO
REFEREES

Dear Professor [name]:

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

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

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

1. Discuss [title and last name]'s specific scholarly contributions and the impact of each on the field; please give your appraisal of the quality and potential of [his or her] overall scholarship; whether [he or she] is considered a leader in this field and how [he or she] ranks nationally among a named cohort of colleagues working in the same area; [In the case of promotion to full professor, the following item should be added: whether [title and last name] has published substantial excellent scholarship since [his/her] promotion to the rank of associate professor.]

2. Based on your knowledge of [title and last name]'s scholarship (and assuming teaching and service expectations have been met) does [his or her] work meet the standards for a similar position as applied in your institution. If your answer is less than fully positive, please explain, as your explanation will be of significant value to us in assessing [his or her] work in terms of national standards.

3. (a) Describe the context in which you know [title and last name]. (b) Provide any information you may have on [his or her] teaching ability. (c) Please add any other information you believe would assist us in our evaluation of [title and last name]'s academic accomplishments, including [his or her] service to organizations outside the university. (d) We would also appreciate it if you include a short biographical sketch of yourself with your letter.

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

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

We have enclosed a copy of [title and last name]'s curriculum vitae, personal statement and some relevant publications. For your information, the position of Research {[Professor] or [Associate Professor] or [Assistant Professor]} at USC is a non-tenure track faculty position. Nonetheless, our expectations are that individuals with such appointments will have research credentials comparable to tenure-track faculty of similar rank. If you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please address the following issues:

1. Discuss [title and last name]'s specific research contributions and the impact of each on the field.

2. Based on your knowledge of [title and last name]'s research achievements does [his or her] work meet the standards for a similar position as applied in your institution.

3. Describe the context in which you know [title and last name]. Please add any other information you believe would assist us in our evaluation of [title and last name]'s accomplishments. We would also appreciate it if you include a short biographical sketch of yourself with your letter.

We highly value your candid judgment and analysis of the issues. We appreciate your cooperation in this important task. Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It is intended to be read only by the school promotion committees.

Thank you.
APPENDIX E

SENIOR EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS
ALTERNATIVE SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER
ADDRESS TO REFEREES

Dear Professor [name]:

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

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

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

1. Please give your appraisal of the quality of [title and last name]'s overall scholarship, specific scholarly contributions, and impact on the field, including a discussion whether [title and last name] is expected to maintain such scholarly achievement.

2. Based on your knowledge of [title and last name]'s scholarship (and assuming teaching and service expectations have been met) does [his or her] work meet the standards for a similar position as applied in your institution.

3. (a) Describe the context in which you know [title and last name]. (b) Provide any information you may have on [his or her] teaching ability. (c) Please add any other information you believe would assist us in our evaluation of [title and last name]'s academic accomplishments, including [his or her] service to organizations outside the university. (d) We would also appreciate it if you include a short biographical sketch of yourself with your letter.

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

Thank you.
## Checklist for Dossier Preparation

For University Guidelines and Forms: [http://www.usc.edu/policies](http://www.usc.edu/policies)

### A. Recommendation for Appointment Form or Recommendation for Promotion Form
- [Complete the appropriate form online, print it out and attach.]

### B. Pre-Recruitment and Post-Recruitment Affirmative Action Forms
- [required only for initial appointment]

### I. Administrative and Faculty Assessments

- **Dean.** Independent assessment and recommendation with a candid explanation of reasons. Do not repeat information already in the dossier. -- For appointments, explain pro-active outreach.
- Note whether the dean approved in advance the list of referees as adequate for UCAPT consideration.
- **School Committee.** Report of the school faculty committee that advises the dean. -- For Interdisciplinary Candidates: Is assessment by appropriate other USC program included?
- **Department Chair.** Independent assessment with explanation of department needs and strategic goals. Do not repeat information already in the dossier.
- **Department Faculty.** Report of screening or other committee representing department faculty.

### II. Curriculum Vitae
- Include a bibliography of publications or list of creative works and a record of research funding (show P.I. and amount of direct support controlled by candidate). Articles in refereed journals should be separate from other publications and from non-publications such as invited lectures and seminars.

### III. Personal Statement
- Candidate may include approaches to teaching, research, and service, together with proposals for future work. Often, two or three pages will suffice.

### IV. Teaching Record
- -- Please place supporting details in Section VII, the appendix.
- **Memo comparing candidate’s teaching quality to department and school norms.**
- **Summary of evidence concerning the candidate’s record of mentoring, courses taught, curriculum development activities, and other student interactions.**

### V. Service Record
- Include available evidence of University, professional and community service activity related to the candidate's field. Assess the quality and the effectiveness of the contributions.

### VI. Referee Letters
- Preface each letter with short bio (not full CV or directory entry.)
- Explain choice of any referees not recognized as top scholars at major universities.
- Place first minimum of -- six substantive letters, answering all questions, from academic scholars who are independent (not suggested by candidate and without prior working, collegial or personal relationships), followed by letters not meeting all those criteria. -- Total should be at least ten.
- Does list include (as appropriate) referees from the broader discipline, and inter-disciplinary referees, including those recommended by appropriate other USC program.

### VII. Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship or Professional Performance, and Teaching
- Include books and selected reprints, accepted manuscripts, critical reviews, abstracts, samples, and photographs with a succinct description of date, source, and importance; details on teaching evaluations.
APPENDIX G

CHECKLIST FOR JOINT APPOINTMENT
Optional form, available for use for joint, secondary, and courtesy appointments.

Name: ____________________________________  Title: ____________________________________

**Term of secondary appointment:**
For Assistant or Associate Professors, a fixed term must be specified. For faculty without tenure, the term should not exceed the maximum probationary period, and is subject to non-reappointment. For full Professors only, the term may be “continuous”; no formal renewal is then required and either department or the faculty member can terminate the arrangement at will. Check if continuous and indicate the start date.

Title: ____________________________________  (e.g., Associate Professor of Agriculture and Astronomy)

From: __________________ To: __________________

- Continuous

Normally, start dates should be either September 1 or January 1 and termination dates should be either December 31 or August 31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY SCHOOL &amp; DEPT./ PROGRAM</th>
<th>SECONDARY SCHOOL &amp; DEPT. /PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School and Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching Load</td>
<td>Specify teaching load (at least half-time):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% or course(s)/units per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty Meetings and Voting</td>
<td>The faculty member attends meetings and votes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Merit Evaluation and Salary Changes</td>
<td>Merit evaluation is to be conducted by the primary department. Normally, salary increases will be determined within the primary academic unit and by regular procedures followed within that unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tenure and Promotion Reviews</td>
<td>Tenure is held in the primary department, if the individual is tenured. The primary department conducts promotion and tenure reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Office Space &amp; Secretarial Support</td>
<td>Provided by the primary department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Service and Responsibilities</td>
<td>Major service responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY SCHOOL &amp; DEPT./ PROGRAM</td>
<td>SECONDARY SCHOOL &amp; DEPT. /PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Guidance/ Dissertation Comm.</strong></td>
<td>Faculty member is considered 'internal'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Renegotiation</strong></td>
<td>This joint appointment is subject to review and possible renewal at the end of the period covered by this agreement, or if continuous can be terminated by either department or the faculty member at will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Faculty contract and payment</strong></td>
<td>The annual contract will be issued by the primary school as home department, and include the title and any contractual agreements on compensation or duties relating to the secondary appointment. The secondary school will transfer funds to cover its share of compensation. The secondary school will not issue any separate letter or contract, but will coordinate as needed with the primary department on the wording of the annual contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Signatures:*

**For Deans’ Use Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY SCHOOL &amp; DEPT./ PROGRAM</th>
<th>SECONDARY SCHOOL &amp; DEPT. /PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Budgetary Obligations</strong></td>
<td>The primary unit is responsible for the faculty member's total compensation at the end of this agreement term, if either the secondary unit or individual decline to renew. If the term is continuous, then the specified allocation will remain in effect until either department or the individual terminates the arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a. Specify the amount or percentage of salary and fringes covered by the secondary school: % or $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Check here if secondary school’s obligation is conditional (and specify conditions in 1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Credited to secondary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Split 50%-50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Used first to cover secondary school’s obligation under 1a, then split 50%-50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other arrangement (specify).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Indirect Cost Recovery on Grants</strong></td>
<td>Indirect cost recovery will be: □ Split in proportion to the percentage of salary paid by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Credited to primary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other arrangement (specify).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unless specified otherwise, primary department will provide the costs of research including lab space, communications, grant management and university indirect changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Signatures:*

**Primary Dept./Program**

Dean: __________________________ Date: ___/___/___

**Secondary Dept./Program**

Dean: __________________________ Date: ___/___/___

**Provost: __________________________ Date: ___/___/___

**Provost approval is mandatory**

*File copy with Provost’s office. Provost approval is required for changed title at Associate Professor or Professor Level, otherwise filing is for information.*