

## Three-Year Academic Progress Review

It is the responsibility of every department in the USC Viterbi School of Engineering to evaluate each of its tenure track probationary faculty before the end of their third year of service at USC. This applies regardless of the faculty member's rank. The overall purpose of the review is to improve communication and understanding of the criteria for tenure. The result of the review procedure is an evaluation of the faculty member's progress to date. It is hoped that this evaluation will allow the faculty member to improve or re-focus his or her efforts for the remainder of the probationary period, as necessary. The review cannot conclude that the faculty member will, or will not, receive tenure at some later date. There is no guarantee that a positive review will result in promotion, nor may a negative review necessarily result in dismissal. This **must be emphasized**. However, it is important that all tenure-track, probationary faculty be fully informed as to the criteria that are typically followed in the tenure process, and whether their efforts to date are entirely satisfactory.

To facilitate the review, the following steps must be followed:

1. The department chair initiates the Three-Year Academic Progress Review for every tenure-track, probationary faculty member (candidate) whose primary appointment is within their department. The review commences when the candidate reaches 2 1/2 years of service at USC and it is completed before the end of 3 years of service.
2. The chair informs the candidate that the review will be undertaken and that he/she will be made fully aware of its conclusions.
3. The chair creates a mini-dossier for the candidate.

The candidate is responsible for providing:

- a CV in the format described by the APT Handbook of the USC Viterbi School of Engineering
- a research statement describing the candidate's research and scholarship

The chair is responsible for providing:

- the candidate's Annual Progress Reports
- student teaching evaluations
- additional information to assist in the review is included as deemed appropriate

4. The chair appoints a three-member committee consisting of tenured faculty members to review the dossier. The committee may solicit additional information as required (including, if needed, outside letters). The committee returns to the chair in a timely manner its report, as well as a summary of its findings, using the attached Three-Year Academic Progress Review Summary. The members of the committee remain anonymous to the candidate.

5. The chair meets with the candidate and reviews the committee report and summary.

6. The report and the summary are then forwarded to the Dean. The candidate may also send, if he/she so wishes, any written comments to the Dean in response to the committee findings.

Three-Year Academic Progress Review Summary  
School of Engineering  
University of Southern California

Name of Probationary Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Hired: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Review: \_\_\_\_\_

**Research:**

**Teaching:**

**Service:**

**Overall Conclusions:**