

USC VITERBI SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE (APT)

GUIDELINES

**Office of the Dean
USC Viterbi School of Engineering
OHE 200- MC 1450**

Revised 2016

PREFACE

This document serves as a guide for faculty, administrators, and staff in the USC Viterbi School of Engineering (VSoE or School) who are involved with appointments, promotions, and tenure. In particular, this document should be read by department chairs and academic program directors, by faculty members serving on faculty appointment and promotion committees, by the members of the School's Appointments, Promotions and Tenure (APT) Committee, and by all faculty in the School. This document has been endorsed by the Engineering Faculty Council and the Dean, and it has been approved by the Provost.

This version of the *VSoE APT Guidelines* includes several significant revisions to the prior edition. Among them, this document more comprehensively describes School-specific guidelines related to research faculty and teaching faculty appointment, (non-)reappointment, and promotion that are applicable to temporary, voluntary, adjunct, part-time and full-time positions. A salient change in this regard is the inclusion of research faculty and teaching faculty on the School-level committee that reviews appointment, promotion, and non-reappointment cases on these tracks (Section 2.2). This document more clearly describes guidelines on dossier preparation (Section 3.1) and evaluation (Section 3.2) consistent with the most recent edition of the *UCAPT Manual* for tenure-track/tenured faculty cases and current practices in the School for tenure-track/tenured faculty cases as well as research or teaching faculty cases, both full-time and part-time. Guidelines for joint appointment cases are also provided (Section 4). Finally, this document provides useful guidelines regarding recommended length of terms, periodic review, and termination of research faculty and teaching faculty appointments in the School (Section 5).

GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLYING TO ALL USC SCHOOLS

School guidelines on research, teaching, practitioner and clinical faculty are endorsed by an appropriate school faculty body and the Dean. They come into force when approved by the Provost after consultation with the Executive Board of the Academic Senate. These school documents are intended to provide useful guides on implementation of university policies. If deviations from the guidelines occur and the individual affected believes they cause unfairness, he or she should immediately write to the Dean and the Provost. The Provost, after consultation with the Dean, will decide whether the deviation was materially unfair and what remedy, if any, is appropriate. In the event of any conflict between school guidelines and the *Faculty Handbook* or other university policies, university policy takes precedence. Any portion of school guidelines based on the *Faculty Handbook* is to be regarded as automatically updated to refer to the current edition of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Decisions on appointment, reappointment and promotion of faculty on full-time appointments shall only be done after review and recommendation by an appropriate faculty body. The appropriate faculty body for research, teaching, practitioner or clinical faculty includes faculty from that track as well as tenure-track/tenured faculty. In non-reappointment cases, the adequacy of the process will be reviewed by the Provost's delegate. In promotion cases, if the Dean has not agreed with the advice of a faculty committee, the file will go to a university committee that advises the Provost. Procedures for part-time faculty may be abbreviated with permission of the Provost, but except in temporary appointments (up to two semesters) will utilize committees including faculty from the appropriate track. Procedures for reappointment and promotion do not apply to individuals on non-renewable contracts.

CONTENTS

1	OVERVIEW OF APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCEDURES IN THE SCHOOL	1
1.1	Faculty Titles	1
1.2	Appointment and Promotion Decisions	1
1.3	Role of the VSoE Faculty in Appointments and Promotions	2
2	COMPOSITION, CHARGE, AND GOVERNING GUIDELINES FOR THE COMMITTEES	5
2.1	Department Committee	5
2.2	APT Committee	8
3	GUIDELINES ON DOSSIER PREPARATION AND EVALUATION OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CASES	14
3.1	Dossier Preparation	14
3.2	Guidelines on Evaluation of Appointment and Promotion Cases	18
3.3	Confidentiality	21
4	PRIMARY AND JOINT APPOINTMENTS IN THE SCHOOL	23
4.1	Introduction	23
4.2	Definitions: Primary, Secondary and Courtesy Appointments	24
4.3	Procedure for Initiating Joint Appointments	28
5	RESEARCH OR TEACHING FACULTY APPOINTMENTS IN THE VITERBI SCHOOL	30
5.1	Research Faculty and Teaching Faculty Size	30
5.2	Appointments and Reappointments	30
5.3	Non-reappointment and Mid-term Termination	31
6	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	32
APPENDICES		
A.	Appointment Evaluation Form for External Candidates to a Tenure-Track or Tenured Senior Ranked Faculty Position	1
B.	APT Executive Committee Appointment Evaluation Form for Candidates to Research or Teaching Faculty Positions	4
C.	Template Cohort Comparison Table for Quantitative Data Section of Dossiers	6
D.	UCAPT Dossier Checklist (taken from the 2013 <i>UCAPT Manual</i>)	8
E.	Research Faculty and Teaching Faculty Dossier Checklist	11
F.	Joint Appointment Checklist	13
G.	Template Solicitation Letters to Referees for Research or Teaching Faculty Positions	16

SECTION 1

OVERVIEW OF APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCEDURES IN THE SCHOOL

The faculty of the USC Viterbi School of Engineering consists of tenure-track and tenured (TT/T) faculty, research faculty and teaching faculty who have full-time or part-time appointments. This document details the procedures established in the School for appointment, promotion, and tenure of its faculty (Section 1). It describes departmental responsibilities, including the roles of the departmental committee, chair, and faculty as a whole; and it also describes the roles of the School's APT Committee, its subcommittees, and its chair (Section 2). It provides School-specific guidelines on the preparation and evaluation of all faculty dossiers (Section 3), primary and joint appointments (Section 4), and research faculty and teaching faculty appointments (Section 5).

1.1 FACULTY TITLES

Titles in use for TT/T faculty in the USC Viterbi School are Assistant Professor of <Discipline>, Associate Professor of <Discipline>, and Professor of <Discipline>. The principal titles for research faculty are Research Assistant Professor of <Discipline>, Research Associate Professor of <Discipline>, and Research Professor of <Discipline>; the principal titles for teaching faculty are Lecturer of <Discipline>, Senior Lecturer of <Discipline>, Associate Professor of <Discipline or Engineering> Practice, and Professor of <Discipline or Engineering> Practice. Typical titles for part-time, voluntary, and temporary research or teaching faculty are Part-time Lecturer, Adjunct Lecturer, Adjunct Professor of <Discipline>, Professor Emeritus of <Discipline>, and Visiting Professor of <Discipline>.¹ Other titles as described in the university's list of Academic Titles Currently in Use, Section 4-B(2) of the *Faculty Handbook* (2015 edition) or the corresponding section of the most recent edition, may at times be used on a case-by-case basis as appropriate.

1.2 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION DECISIONS

The decision to appoint an Assistant Professor on the tenure track in a primary department, appoint a faculty member in a secondary department (i.e., joint appointment), appoint or promote a candidate to a research or teaching faculty position, or appoint a candidate to an Adjunct Professor or Visiting Professor position in the School is made on the basis of faculty recommendation by the Dean or dean's delegate.

The decision to make faculty appointments at senior ranks on the tenure track (e.g., Associate Professor or Professor, without tenure), appoint or promote a candidate to a tenured position, or appoint to the status of Professor Emeritus is made on the basis of faculty recommendation by the Provost on behalf of the President. An appointment to a tenured position cannot be extended formally to candidates until the Provost has approved the appointment.

¹ Whenever "Professor" is mentioned in this set of titles, except for the case of Professor Emeritus, it usually includes the options of Assistant Professor, Research Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor.

In all cases, the recommendation of the faculty of the School on the suitability of the appointment or the promotion is important. It is expressed through a review procedure which normally occurs at two levels: the department level and the school level.

1.3 ROLE OF THE VSoE FACULTY IN APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

The following describes the general procedures to be followed for faculty evaluation of a candidate under consideration for appointment or promotion. The review and evaluation normally occur at two levels.

(i) Review and Evaluation at the Department Level²

- It is expected that faculty appointments (including reappointments) and promotions are initiated at the department level. (Rarely there may be a school-level appointment as authorized by university policy.) The department normally reviews all appointment and promotion cases including voluntary Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, and Professor Emeritus appointments in the department; joint appointments in which the department is the secondary department; and part-time appointments (but not temporary part-time appointments up to two semesters) in the department.
- The first step involves the preparation of the candidate's dossier. The departmental committee, in collaboration with the department chair, is responsible for assembling the dossier. The composition and rules of this committee are described in Section 2.1 of this document. Detailed instructions on how to assemble and evaluate the dossier are given in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. The departmental committee reviews the dossier, evaluates the candidate, and makes a recommendation regarding the appointment, (non-)reappointment, or promotion for all cases. The committee's review and evaluation require at least one meeting of the entire committee.
- For all initial appointments except for voluntary Adjunct Professors, Visiting Professors and part-time teaching faculty, the full-time 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. Only TT/T faculty may vote on TT/T cases, with only tenured faculty voting on tenured cases. The review and vote require a separate meeting of the departmental faculty.
- Part-time teaching faculty appointments and (non-)reappointments have an abbreviated process. After an individual has had up to two semesters on temporary appointments, part-time appointments and (non-)reappointments are recommended to the department chair and Dean by a committee of two or more members, which may include equally eligible part-time and full-time faculty, without a requirement of a departmental faculty meeting or vote.

² A similar procedure is followed for academic program units that are not departments, with the program taking the place of the department, the program's director taking on the role of the department chair, an ad hoc committee taking on the role of the departmental committee, and the program faculty taking on the role of departmental faculty. In unusual circumstances as authorized by University policy, an appointment may be made at the School level, with the School APT committee taking the place of the departmental faculty, an ad hoc committee taking the place of the departmental committee, and the chair of the ad hoc committee taking on the role of department chair.

Similarly, (non-)reappointment of full-time research and teaching faculty approved by a faculty committee (which is the consultative body that provides a recommendation to the department chair and Dean) also do not require review by the departmental faculty.

- The department chair appends his/her comments to the committee's recommendation and the faculty vote, as applicable.
- Departmental recommendations—including the departmental committee report, the faculty vote as applicable, and the chair's comments—are subject to final approval by the Dean.
- For tenure-track Assistant Professor (without tenure), Lecturer, voluntary Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Professor Emeritus and part-time appointments, as well as for joint appointments in which the School is both the primary and secondary unit, the departmental recommendation is directly forwarded to the Dean (or dean's delegate) for final approval, without using the school-level review step described below for all cases. However, the school-level review step is used for multi-year full-time Lecturer appointments and full-time research or teaching faculty non-reappointment cases.

(ii) Review and Evaluation at the School Level

- The review and evaluation of faculty appointment and promotion cases at the school level are conducted by the School's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee. Its composition and guidelines are described in Section 2.2.
- The APT Committee evaluates all full-time faculty appointments and promotions except those to non-multi-year Lecturer, tenure-track Assistant Professor (without tenure), Visiting Professor, and joint appointments in which the School is both the primary and the secondary unit. It also reviews all full-time research or teaching faculty non-reappointment cases; it does not review part-time or voluntary faculty appointment and (non-)reappointment cases.
- Eligible members of the APT Committee (see Section 2.2-D) 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 departmental committee, any vote of the departmental faculty and the recommendation of the chair.
- For appointment and promotion to a tenure-track or tenured senior ranked position, the dossier is reviewed by a subset of the APT Committee, consisting of tenured faculty of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion, following the procedure described immediately below. Following the procedures described below, research faculty and teaching faculty on the APT Committee review only the dossiers of candidates in their respective tracks (research or teaching).
- For promotion to a tenured position of an internal candidate, a three-member subcommittee of the APT Committee, consisting of tenured 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 tenured faculty members of the APT

Committee, whose rank is higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment or promotion, documented in a subcommittee memo. At least one meeting of the full subcommittee is required. The tenured faculty 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 closed vote, on the appointment or promotion, during one of the scheduled APT Committee 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 Committee recommendation.

- Under special circumstances for expedited review of lateral appointment or promotion to a senior ranked TT/T position of an external or internal candidate, respectively, the tenured faculty 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 using a specific form for this purpose, as given in Appendix A. No meeting of the APT Committee is required, unless at least one tenured faculty member makes such a request. If no meeting or discussion ensues, the results of the vote as summarized by the APT Chair in a memo to the Dean constitute the final APT Committee recommendation.
- For appointment or promotion of full-time research or teaching faculty (except for non-multi-year appointments at the Lecturer rank), for non-reappointment of full-time research or teaching faculty, and for joint appointments involving others schools with the Viterbi School as the secondary unit, the dossier normally is reviewed by eligible members of the APT Executive Committee. The composition and guidelines of this subcommittee are described in Section 2.2. The specific form used for this review is given in Appendix B. The results of this review, as summarized by the APT Chair in a memo to the Dean, constitute the final APT Committee recommendation.
- The final APT Committee recommendation is forwarded to the Dean. The final decision is made by the Dean or dean's delegate.

Taking into consideration the recommendation of the above faculty bodies, the Dean (or dean's delegate) makes the final decision for appointment, (non-)reappointment, and promotion cases that do not consider senior faculty ranks on the tenure track or involve the granting of tenure. For research or teaching faculty promotions, the cases are automatically submitted for review by the appropriate university committee which advises the President when the Dean's decision is in disagreement with the recommendations of the department-level faculty body, in accordance with the *Faculty Handbook*. For cases involving tenure-track faculty appointments at senior ranks or the granting of tenure, the Dean forwards to the Provost the candidate's dossier, which now in addition contains the APT Committee findings and recommendations and a memo from the Dean containing his/her own evaluation. The Provost, in consultation with the University Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (UCAPT), makes the final decision on these cases.

SECTION 2

COMPOSITION, CHARGE AND GOVERNING GUIDELINES FOR THE COMMITTEES

2.1 DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE

A. Committee Composition

For normal appointments or promotions of candidates in a primary department, the departmental committee usually 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 tenure-track or tenured position, only TT/T faculty 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 (e.g., 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 research or teaching position, the committee should include research or teaching faculty, as appropriate for the candidate's track, and TT/T faculty member(s) in all academic units with TT/T faculty. (A committee for part-time faculty may be one research or teaching faculty member and one TT/T faculty member. Part-time faculty are eligible for appointment to such committees.)

For joint appointments of TT/T faculty in a secondary department, the department committee usually consists of three TT/T members, of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment. For joint appointments of research or teaching faculty in a secondary department, the committee may also include research or teaching faculty of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed appointment, as appropriate for the candidate's track.

The committee membership is dictated by the following.

1. The nature of the appointment or promotion places constraints on the rank, track and title of the members of the committee, as described above.
2. Committee members for each case normally are appointed by the department chair or as the department policy otherwise decides.
3. If the member is unable to complete his/her duties, he or she should be replaced.
4. 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 department policy otherwise decides.
5. Faculty members who hold administrative appointments at the same time (such as department chair, associate department chair, academic program director, dean, vice dean, or higher level administrator) may not serve in the committee (except for a committee on part-time faculty).

6. The department chair designates one member of the committee to be committee chair.

In practice, exceptions to the above rules may be unavoidable, particularly in smaller departments. In such cases, any mitigating circumstances should be documented.

B. Committee Charge

The departmental committee is charged with the following.

- Assemble the candidate's dossier in collaboration with the department chair. The guidelines for assembling the dossier are described in Section 3.1.
- Review the dossier and evaluate the candidacy for the appointment or promotion. Guidelines for such an evaluation are provided in Section 3.2.
- Provide a written report of their evaluation and their recommendation, including minority opinions, if any, to the department chair, usually in the form of a memorandum.
- As previously noted, the committee review and evaluation requires at least a meeting of the entire committee.

C. Governing Guidelines and Procedures at the Department Level

The eligible 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. If the appointment is to a tenure-track or tenured position, only TT/T faculty can review the dossier and participate in the vote. For appointments or promotion to a tenured position, only tenured faculty can participate in the review and vote. The review and vote require a separate meeting of the departmental 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.

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

A quorum of the departmental faculty is defined as a minimum of 2/3rd of the eligible voting membership (or, alternatively, a vote "yes" or "no" by more than held 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 Committee or the UCAPT. The Dean does not vote in the meeting of his/her department. 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.

D. Departmental Activity Schedule

The following table is the recommended schedule for the processing of appointment and promotion cases of internal candidates to tenured positions. For processing of appointment of external candidates, a similar timetable as that for internal candidates is recommended. It is important that the schedule of activities be adhered to as closely as possible, as the Dean's recommendation for TT/T cases needs to reach the Provost's office by the deadlines specified in the *UCAPT Manual*.

Assemble the dossier, including referee letters (as needed): **Spring of prior year**

Departmental committee report submitted to the departmental faculty:

- For promotion of tenured faculty **mid-August**
- For promotion of non-tenured faculty on the tenure track **early October**

Candidate's complete dossier (one original and three copies), including the departmental committee report and chair's memo, submitted to the Dean's office:

- For promotion of tenured faculty **September 1**
- For promotion of non-tenured faculty on the tenure track **November 1**

The following table is the recommended schedule for the processing of promotion and reappointment (including non-reappointment) cases of candidates to research or teaching faculty positions. For the initial appointment of research or teaching faculty candidates, a specific timetable is not prescribed, but dossiers should be submitted at least four to six weeks prior to the intended start date.

Assemble the dossier, including referee letters: **Fall of current year**

Departmental committee report submitted to faculty or chair: **January 15**

Candidate's complete dossier submitted to the Dean's office: **February 1 or earlier**

In all cases, including non-reappointment cases, early submission of dossiers to the Dean's office is strongly encouraged.

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, in accordance with the *Faculty Handbook*. The maximum probationary period for the School is seven years, with an associated TDD the year prior (i.e., six years). This period, however, may range from four years (with three or more years of prior full-time TT/T faculty appointment elsewhere) to seven years (in the case of no prior full-time professor appointment). If there is a question about the starting time of the "tenure clock", the department chair should request a written clarification from the Dean or dean's delegate. This should be done before the candidate's dossier is submitted for school-level review.

If the candidate would like to request that his/her TDD be extended (e.g., via temporary “stopping of the clock”), a petition must be sent by the department to the Dean. The Dean forwards this request, along with an explanatory memo, to the Provost for his/her decision, per university policy.

The *Faculty Handbook* indicates the candidate must be informed about the tenure decision prior to the TDD. This allows the candidate to remain as a VSoE 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 of the sixth academic year whether she or he 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 should 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, a tenure-track Assistant Professor is considered for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in her/his sixth year of service. If the candidate provides a written request to withdraw from consideration before the tenure decision, the review process is not completed. A candidate who chooses to request consideration for tenure prior to the TDD should make this request in writing to her/his department chair. It is recommended that the candidate should consider “early” promotion only if she/he has an excellent chance of a positive decision.

It is important that the department submit a complete dossier (including letters of reference), irrespective of the outcome of the faculty vote. As described in the *UCAPT Manual*, if a candidate for tenure is not recommended by the department-level faculty body, there is automatic review at the school level. If the negative recommendation is sustained at the school level by the Dean, the candidate will be so informed, and there will be no consideration at a higher level of review. The full dossier will go forward to UCAPT if there is a positive recommendation from either the Dean at the school level or by the department-level faculty body.

2.2 APT COMMITTEE

A. Committee Composition

The APT Committee consists of nine (9) tenured faculty at the Professor rank, each representing one department of the School; five (5) tenured faculty at the Associate Professor rank from across the School *at large*; and two (2) full-time research faculty and two (2) full-time teaching faculty at the Professor rank from across the School *at large*. The committee is formed every academic year. The term of service of the APT Committee members is two (2) years. An individual holding an appointment on the UCAPT cannot be a member of the APT Committee at the same time.

The tenured Professors are separately elected from the faculty of each of the School’s departments: Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, Astronautical Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering-Electrophysics, Electrical Engineering-Systems, and Industrial and Systems Engineering. They are elected using the following guidelines.

1. The TT/T faculty of each department elects a tenured 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 referred to as *tenured at-large* members) are elected by the entire TT/T faculty of the School, based on nominations received from the departments and/or from *any* faculty member in the School. No more than two *tenured at-large* members may serve from any one department at any given time. The *tenured at-large* members are elected in a process conducted by the Dean's office. In case a *tenured at-large* member is unable to serve or becomes promoted during his/her term of service (thus is no longer eligible to serve in an at-large capacity), he/she will be replaced by the next highest vote-getter from the most recent election.

The two full-time research faculty and two full-time teaching faculty at the Professor rank (also referred to as *Research/Teaching at-large* members) are elected by the entire full-time research and full-time teaching faculty of the School in their respective tracks, based on nominations received from the departments and/or from *any* faculty member in the School. No more than one *Research/Teaching at-large* member from each of the research or teaching tracks may serve from any one department at any given time. The *Research/Teaching at-large* members are elected in a process conducted by the Dean's office. In case a *Research/Teaching at-large* member is unable to serve during his/her term of service, he/she will be replaced by the next highest vote-getter in his/her respective track (research or teaching) from the most recent election.

B. Committee Charge

The APT Committee is charged with the following.

- Review the dossier of a candidate for appointment or promotion, after the departmental review and evaluation, and evaluating the candidacy for the appointment or promotion. *Research/Teaching at-large* members of the committee review only the dossiers of research or teaching faculty candidates, and only those within their respective track. Guidelines for the evaluation are the same as for the departmental evaluation and are provided in Section 3.2.
- Provide a written record of their evaluation and their recommendation, including minority opinions to the Dean.
- The APT Committee makes a recommendation to the Dean.

In addition, the APT Committee is charged with the following.

- Review the recommendations of the departments to the Dean regarding the annual faculty merit evaluations, and
- Review the recommendations of the department to the Dean regarding non-reappointment of full-time research or teaching faculty.

The committee charge is delivered by the Dean (or dean's delegate), at the beginning of the academic year, during the first APT Committee meeting.

While the committee's regular activity expires at the end of each 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 membership of the following two standing committees is constituted.

- The Executive Committee comprises three voting members and one alternate at the rank of tenured Professor elected by the tenured members of the APT Committee, and it also comprises the elected *Research/Teaching at-large* members who vote only on cases in their respective tracks. The alternate is a non-voting member of the committee except for cases in which candidates are from a tenured Professor's department; in such cases, the alternate becomes eligible to vote in lieu of the member who becomes ineligible to vote. Thus, for any research or teaching case being reviewed, up to three tenured faculty members and up to two research or two teaching faculty members corresponding to the candidate's track (research or teaching) may vote.
- The Merit Review Subcommittee reviews the annual faculty merit evaluation procedures followed by the departments. The membership of the subcommittee consists of four members from at least three different departments, drawn jointly from the APT Committee and the EFC (ideally including members who happen to serve simultaneously in both faculty bodies). The majority of the subcommittee must be tenured faculty. Members of the subcommittee are selected by the APT and EFC Chairs with at least two representatives from each body. Its charge and function are described in Section 2.2(F) 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 tenured faculty elected to the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee serves the Dean in an advisory capacity on appointment and promotion matters which do not require the consideration of the full committee, including joint appointment as well as research or teaching faculty appointment, promotion, and non-reappointment cases. This is intended to relieve the full committee of cases not involving tenure.

The APT Chair is responsible for doing the following.

- Call the committee meetings.
- Assign subcommittees, including a subcommittee chair, to evaluate and review appointment and promotion cases.
- Meet with the Executive Committee on matters of its jurisdiction.
- Summarize in a memo to the Dean the findings of the APT Committee for each appointment, non-reappointment, and promotion case.

- Interface with the academic departments and the Dean’s office, through the office of the VSoE Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs.

D. Governing Guidelines and Procedures at the School Level

The procedures are different for the promotion of an internal candidate along the tenure track, the expedited appointment or promotion of an external or internal candidate, respectively, to a senior ranked TT/T position, and the appointment, promotion, or non-reappointment of a research or teaching faculty member. These are detailed below. A quorum of the APT Committee is defined as a minimum of 2/3rd of the eligible voting membership, namely:

- 2/3rd minimum of the eligible tenured Professors of the APT Committee (9) is 6
- 2/3rd minimum of the tenured faculty of the APT Committee (14) is 10
- 2/3rd minimum of the Executive Committee’s voting-eligible members (5) is 4

Promotion on the Tenure Track of an Internal Candidate

Upon the notification by the department to the Dean’s office of a pending promotion case, the APT Chair appoints a three-member APT subcommittee (including a subcommittee chair), whose members are tenured faculty of a rank higher than that of the candidate, and who do not belong to the same department as that of the candidate. The Dean’s assistant to the APT Committee (currently one of the Faculty Affairs Coordinators in the Dean’s office) arranges for the subcommittee members to gain access to 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 3.2. The subcommittee should endeavor to report their findings within two (2) weeks of its formation. If the subcommittee has not completed its task within 15 working days, the APT Chair may appoint a new subcommittee.

Upon the receipt of the subcommittee’s written report, the APT Chair calls for a meeting of the APT Committee’s tenured faculty 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 members during the meeting, when the report is distributed to all attending members. Following discussion of the case, a vote is taken. APT Committee members cannot vote on the cases of candidates from their own department, although they can participate in the discussions.

In voting, absentee ballots are allowed but are recorded as such and should be cast before the case is discussed by the APT Committee. A member casting such a ballot is also included as part of the quorum. Except for absentee ballots, which may be revealed to the APT Chair to be included in the vote tally, all votes are secret. 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.

Lateral Appointment to a Senior Ranked TT/T Position and Expedited Review (Special Cases)

Normally the procedure described immediately above should be followed in all cases. If there is a special circumstance for which an expedited review process is warranted, at the request of the Dean, the following procedure may alternatively be used.

Upon the notification by the department to the Dean's office of a pending case for the lateral appointment of an external candidate or the promotion of an internal candidate to a senior ranked TT/T position, the tenured members of the APT Committee of a rank higher than or equal to that of the candidate are notified. Each eligible 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. Guidelines to be followed during the evaluation are given in Section 3.2. The evaluation will be formal and requires completing the evaluation form shown in Appendix A. Provided that a quorum of written responses are received by the due date, the following actions are taken.

- (a) If no member requests a meeting, the vote will be summarized in a memo written by the APT Chair and forwarded to the Dean. No meeting will be held.
- (b) If at least one member requests a meeting, the dossier will be discussed at an APT Committee meeting held within the first week following the request, attended by eligible members. A formal discussion, followed by a secret vote will be taken at that time. A memo summarizing the APT Committee discussion and vote will 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, Promotion, or Non-reappointment of Full-time Research or Teaching Faculty

Upon the notification by the department to the Dean's office of a pending case for the appointment, promotion, or non-reappointment of a full-time research or teaching faculty candidate, the Executive Committee is notified. The candidate's dossier is reviewed by the Executive Committee as soon as practicable. Their recommendation becomes that of the APT Committee, unless the Executive Committee decides to present the case to the full APT Committee for a vote. Following the recommendation of the Executive Committee (or the APT Committee, depending on the case), the APT Chair will prepare and submit a memorandum to the Dean that summarizes the APT Committee's recommendation. Guidelines to be followed during the evaluation are given in Section 3.2.

Joint Appointment of a Faculty Member Involving Other Schools

The procedure described immediately above are to be followed in all cases except that only tenured faculty of the Executive Committee review and evaluate joint appointments of TT/T faculty.

E. APT Activity Schedule

The following table is the recommended schedule for the processing of appointment, promotion and non-reappointment of full-time faculty candidates reviewed by the APT Committee.

Departmental report and candidate's complete dossier (one original and three copies) provided to the Dean's office for APT Committee review:

- For appointment or promotion of tenured faculty **September 1**
- For promotion of non-tenured faculty on the tenure track **November 1**
- For promotion or non-reappointment of research or teaching faculty **February 1**

APT Committee recommendation (including subcommittee report and Chair's memo) forwarded to the Dean's office:

- For promotion of tenured faculty **October 1**
- For promotion of non-tenured faculty on the tenure track **December 15**
- For promotion or non-reappointment of research or teaching faculty **February 10**

Dossier (including Dean's recommendation) forwarded to UCAPT and the Provost:

- For promotion of tenured faculty **October 15**
- For promotion of non-tenured faculty on the tenure track **February 1**

For expedited appointments to senior ranked or tenured positions of external candidates and for initial appointments of research or teaching faculty candidates, dossiers will be evaluated as they arrive to the APT Committee. In all cases, including non-reappointment cases, timely evaluation of dossiers is expected and strongly encouraged.

F. The Merit Review Subcommittee

The Merit Review Subcommittee reviews the annual faculty merit evaluation procedures followed by the departments. The charge of the subcommittee is to review the procedures followed in the annual faculty merit recommendations proposed 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. Members of the subcommittee who belong to the same department as the department chair interviewed are excused from that meeting. The subcommittee 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 Committee 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.

SECTION 3

GUIDELINES ON DOSSIER PREPARATION AND EVALUATION OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CASES

3.1 DOSSIER PREPARATION

All dossiers should be placed in a three-ring binder and also provided in electronic form, with sections in the order described below and with tabs for easy identification. Four dossier binders should be prepared for each case: 1 original and 3 copies. All dossiers should be hand-delivered to the Dean's office (Faculty Affairs Coordinator who assists the Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs). Each dossier should consist of the following, depending on the type of faculty track.

A. Dossiers for TT/T Faculty Candidates

The guidelines provided in the UCAPT Manual are to be used for dossier preparation of all normal appointments or promotions to senior ranked positions, both tenure-track and tenured. See Sections 6.2, 6.3, 7 and 8 of the 2013 UCAPT Manual or the corresponding sections of the most recent edition. Additional VSoE-specific guidelines that pertain to current practices of the School for particular dossier items are described below.

(i) Faculty Assessments: These are expected at the department and school levels of review.

- The departmental committee's report should include the following:
 - (a) For initial appointments, a description of the search and screening process (may include identification of the persons who conducted the review),
 - (b) Identification of candidate's area of expertise and specific scholarly contributions, and a critical assessment of candidate's accomplishments in research, teaching and service (as applicable),
 - (c) For promotions, it is useful to include an evaluation of the candidate's contributions since the initial appointment or most recent promotion, whichever occurred last, and
 - (d) The substantive arguments for both the majority and any minority opinions.
- The department chair's memo should include or address the following:
 - (a) A description of the department's needs,
 - (b) Identification of candidate's qualifications to advance the department's academic plan within the context of candidate's area of expertise and specific scholarly contributions,
 - (c) A report summarizing faculty consultation, including faculty vote (as applicable), and

- (d) A discussion of any disagreement with the departmental committee's and/or departmental faculty's judgments, providing substantive arguments for both the majority and any minority opinions.
- The APT subcommittee report should include the following:
 - (a) A brief description of the review process (may include the identification of the persons who conducted the review),
 - (b) Identification of candidate's area of expertise and specific scholarly contributions, and a critical assessment of candidate's accomplishments in research, teaching, and service (as applicable), and
 - (c) The substantive arguments for both the majority and any minority opinions.
- The report of the APT Chair should summarize:
 - (a) The views of the APT Committee concerning the candidate's qualifications, including the majority and any minority opinions, and
 - (b) The vote of the APT Committee; the discussion in the report should reflect this vote.

(ii) Quantitative Data: The template cohort comparison table provided in Appendix C is intended to assist departments in summarizing publication and citation data expected in dossiers, per the *UCAPT Manual*. It is most helpful for the department to state clearly the definition of the cohort comparison group appropriate for the candidate's discipline. For example, the cohort group may consist of *all* persons from the top 10 (or top 20) departments promoted to the same rank in the past two to three years, or it may consist of all such persons in the candidate's *subfield*, or it may consist only of some (*subset*) of persons from either of the two previous sets, but if so, a brief explanation of which particular subset, and why, should also be given (e.g., these persons were identified by arm's length referees in their letters as appropriate peers from top departments against which to compare the candidate). The first few lines of the template cohort comparison table is meant to convey this kind of information and can be tailored appropriately for each case, but an alternative description of the method used in forming the cohort may accompany the table.

(iii) Curriculum Vitae: The CV should contain at least the following components.

- The *Education History* section should include the school/university, degree earned, month and year for each institution from which the candidate has graduated.
- The *Employment History* section should include the title(s), place of employment, and period of employment for each employer after obtaining the highest degree earned.
- The *Honors and Awards* section should list all relevant distinctions, by date recognized.
- The *Research Grants* section should include the title, PI and co-PIs (if any), total funding amount, candidate's portion of funding, duration of funded project, funding agency, a very brief description of the funded research and specific role of the candidate in the project.

- The *Publications* section should include items in the following list, by category. Items that have not yet appeared should be clearly marked as “accepted, to appear” or “submitted, under review.” (Optionally, candidate’s contributions to each publication may be briefly outlined.) For refereed conference articles, candidates are encouraged to provide relevant information about the review and selection process of the conference, the acceptance rate of submitted papers to the conference, the archival proceedings where accepted papers are published (including DOI archive number, where applicable), and any other quantitative indications of the quality and importance of the conference in the candidate’s field.
 - Refereed journal articles
 - Books (excluding edited works)
 - Edited works (such as journals and proceedings)
 - Chapters in books
 - Refereed conference articles
 - Technical reports
 - Other scholarly publications
 - Patents
- The *Mentoring* section should include the following, with indication of the candidate’s role in the mentorship, e.g., sole advisor, co-advisor (primary/secondary), committee member.
 - Postdoctoral Scholars, both current and former (list dates and placement, if known)
 - Doctoral students, both current and graduated (list dates and placement, if known)
 - Masters students and undergraduate students, both current and graduated (list dates)
- The *Teaching* section should include courses developed and taught (semesters indicated).
- The *Service* section should include department, School, university, and external activities.

A useful checklist for the preparation of TT/T dossiers, taken from the 2013 *UCAPT Manual*, is provided in Appendix D of this document.

B. Dossiers for Research Faculty, Teaching Faculty, and Joint Appointments

The above guidelines pertain to all senior-ranked normal appointment or promotion cases involving TT/T positions. For normal appointment or promotion of candidates to research or teaching faculty positions, the components of the dossier pertaining to teaching (for candidates on the research track) or to research (for candidates on the teaching track) are not necessary. This also applies to the faculty assessment component of dossiers for research or teaching faculty candidates which, otherwise, follows similarly as that described above for TT/T faculty cases.

Expected dossier components for normal appointment or promotion of full-time faculty on research or teaching tracks are detailed below, respectively.

Full-time Research Faculty

- *Faculty Assessments*, including department committee report, chair and APT Chair memos

- *Candidate's CV*, including education history, employment history, honors and awards, research grants, publications, mentoring, and service components
- *Personal Statement*, including research statement (typically not more than 3-4 pages)
- *Research Record*, including research projects and funding
- *Evidence of Scholarly Contributions*, including copies of three to four peer-reviewed publications and any other relevant supporting material (e.g., awards, research artifacts) relevant to qualifications for the proposed rank
- *Referee Letters*:
 - o For Assistant Professor rank: at least three to four total letters with no expectation for letter writers to be arm's length or external
 - o For Associate Professor rank: at least three to four external letters, at least two of which should be from arm's length referees of equivalent or higher rank or stature (e.g., if from a non-academic institution)
 - o For Professor rank: at least three to four external letters from arm's length referees of equivalent rank or stature (e.g., if from a non-academic institution)

Full-time Teaching Faculty

- *Faculty Assessments*, including department committee report, chair and APT Chair memos
- *Candidate's CV*, including education history, employment history, honors and awards, educational grants (if any), publications, teaching, mentoring, and service components
- *Personal Statement*, including teaching statement (typically not more than 3-4 pages)
- *Teaching Record*, including at least past 2 - 3 years of students' teaching evaluations (if available) and, additionally, if the individual has previously taught in the school, assessments from classroom observations by senior colleagues (if possible)
- *Evidence of Scholarly Contributions*, including syllabi of courses, innovative curricula and educational materials developed, new pedagogical and teaching methods developed, laboratory facilities developed, and other supporting material (e.g., awards, publications, invited lectures, other professional activities) relevant to qualifications for proposed rank; evidence of substantive scholarship will be considered if available
- *Referee Letters*:
 - o For Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks: at least three to four total letters with no expectation for letter writers to be arm's length or external
 - o For Associate Professor rank: at least three to four external letters, at least two of which should be from arm's length referees of equivalent or higher rank or stature (e.g., if from a non-academic institution)
 - o For Professor rank: at least three to four external letters from arm's length referees of equivalent rank or stature (e.g., if from a non-academic institution)

Expected dossier components for non-reappointment of full-time research or teaching faculty are detailed below. (There may be circumstances where some item is not reasonably available.)

- *Faculty Assessments*, including department committee report and chair memo (which may include information on needs of the unit and funding availability and can be provided to the departmental committee) and the APT Chair memo
- *Candidate's CV*, including education history, employment history, honors and awards, research/educational grants, publications, teaching, mentoring, and service components

- Copies of all annual performance/merit reviews since last reappointment or promotion, as needed and if available
- *Teaching Record* or *Research Record*, as applicable for the track

Expected dossier components for Adjunct, Visiting, Emeritus, and all joint appointments are detailed below. Additional evidence of scholarship (e.g., referee letters, publications, and other materials) is optional.

- *Faculty Assessments*, including departmental committee report and/or chair memo
- *Candidate's CV*
- *Personal Statement* which explains the value of the affiliation, as applicable for the position (For Adjunct appointments, this may be the letter of application. For joint appointments, this can be a brief statement explaining the individual's plans to participate in the department. For Visiting appointments, a personal statement may or may not be available. No personal statement is expected for Emeritus appointments.)
- *Joint Appointment Checklist*, which is to be filled out and signed by both the candidate and the chair of the primary department (*required only for joint appointments*)

Expected dossier components for part-time teaching faculty are detailed below. Additional evidence of scholarship (e.g., referee letters, publications, other materials) are completely optional.

- *Faculty Assessment*, including the chair's recommendation
- *Candidate's CV*

A useful checklist for the preparation of research or teaching faculty dossiers is provided in Appendix E of this document. The Joint Appointment Checklist is provided in Appendix F. Templates for solicitation letters to referees for research or teaching faculty dossiers are provided in Appendix G. If the department, for a justifiable reason, wants to rephrase the solicitation letter, the chair must consult with the Dean's Office (i.e., Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs) in advance. Also, the list of potential referees must first be approved by the Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs before any letters are solicited. Preface the set of referee letters in the dossier with a chart showing in separate columns for each referee solicited his/her title, institutional affiliation, who suggested the referee, the relationship of the referee with the candidate, and whether the referee provided a letter. In a separate page immediately before each referee letter, include a brief bio of the referee.

3.2 GUIDELINES ON EVALUATION OF APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION CASES

A. Dossiers for Appointment or Promotion to Senior Ranked TT/T Positions

The guidelines provided in the UCAPT Manual are to be used for the evaluation of dossiers of all appointments or promotions to senior ranked positions, both tenured and tenure track. Current practice in the School is to follow UCAPT guidelines in all cases. See Sections 1.1, 2 (including Sections 2.5 and 2.9 on conference publications and interdisciplinary work), 3.3, 4.2, and 5 of the 2013 UCAPT Manual or corresponding sections of the most recent edition. An important consideration in the evaluation of research scholarship is the fact that different sub-areas of computer science and engineering use various mixes of refereed conferences and journals to disseminate significant research findings. In some sub-areas, the top venues are all peer-reviewed journals; in others, the top venues are a mixture of peer-reviewed journals and conferences; and in

still others the top venues are all peer-reviewed conferences. When considering each appointment or promotion case, the quality of the venue needs to be considered on a per-sub-area and per-venue basis. In sub-areas where conferences are among or exclusively the top venues, publication in them should generally be treated in an equivalent manner to papers in top journals in other fields. In these sub-areas, top researchers often publish exclusively or nearly exclusively at such conferences.

B. Dossiers for Joint Appointment Cases

Generally there is an expectation that the affiliation will bring value to the department and/or School in some significant way to further enhance the reputation of the VSoE, such as by expanding the School's research and/or teaching mission through the fostering of mutually enhancing research collaborations or teaching. The type and budgetary commitment of the joint appointment should be commensurate to the expected scope of activities of the candidate in the department. See Section 4 of this document for more details.

C. Dossiers for Appointment, Promotion or Non-reappointment to Research or Teaching Faculty Positions

Guidelines pertaining to evaluation of dossiers for primary appointment or promotion of full-time faculty on research or teaching tracks are detailed below, respectively. Generally, for all tracks and ranks (full- or part-time), there is an expectation of distinction in research or teaching excellence and/or scholarship that meets national standards for the corresponding track and rank at leading institutions and that enhances the reputation of the VSoE. Appointments are based on qualifications, departmental needs, and availability of funding. Reappointments are based on performance, departmental needs, and availability of funding. Promotions are based on merit as governed by the specific expectations established by each department in accordance with School standards, in recognition of the accomplishments of faculty members who have demonstrated significant contributions and excellence in research or teaching. Thus, promotions are neither automatic nor based on years of employment at a given rank.

1) General Guidelines for Evaluation of Research Faculty Dossiers

For all research faculty ranks (full- or part-time), there is an expectation of distinction in research excellence and scholarship that (a) meets national standards for the corresponding rank at leading departments or institutions, and (b) enhances the reputation of the VSoE. The main factors to be considered are excellence and creativity in scholarly research evidenced by important and original contributions that are of impact to the field and supported from available funding.

2) General Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching Faculty Dossiers

For all teaching faculty ranks (full- or part-time), there is an expectation of distinction in teaching excellence and/or scholarship that (a) meets national standards for the corresponding rank at leading departments or institutions and (b) enhances the reputation of the VSoE. Appointments of new teaching faculty at all levels may take into account experience as a practicing professional in an engineering field related to the intended area of instruction to address departmental needs. The initial appointment is made commensurate with the candidate's current standing in the engineering profession. Promotion decisions normally are based on appropriately weighing the candidate's

contributions in the areas listed below such that successful candidates will, on balance, have contributed significantly to the pedagogical mission of the School to a degree commensurate with these descriptions. Specific guidelines are given below for each rank.

Lecturer of <Discipline>: (entry level rank)

- Effective as primary instructor for lecture, laboratory and/or discussion-section course, including development or revision of teaching materials to enhance instructional processes
- Effective in supervision and evaluation of students in classroom, laboratory, and/or discussion settings
- Participant in curricular planning, course development, innovative teaching and evaluation
- Service on department, School, and/or university committees in areas relevant to candidate's expertise

Senior Lecturer of <Discipline>:

- Met the criteria for Lecturer
- Demonstrate excellence in teaching and service, evidenced by annual performance reviews
- Develop new and effective teaching methods or materials
- Implement new courses or components of courses, as appropriate
- Maintain competence in area of expertise and enhance professional knowledge in areas important to the curriculum
- Effectively advise and mentor students
- Typically, although not required, will have spent at least three years of full-time instruction as an instructor and/or Lecturer at USC or a peer institution, or will have had at least as many years of experience as a practicing professional in the engineering field

Associate Professor of <Discipline or Engineering> Practice:

- Met the criteria for Senior Lecturer
- Leadership in the department and/or School in the area of teaching, including laboratory or industrial site coordination, and curricular development
- Development of new pedagogical methods and teaching materials in engineering with specific emphasis in the practice of engineering in its various forms
- Service as a mentor to students and graduates
- Additional positive factors considered include having received department awards, having given lectures at local, state, or national meetings on teaching methods or educational issues, and having published articles, chapters or books, or conference presentations that advance pedagogy in engineering; substantive scholarly publications in the candidate's field of engineering will be considered if submitted
- Typically, although not required, will have spent at least seven years of full-time instruction as a Lecturer and/or Senior Lecturer at USC or a peer institution, or will have had at least as many years of experience as a practicing professional in the engineering field

Professor of <Discipline or Engineering> Practice:

- Met the criteria for Associate Professor of Practice

- Received funding for educational projects or studies
- Service as a mentor to new teaching faculty
- Additional positive factors considered include having a Ph.D. degree in Engineering-related fields, having external recognition for instructional materials or innovative teaching methods, having received School and university awards, and having published articles, chapters or books, or conference presentations that advance pedagogy in engineering and/or make a significant contributions to the profession; substantive scholarly publications in the candidate's field of engineering will be considered if submitted
- Typically, although not required, will have had many years of experience as an instructor, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and/or Associate Professor of Practice (or equivalent) at USC or a peer institution; many years of experience as a practicing professional in the engineering field; or will have been previously tenured, at rank, at another reputable institution

3) *General Guidelines for Evaluation of Temporary, Part-time, and Voluntary Faculty Dossiers*

For Part-time Lecturer and Adjunct Lecturer appointments, the first two criteria stated above for full-time Lecturers equally apply. For voluntary Adjunct and Visiting faculty appointments, generally there is an expectation that the affiliation will bring value to the department and/or School in some significant way to further enhance the reputation of the VSoE, such as by expanding the School's research and/or teaching mission through the fostering of mutually enhancing collaborations. The rank and title should be commensurate to the qualifications and expected activities of the candidate. The criteria for Emeritus appointments are stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (Section 10-A of the 2015 edition).

3.3 CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality is central to the proper and effective functioning of appointment, promotion, and tenure processes. For the candidate and the School, it is essential that the appointment, 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. All those participating in the review should take care to follow the policies stated in the *Faculty Handbook*, the *UCAPT Manual*, and these guidelines, so that actual practice observes the stated criteria. The following should be kept in mind, which likewise apply at the department level as appropriate (i.e., department chair, committee, and faculty participating in the review of a candidate's dossier).

1. The letter of the APT Chair summarizes the discussion and vote of the APT Committee on the candidate's case, and not names, affiliations or other attributes of members of the APT Committee other than the Chair. The letter and APT subcommittee report is to be delivered by the APT Chair to the Dean's office (i.e., assistant to APT Committee) and nowhere else.
2. The APT subcommittee report should 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 APT Chair. The report is to be addressed to the APT Chair who will deliver it to the Dean's office (i.e., assistant to the APT Committee) and nowhere else.
3. 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 APT Chair to the Dean's office (i.e.,

assistant to the APT Committee). In all cases, it should not contain names, affiliations or other attributes of members of the APT Committee without their specific consent.

4. In addition to the above, it is understood that the APT Chair may have the need to communicate with the Dean's office (i.e., assistant to the APT Committee or Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs) 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 *must not* inform candidates, their department chair, other faculty, or anyone else about the results of a case, the vote in a case, deliberations in a case, the contents of a dossier, when a case is being considered, or even which case is being considered.

SECTION 4

PRIMARY AND JOINT APPOINTMENTS IN THE SCHOOL

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Three types of faculty appointments are possible.

1. Primary (normal) appointment is to a department in which the faculty member belongs. The appointee may hold tenure with a continuous appointment, be on the tenure track with an appointment for a probationary period, or not be on the tenure track with either renewable fixed-term or a non-renewable fixed-term appointment.
2. Secondary (joint) appointment is to another department possibly involving some rights, such as teaching, directing graduate students or providing service, but with agreed upon restrictions such as budgetary support and voting rights, and without tenure in the department. The appointee may have a continuous secondary appointment (only if tenured, at the Professor rank in her/his primary department) or a renewable fixed-term secondary appointment, as agreed.
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 appointee may have a continuous courtesy appointment (only if tenured, at the Professor rank in her/his primary department) or a renewable fixed-term courtesy appointment, as agreed.

This section and the accompanying Joint Appointment Checklist (Appendix F) provide guidelines for primary and joint appointments, both secondary and courtesy. The main thrust is that a written understanding (e.g., Joint Appointment Checklist) must be mutually agreed upon and signed by the faculty member and both departments involved, clearly delineating the rights and responsibilities of all the parties. Any agreed upon deviations should be spelled out clearly.

The definitions, checklist, guidelines and procedures given below apply to full-time TT/T faculty as well as full-time research faculty and teaching faculty having joint appointments involving two or more departments in which at least one department is in the Viterbi School. 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 in various academic units across one or more schools.

In some cases where the joint appointment is between a program and an academic department, the guidelines described here may not be suitable and may be replaced by more appropriate ones. In such cases, 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 agreement. The latter must have the same approval signatures as specified on the present Joint Appointment Checklist.

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 will either bring the faculty member into that department full-time or initiate non-reappointment to the full-time position (that can be combined with offering a part-time position).

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 ensuring 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. The guidelines given in the *UCAPT Manual* (Section 2.9 of the 2013 version) should be followed for promotion reviews of TT/T faculty with joint appointments.

6. Office Space and Secretarial Support

The primary department provides office space and secretarial support.

7. Service Responsibilities

The primary department is where 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 and Renewal

A joint appointment is subject to review and renegotiation at the end of the period specified in the Joint Appointments Checklist. 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 is providing resources to facilitate research, special arrangements should be specified, e.g., in the Joint Appointment Checklist or a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

13. Appointment Procedure

The appointment procedure is described in prior sections of this document.

14. Change of Primary Appointment

Guidelines for change of primary appointment of tenured faculty from one department to another, either within the same school or between schools, are provided in the *UCAPT Manual* (Section 6.3 of the 2013 version). A similar procedure may be used for non-tenured faculty.

B. Secondary Joint Appointments

1. Teaching Load

The faculty member may carry some part of her/his 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. If the joint appointment is discontinued for any reason, the dean may decide to transfer funds from the budget of the secondary department to the primary department to cover the salary 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 primary department is responsible for the department-level decision in the promotion review. 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, per the *UCAPT Manual* (Section 2.9 of the 2013 version) for tenure cases. Upon promotion, normally a new Joint Appointment Checklist should be filed reflecting the promoted title and any agreed upon changes in the terms of the joint appointment.

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 (including research faculty, if eligible or approved) can be considered an external member of the guidance and/or dissertation committees in the secondary department unless serving as the committee chair in that department.

9. Renegotiation and Renewal

A joint appointment is subject to review for renewal and/or renegotiation at the end of the period specified in the Joint Appointment Checklist or upon promotion. A reasonable appointment period might be six years or less, although exceptions are expected particularly when appointments are between different revenue centers. The initiative for renewal or renegotiation at the appropriate time is the responsibility of the faculty member, in consultation with the secondary department.

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 Joint Appointment Checklist or an MOU.

11. Listing of Secondary Appointments

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

12. Appointment Procedure

The appointment procedure is described in prior sections of this document and Section 4.3 below.

C. Courtesy Joint 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 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 but have (or are retired from) primary careers outside of USC.

2. Teaching Load

Normally the faculty member will not teach in the department in which she/he holds the courtesy appointment (henceforth the “courtesy appointment department”).

3. Budgetary obligations

None.

4. Faculty Meetings and Voting

Normally the faculty member will not attend faculty meetings nor vote in the courtesy appointment department. If any other arrangements are to be made they should be clearly specified at the time of appointment in the Joint Appointment Checklist.

5. Merit Evaluations

Not relevant.

6. Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Determined by the primary department.

7. Office Space and Secretarial Support

Normally there are none.

8. Service Responsibilities

Normally there are none.

9. Guidance and Dissertation Committees

The faculty member (including research faculty, if eligible or approved) normally is considered an external member of the guidance and/or dissertation committees in the courtesy department unless serving as the committee chair in that department.

10. Renegotiation and Renewal

A courtesy appointment will remain in force for a period as agreed to in the Joint Appointment Checklist or upon promotion, at which point it will automatically terminate unless renewed or renegotiated. The initiative for renewal or renegotiation at the appropriate time is the responsibility of the faculty member, in consultation with the secondary department.

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* joint appointment rather than a *courtesy* joint appointment as described here.

13. Appointment Procedure

The appointment procedure is described in prior sections of this document and Section 4.3 below.

14. Listing of Courtesy Appointments

In departmental and university listings of faculty (brochures, posters, websites, etc.), courtesy appointments should be listed under the following separate heading: “Affiliated Faculty in Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering,” or whichever is the appropriate department.

4.3 PROCEDURE FOR INITIATING JOINT APPOINTMENTS

1. The candidate, 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. Then, the Joint Appointment Checklist is completed and the candidate and the chair of the primary department sign the document. (The chair of the primary department must first consult the faculty of his/her department.) The agreement must ultimately be supported by the respective Dean(s) and approved by the Provost.

2. For either a Secondary or a Courtesy Appointment in the Viterbi School, the secondary or courtesy department should prepare a short dossier justifying the reason for the joint appointment and delineating its conditions. Section 3.1(B) detail the dossier components.
3. Eligible members of the secondary or courtesy department, of a rank higher than or equal to that of the proposed joint appointment, should review the dossier and vote on the appointment. If the candidate is a TT/T faculty member, only the TT/T faculty may vote; if the candidate is a research or teaching faculty member, faculty in those respective tracks may also vote, as appropriate. A meeting to discuss the matter before the vote is taken may be desirable, but it is not necessary. The department chair then records the outcome of the vote in the dossier and may also add additional information resulting from the discussion at a department meeting. The chair then signs the checklist which is added to the dossier.
4. The dossier is then submitted to the Dean's assistant (Faculty Affairs Coordinator) who, in turn, passes it on to the APT Executive Committee for review. This is only necessary if the candidate is not already a faculty member in the School. The APT Executive Committee, at their discretion, may 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 Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs for final action.
5. The joint appointment process can be initiated at any time during the candidate's career, including at the time of her/his initial appointment. In the latter case, the dossier referred to above will be the complete initial appointment dossier augmented by the Joint Appointment Checklist and the chair's memo of the secondary or courtesy department. The primary department will process the appointment according to its normal procedure as it would if no joint appointment were considered. The secondary or courtesy department will process the dossier as described in item (2) above. They determine only if the appointment, if approved by the primary department, will be a joint appointment.
6. Joint appointments may be renewed at the end of their terms or renegotiated. If renewal is based on the same terms as the current appointment, only a revised Joint Appointment Checklist needs to be agreed to and submitted for approval. The appointee may request a renegotiation at any time, including at the end of the current appointment. 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 would then need to be updated based on the newly agreed upon terms and submitted for approval, along with a memo from the secondary chair. In neither case is APT Executive Committee review required.
7. This joint appointment procedure should in no way compromise the integrity of the primary department's appointment and promotion processes as dictated by university policies and school guidelines.

SECTION 5

RESEARCH OR TEACHING FACULTY APPOINTMENTS IN THE VITERBI SCHOOL

The School-specific guidelines described below supplement, where necessary, university policies including the *Faculty Handbook*. University policies supersede these guidelines in case of any conflict.

5.1 RESEARCH FACULTY AND TEACHING FACULTY SIZES

The School is in accord with the university's position, as stated in the *Faculty Handbook*, to preserve the tenure system as the principal form of faculty appointment. It, therefore, recommends that the total number of full-time research faculty and teaching faculty appointments, collectively, in the School not to exceed the number of TT/T faculty, with the number of full-time teaching faculty appointments not exceeding a quarter of the TT/T faculty. This count excludes teaching faculty whose primary appointments are not in academic departments; specifically, teaching faculty in academic program units such as the Engineering Writing Program and the Information Technology Program. Both counts also exclude temporary, voluntary, and part-time faculty.

5.2 APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

Research or teaching faculty are appointed to fixed-term contracts, typically no longer than three-year terms. Appointments are recommended and decided using the procedures described in prior sections of this document. The appointment letter will specify the length of the term and whether the appointment is renewable or will be renewed unless adequate notice is given. The appointment letter provides adequate notice of non-reappointment except in cases in which it explicitly indicates that the faculty member will be reappointed—in such cases, separate notification of non-renewal would be needed. The university has no obligation to renew appointments. Thus, the appointment will expire at the end of its term unless there is written renewal, as stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (Sections 4-D(2) and 4-G of the 2015 version or the corresponding section of the current edition).

The term of appointment of temporary and voluntary faculty is determined based on specific circumstances of each case. The term of part-time teaching faculty appointments depends on departmental needs and can be one semester, an academic year, or longer. The initial term of full-time teaching faculty appointments typically is one academic year. If the appointment is renewed, the second term typically is two academic years, followed by three-year renewable appointments thereafter, all subject to the discretion of the Dean or dean's delegate. The term of appointment of research faculty typically is up to three years. Normally such appointments are based on the fiscal year rather than the academic year, although both are possible. Research or teaching faculty at senior ranks may be offered appointment contracts that roll over, with automatic renewal, unless there is a decision not to reappoint (see Section 5.3 below).

Reappointment decisions normally will be preceded by an appropriate evaluation, and non-reappointments (except for temporary or non-renewable appointments) must comply with the provisions of the *Faculty Handbook*. (See Section 5.3 of these guidelines, below.) Faculty, full- or part-time, with annual or multi-year contracts normally are evaluated for reappointment, with

consideration of whether a promotion process should be initiated, during the expiration year of the current term using the procedures described in prior sections of this document. There is no guarantee of reappointment, which is at the university's discretion. In all cases, reappointment is based primarily on satisfactory performance of the faculty member and departmental teaching needs (for teaching faculty) or availability of externally sponsored funding (for research faculty).

5.3 NON-REAPPOINTMENT AND MID-TERM TERMINATION

If a renewable annual or multi-year appointment (full-time or part-time after two semesters) is not to be renewed, an appropriate review using the procedures described in prior sections of this document is to be conducted. It is the current practice of the school to give a notice of non-reappointment, or pay in lieu of notice, to the faculty member at least 90 days prior to the expiration of the term of the appointment (except for temporary or non-renewable appointments). A review process is not required for non-renewable appointments nor for semester contracts for up to two semesters. Some departments recommend an up-or-out deadline (typically around six years) for research faculty at the junior rank. For such faculty in these departments, the appointment letter offered to them stating the condition of being eligible to be considered for reappointment only if promoted will provide adequate notice of non-reappointment if the faculty member is not promoted and reappointed. In all cases, normally the review will be conducted during the expiration year of the current term of appointment using the procedures described in prior sections of this document.

Contracts of research faculty and teaching faculty may be terminated earlier than their stipulated end, with a minimum of 90 days' notice, if there is a bona fide need to do so, under the provisions of Section 4-G(3) of the 2015 *Faculty Handbook* or the corresponding section of the current edition. Under the current policy, early termination may occur (a) based on cutbacks in external sources of funding for the specific activity (e.g., the research funding supporting the position), or (b) based on substantial program change, departmental needs or substantial resource limitations in the School, or (c) based upon poor performance or adequate cause. It is the practice of the School that in all such cases the Dean will first consult with the appropriate faculty committee using the procedures described in prior sections of this document.

In case of mid-term *dismissal for cause*, the same due process available to tenure-track/tenured faculty members is also provided to research faculty and teaching faculty members, as described in the *Faculty Handbook* (Chapter 8 of the 2015 version or the corresponding section of the current edition).

Section 6

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

These guidelines borrow freely from the USC *Faculty Handbook* (2015 version), the *UCAPT Manual* (2013 version), prior written documents from the USC Viterbi School, and from various materials provided by prior VSoE APT Committees. All comments and corrections should be directed to the office of the Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs.

APPENDIX A

**APPOINTMENT EVALUATION FORM FOR
EXTERNAL CANDIDATES TO A TENURE-TRACK OR TENURED
SENIOR RANKED FACULTY POSITION**

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

Name of Candidate: _____ **Date:** _____

School: _____ **Department:** _____

Appointment/Promotion? _____ **Date of Mandatory Decision of Tenure:** _____

Proposed Rank: _____ **Tenure:** _____

Present Rank: _____

Evaluation of Dossier

	Adequate for Evaluation	Inadequate for Evaluation
I. Administrative/Faculty Assessments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. Curriculum Vitae.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
III. Personal Statement.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV. Teaching Record.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. Service Record.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. Letter of Reference.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. Evidence of Research/Scholarly/Creative Activity.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation of Candidate

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

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

Approve Strongly Tentatively

Disapprove..... Strongly Tentatively

Request more evidence (as noted in "adequacy" section)

Discuss at a panel meeting

Reviewed by: _____ **Date:** _____

PLEASE USE THE REVERSE OF THIS PAGE FOR COMMENTS

Overall assessment of the case, main strength and main weakness
Assessment of research
Assessment of teaching
Other considerations
Assessment of external reviewers

APPENDIX B

**APT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT EVALUATION FORM
FOR CANDIDATES TO A RESEARCH OR TEACHING
FACULTY POSITION**

**Viterbi School of Engineering
Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure Committee
Executive Committee Report**

Name of Candidate: _____ Department: _____

Appointment/Promotion (Proposed Rank): _____

Present Rank: _____

Reviewer: _____

COMMENTS:

Recommended: Not Recommended: Abstained:

Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX C

TEMPLATE COHORT COMPARISON TABLE FOR QUANTITATIVE DATA SECTION OF DOSSIERS

Template Cohort Comparison Table

This cohort comprises [some?, all?] of the [discipline/subfield] engineering faculty at the top [20] engineering schools and in the top [20] [discipline] engineering departments (both as ranked by USN&WR in Spring 20XX) that have been promoted in 20XY or 20XZ (the last two years as specified by the *UCAPT Manual*). Data is obtained from available CV information.

School	USN&WR 20XZ Ranking Grad Engg	Name	Field ³ [theoretical vs. experimental]	PhD Year	Date			Promoted	Current Rank	# journal pubs ISI WoS ⁴		Citations		H-index		avg journal impact factor ⁵
					Start TT (place if different, or previous job)	current TT/T position				as of current date	end of year before promotion	as of current date	end of year before promotion	per year as of current date	as of current date	
USC		A		20__	20__ (place)	20__			Asst. Prof.							
Institu- tion 1		B		20__	20__ (place)	20__	20XY		Assoc Prof.							
Institu- tion 2		C		20__	20__ (place)	20__	20XZ		Assoc Prof.							
Institu- tion 3		D		20__	20__ (place)	20__	20XZ		Assoc Prof.							
Institu- tion 4		E		20__	2005	20__	20XY		Assoc Prof.							
Institu- tion 5		F		20__			20XZ									
Institu- tion 6		G		20__			20XY									

Note: “end of year before promotion” columns only include ISI Web of Science [separate columns may be added for Google Scholar, if applicable for the field] listed publications and citations prior to the year of tenure.

³ The columns are optional, yet recommended.

⁴ Only journal publications are included in the count. If applicable for the field, a separate column for peer-reviewed conference publications may be added.

⁵ For each individual, this is the average **20XZ** Impact Factor of the journals in which the (up to) 10 most-cited papers are published.

APPENDIX D

**UCAPT DOSSIER CHECKLIST
(FROM 2013 *UCAPT MANUAL*)**

CHECKLIST FOR DOSSIER PREPARATION

School _____ Name of Candidate _____

<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommendation for Appointment form or Recommendation for Promotion form.
<input type="checkbox"/>	For appointments only: Documentation of position posting or waiver of requirement to post position. Include summary of proactive outreach to ensure equal opportunity. [Only the Provost's Office can waive the requirement to post a position. The offer letter does not need to be included in the dossier.]
<input type="checkbox"/>	I-A. Administrative and Faculty Assessments (see section 7.2). [Include all applicable assessments from the list below.]
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dean. Independent assessment and recommendation with a candid explanation of reasons.
<input type="checkbox"/>	School committee. Report of the school faculty committee that advises the dean.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Department chair. Independent assessment with explanation of department needs and strategic goals. Summary of faculty discussion.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Department faculty. Report of screening or other committee representing department faculty.
<input type="checkbox"/>	For interdisciplinary candidates: Any additional evaluations from appropriate departments/schools. (The second department/school does not vote.) Note: this is typically only applicable for candidates with joint appointments greater than 0% (see section 2.9).
<input type="checkbox"/>	I-B. Quantitative Data (see section 7.3). [Include all applicable assessments from the list below.]
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cohort analysis.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Chart showing number of candidate's publications or creative works per year.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Citation counts for candidate's publications.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Journal impact factors (or other measures of the candidate's publications, creative work, performance venues, etc.).
<input type="checkbox"/>	List of grants.
<input type="checkbox"/>	II. Curriculum Vitae (see section 7.4).
<input type="checkbox"/>	III. Personal Statement (see section 7.5).
<input type="checkbox"/>	IV. Teaching Record (see section 7.6). Note: additional evidence of teaching effectiveness should be included in the Appendix (section VII-B).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teaching memo from department/school.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teaching statement from candidate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Chronological list of classes taught, with contact hours and enrollment size. Include independent studies supervised.
<input type="checkbox"/>	List of principal courses developed or substantially revised.
<input type="checkbox"/>	List of graduate students and post-docs mentored. Show each advisee's next career position, if available.
<input type="checkbox"/>	V. Service Record (see section 7.7).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Service statement from candidate (optional).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Service record.
<input type="checkbox"/>	VI. Referee Letters (see section 7.8).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sample solicitation letter.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Referee chart. Chart should show who suggested the referee, the referee's relationship to the candidate, and whether the referee answered all of the questions. Include all individuals who declined to be referees, as well as reasons for declining. Explain the choice of any unusual referees.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Referee bios. Include a brief referee bio before each referee letter.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VI-A: Substantive letters from arms-length referees. The dossier should include at least five to six substantive, arms-length letters.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VI-B: Other letters (collaborator, non-arms-length, non-substantive, etc.). Include all correspondence to and from referees who declined.
<input type="checkbox"/>	VII. Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship, Performance, and Teaching (see section 7.9).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VII-A: Evidence of Scholarship and Performance. Include sample of candidate's recent publications and other scholarly or artistic works. Send books and accepted book manuscripts along with the dossier. Section VII-A may also include: published reviews of candidate's work, publishers' reviews of candidate's manuscripts, "pink sheets" of pending grants, abstracts and samples of creative work.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VII-B: Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness. Include selected course syllabi, student evaluations, classroom observations, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Updated March 2013

APPENDIX E

**RESEARCH FACULTY AND TEACHING FACULTY
DOSSIER CHECKLIST**

Research or Teaching Faculty Appointment and Promotion Dossier Checklist

Faculty Title and Rank	Administrative & Faculty Assessments (Section I-A)			Curriculum Vitae (Section II)	Personal Statement (Section III)	Letters of Reference (Section VI)			Evidence of Scholarship and Professional Performance (Appendix -Section VII)	
	Recommendation for Appointment and Terms of Offer forms	Chair's Memo	Department Committee Memo			At least 3-4 letters (can be from internal referees)	At least 3-4 external letters (at least 2 arm's-length)	At least 3-4 external letters (at least 3 arm's-length)	VIIA – Evidence of Research (annual performance reviews, 3-4 peer-reviewed publications)	VIII – Evidence of Teaching (annual performance reviews, 2 years of teaching evaluations, educational materials developed)
Research Assistant Professor	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Research Associate Professor	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	
Research Professor	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Lecturer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			*	*
Senior Lecturer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			**	**
Associate Professor of Engineering Practice	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		*	**
Professor of Engineering Practice	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		*	**
Adjunct Faculty (all ranks)	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	*			*	
Visiting Faculty (all ranks)	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	*			*	
Emeritus Faculty	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	*			*	
Reappointments (all ranks)	✓	✓	*	✓						
Non-Reappointments		✓	*	✓					✓	✓

* If available

** Required for promotion; provide for appointments, if available

Note: Arm's-length letters are from non-colleagues, non-co-authors, and persons not suggested by the candidate.

Referee names must be approved by the Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs prior to soliciting letters.

APPENDIX F

JOINT APPOINTMENT CHECKLIST

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
JOINT APPOINTMENT CHECKLIST

Name: 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 the school or the faculty member can initiate a termination of the secondary appointment with the Dean's office at will. Check if continuous and indicate the start date.	Title: Start of secondary appointment: _____ month/day/year End of secondary appointment: _____ month/day/year <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous Normally, start dates should be either August 16 or January 1, termination dates should be either December 31 or May 15.
---	--

	PRIMARY SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM	SECONDARY SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM
1. School & Dept	Name of primary dept/program:	Name of secondary dept/program:
2. Teaching Load	Specify the teaching load percentage (at least 50%) or number of courses/units: % or courses/units per year.	Specify teaching load percentage (at most 50%) or number of courses/units: % or courses/units per year.
3. Faculty Meetings & Voting	The faculty member attends meetings and votes.	Generally, the faculty member will neither attend nor vote. Specify privileges allowed in secondary department: Attends: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Votes on non-personnel issues: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes Votes on personnel issues: <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
4. Merit Evaluation & Salary Review	Merit evaluation is to be conducted by the primary department. Normally, salary increases will be proposed in the primary academic unit and by regular procedures followed within that unit. The secondary department may conduct its own review and will forward the results to be considered in the primary department. Any other arrangement must be specified in this agreement.	
5. Tenure & Promotion Reviews	Tenure is held in the primary department, if the individual is tenured. The primary department conducts promotion and tenure reviews.	The secondary appointment is at the rank set in the primary department. Tenure is not held in the secondary department. The secondary department should forward its recommendation for consideration by the primary department at the time of promotion/tenure review, and it will be included in the promotion/tenure dossier. If there is non-reappointment in the primary department, the secondary appointment terminates at the same time. Specify any other arrangements:
6. Office Space, Administrative Support	Any space and secretarial support should reflect the faculty member's participation in the secondary department. Specify arrangements.	

	PRIMARY SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM	SECONDARY SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM
7. Service Responsibilities	Major service responsibilities.	Minimal unless specified otherwise. The total service should not exceed that expected of faculty having single appointments.
8. Renegotiation	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.	
9. Faculty Contract & Payment	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 issue a letter of secondary appointment, stating only the title and term, but will not prepare a separate contract. The secondary school will coordinate as needed with the primary department on the wording of the annual contract.

Signatures:

(Deans' approval required below)

Faculty Member _____

Primary Department Chair: _____ Secondary Department Chair: _____

FOR DEANS' USE ONLY

COMPLETE ONLY IF APPOINTMENTS ARE IN DIFFERENT SCHOOLS

1. Budgetary Obligations	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.	Specify the amount or percentage of salary and fringes covered by the Secondary School: % or \$ <input type="checkbox"/> Check here if secondary school's obligation is conditional (and specify conditions below).
2. Teaching Revenue	Revenue from courses taught in the secondary school are: <input type="checkbox"/> Credited to secondary school <input type="checkbox"/> Or other arrangement (specify):	
3. Indirect Cost Recovery on Grants	Indirect cost recovery will be: <input type="checkbox"/> Divided between the schools in proportion to the percentage of faculty member's salary paid by each school. <input type="checkbox"/> Credited to Primary School <input type="checkbox"/> Or other arrangement (specify):	
Unless specified otherwise, the primary department will provide all resources for the costs of research, including lab space, communications, grant management, and university indirect charges.		

Remarks:

Dean and Provost Approval:

Dean Primary School/Department/Program: _____ Date: _____

Dean Secondary School/Department/Program: _____ Date: _____

**Provost: _____ Date: _____

**File copy with Provost's office. Provost approval is required for any cross-school appointment.

APPENDIX G

TEMPLATE SOLICITATION LETTERS TO REFEREES FOR RESEARCH OR TEACHING FACULTY POSITIONS

**TEMPLATE SOLICITATION LETTER TO REFEREE FOR:
APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO A RESEARCH FACULTY POSITION**

Dear Professor [*name*]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the Department of [*discipline*] in a frank evaluation of the scholarship of [*faculty member's title and full name*] who is being considered for [*appointment/promotion*] to the rank of Research [*Professor or Associate Professor or Assistant Professor*]. This is a non-tenure-track research faculty position. I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, and sample publications.

Would you please let me know as soon as possible if you will be able to provide a review [*give your email/contact information*]? [*If you would like copies of [her/his] additional scholarly publications beyond the sample we have enclosed, please let me know.*]

We are seeking your assessment as to whether [*candidate name*]'s scholarship has demonstrated excellence and creativity, made important and original contributions, had an impact on the field, shows a clear arc of intellectual and creative development, and is widely perceived as outstanding. If you are knowledgeable and able to do so, we would appreciate your comments regarding any recognition [*candidate name*] may have received, including prizes, grants, honors and awards.

Every [*appointment/promotion*] is expected to meet national and international standards of leading institutions with similar positions as well as improve the overall stature of the department. Our reviewers, therefore, would also find it valuable for you to identify the leading departments of [*candidate name*]'s field, and give us your candid judgment on whether [*candidate name*]'s contributions would meet the standards for [*appointment/promotion*] to this position in those institutions (assuming an opening existed and service was acceptable).

Please understand that we seek your evaluation at an early stage in our process and that we have not yet made a decision. We seek your frank and candid assessment. We very much appreciate the time and effort involved in providing a review. If you are able to provide a letter of evaluation, would you please include a short biographical sketch about yourself, and describe any professional and personal relations you have had with the candidate.

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by relevant faculty in the [*department/program*], school and university [*appointment/promotion*] committees and officials, and it is intended to be read by no one else.

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

TEMPLATE SOLICITATION LETTER TO REFEREE FOR: APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER

Dear [referee's title and name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the [Department/Program] in a frank evaluation of the scholarship of [candidate name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [Lecturer/Senior Lecturer]. This is a non-tenure-track teaching faculty position. I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, teaching evaluations, and [other scholarly product: course syllabi, education/teaching materials, sample of publications, etc., as applicable].

Would you please let me know as soon as possible if you will be able to provide a review [give your email/contact information]? [If you would like copies of [her/his] additional education/teaching materials or publications beyond the sample we have enclosed, please let me know.]

We are seeking your assessment as to whether [candidate name] has demonstrated excellence and creativity in teaching and service, developed effective teaching methods and materials, implemented new courses or components of courses and labs, maintained and/or enhanced professional knowledge in areas important to the curriculum, and effectively mentored students. If you are knowledgeable and able to do so, we would appreciate your comments regarding any recognition [candidate name] may have received, including prizes, grants, honors and awards.

Every [appointment/promotion] is expected to meet national and international standards of leading institutions with similar positions as well as improve the overall stature of the [department/program]. Our reviewers, therefore, would also find it valuable for you to identify the leading departments of [candidate name]'s field, and give us your candid judgment on whether [candidate name]'s contributions would meet the standards for [appointment/promotion] to this position in those institutions (assuming an opening existed and service was acceptable).

Please understand that we seek your evaluation at an early stage in our process and that we have not yet made a decision. We seek your frank and candid assessment. We very much appreciate the time and effort involved in providing a review. If you are able to provide a letter of evaluation, would you please include a short biographical sketch about yourself, and describe any professional and personal relations you have had with the candidate.

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by relevant faculty in the [department/program], school and university [appointment/promotion] committees and officials, and it is intended to be read by no one else.

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

**TEMPLATE SOLICITATION LETTER TO REFEREE FOR:
APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION TO
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF <DISCIPLINE> PRACTICE OR
PROFESSOR OF <DISCIPLINE> PRACTICE**

Dear [referee's title and name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the [Department/Program] in a frank evaluation of the scholarship of [candidate name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [Associate Professor of the Practice or Professor of the Practice]. This is a non-tenure-track teaching faculty position. I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, teaching evaluations, and [other scholarly product: course syllabi, education/teaching materials, sample of publications, etc., as applicable].

Would you please let me know as soon as possible if you will be able to provide a review [give your email/contact information]? [If you would like copies of [her/his] additional education/ teaching materials or publications beyond the sample we have enclosed, please let me know.]

We are seeking your assessment as to whether [candidate name] has demonstrated excellence and leadership in the area of teaching and service, developed effective teaching methods and materials, implemented new courses or components of courses and labs, developed new pedagogical methods and teaching materials, effectively mentored students/graduates [for Professor rank, add: and other teaching faculty], published articles or teaching materials that make a significant contribution to the profession, [for Professor rank, add the following: received funding for educational projects or studies, received national recognition for instructional materials or innovative teaching methods]. If you are knowledgeable and able to do so, we would appreciate your comments regarding any recognition [candidate name] may have received, including prizes, grants, honors and awards.

Every [appointment/promotion] is expected to meet national and international standards of leading institutions with similar positions as well as improve the overall stature of the [department/program]. Our reviewers, therefore, would also find it valuable for you to identify the leading departments of [candidate name]'s field, and give us your candid judgment on whether [candidate name]'s contributions would meet the standards for [appointment/promotion] to this position in those institutions (assuming an opening existed and service was acceptable).

Please understand that we seek your evaluation at an early stage in our process and that we have not yet made a decision. We seek your frank and candid assessment. We very much appreciate the time and effort involved in providing a review. If you are able to provide a letter of evaluation, would you please include a short biographical sketch about yourself, and describe any professional and personal relations you have had with the candidate.

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by relevant faculty in the [department/program], school and university [appointment/promotion] committees and officials, and it is intended to be read by no one else.

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