

University Committee on
Appointments, Promotions,
and Tenure

UCAPT MANUAL
2017



Table of Contents

1. UCAPT and the Dossier Review Process	2
1.1 Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Appointment.....	2
1.1.1 Recusal.....	2
1.2 UCAPT.....	3
1.3 Deadlines for Dossiers.....	3
1.4 Confidentiality.....	4
1.5 The Dossier Review Process.....	5
1.5.1 Adherence to Policy.....	5
1.5.2 Changes in Editions of UCAPT Documents.....	5
1.5.3 Predictions and Advice.....	5
1.5.4 Communicating Decisions.....	6
1.5.5 Providing Fuller Explanation of a Negative Decision.....	6
1.6 Reconsideration of a Tenure Dossier.....	6
1.7 Interference and Procedural Irregularities.....	8
1.8 Equal Opportunity.....	8
1.9 RTPC Faculty.....	8
2. Standards and Evaluation	8
2.1 Expectations and Standards for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure.....	8
2.1.1 Candidates for Tenure.....	9
2.1.2 Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor.....	10
2.2 Time Period.....	10
2.3 Assessing Research Quality and Impact.....	10
2.3.1 Overview.....	10
2.3.2 Quality and Venue of Publications.....	11
2.3.3 Citations.....	12
2.3.4 Artistic and Creative Work.....	12
2.3.5 Honors and Awards.....	12
2.3.6 Conferences, Patents, and Other Forms of Scholarship.....	12
2.3.7 Impact on Practice and Society.....	13
2.3.8 Grants and Fellowships.....	13
2.3.9 Peer Reviews.....	13
2.3.10 Editorial Positions and Leadership in Professional Societies.....	14
2.3.11 Digital Scholarship.....	14
2.3.12 General Comment Regarding Explanatory Information in the Dossier.....	14
2.4 Assessing Research Independence.....	15
2.5 Assessing Research Trajectory.....	16
2.6 Assessing Teaching and Mentoring.....	16
2.7 Interdisciplinary Work.....	16
2.7.1 Candidates with Joint Appointments.....	16
2.7.2 Interdisciplinary Candidates without Joint Appointments.....	17
2.7.3 Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (Department and School Level).....	17
2.7.4 Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (UCAPT).....	17
2.7.5 Mentoring Interdisciplinary Faculty Members.....	17
2.8 International Scholarship and Teaching.....	18
3. Information for Tenure-Track Assistant Professors	18
3.1 Standards for Tenure.....	18
3.2 Timeline for Tenure.....	18
3.3 Pre-Tenure Reviews.....	18
3.3.1 Year 5 or 6 Review.....	19
3.4 Revising the Tenure Decision Date.....	19
3.5 Early Tenure Review.....	19

4. Information for Full Professor Candidates	20
4.1 Standards for Promotion	20
4.2 Timeline for Promotion.....	20
4.3 Contents of the Dossier.....	20
4.4 Resubmission of a Dossier After a Negative Decision.....	20
5. Information for Clinical Scholar Candidates	20
6. Information for Senior Lateral Appointments	21
6.1 Timing and the UCAPT Process.....	21
6.2 Contents of the Dossier.....	22
6.3 Internal Lateral Appointments	22
7. Information for Librarians and RTPC Faculty	23
7.1 Information for Librarian Promotions and Appointments	23
7.2 Information on RTPC Promotions	23
8. The Dossier	24
8.1 Dossier Overview	24
8.1.1 Overview	25
8.1.2 The Importance of Candor	25
8.1.3 Documenting the Process Fully.....	25
8.1.4 The Departmental Committee Report and Chair’s Memo.....	26
8.1.5 The School Committee Report.....	27
8.1.6 The Dean’s Memo	27
8.2 Quantitative Data (Section I-B).....	27
8.3 Curriculum Vitae (Section II).....	29
8.4 Personal Statement (Section III)	30
8.5 Teaching Record (Section IV).....	30
8.5.1 Teaching Memo.....	30
8.5.2 Teaching Statement	30
8.5.3 Teaching Record and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness.....	30
8.6 Service Record (Section V).....	31
8.6.1 Service Statement (optional).....	31
8.6.2 Service Record.....	31
8.7 External Reviewer Letters (Section VI).....	31
8.7.1 Template Letter	31
8.7.2 Selection of Reviewers	31
8.7.3 Method of Contacting Reviewers.....	33
8.7.4 Organization of Reviewer Letter Section of Dossier	34
8.7.5 Confidentiality	34
8.7.6 Unsolicited Letters.....	35
8.8 Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship, Performance, and Teaching (Section VII).....	35
8.8.1 Evidence of Scholarship and Performance (Section VII-A).....	35
8.8.2 Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (Section VII-B).....	35
9. Templates for Solicitation Letters for Reviewers	37
9.1 Standard Letter	37
9.2 Clinical Scholar Candidate	38
9.3 Reviewer is a Collaborator.....	39
Appendix	41
Checklist for Dossier Preparation.....	41
UCAPT Appointments and Promotions Evaluation Form	43

The UCAPT Manual

2017

Faculty governance, a guiding principle of this University, necessitates that the ultimate recommendation on key personnel decisions is made by committees composed of faculty at the university level that serve to ensure consistency and fairness, as well as to maintain the upward trajectory of faculty excellence at the University.

The University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (UCAPT) serves as the ultimate advisory body to the Provost, who retains final authority on behalf of the President. Panels of UCAPT advise the Provost on tenure decisions, and promotion and appointment to tenure-track and tenured Associate Professor and Professor positions and the awarding of the distinction of Clinical Scholar. The University Committee on Library Appointments, Promotions, and Continuing Appointments advises the Provost on senior librarian ranks. The University Committee on Research, Teaching, Practitioner, and Clinical Promotions advises the Provost on promotions not involving the grant of tenure, where a dean disagrees with the recommendation of a faculty committee. All these groups share this Manual.

The Faculty Handbook (www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook) and this UCAPT Manual are the definitive guidelines of the University's policies and procedures regarding appointments, promotions, and tenure. The Faculty Handbook states the University's fundamental policies and practices. The UCAPT Manual supplements the Faculty Handbook by detailing the appointment, promotion, and tenure processes.

In addition to providing guidelines, the UCAPT Manual aims to demystify the faculty promotion and appointment process. Each edition gives public answers to important questions that have come up since the prior edition. While aspects of the process are necessarily confidential, UCAPT strives to make the process and criteria as transparent as possible. For additional transparency, the lists of committee members and statistical summaries are published periodically.

Section 1 of the Manual gives an overview of the appointment, promotion, and tenure review process, and explains when and by whom the dossier is reviewed. Section 2 details the University's standards for appointment, promotion, and tenure and the criteria for evaluation of the faculty member's research, teaching, and service. Sections 3 through 7 provide information relevant to specific tracks or ranks: assistant professors on the tenure track, candidates for full professor, candidates for Clinical Scholar and similar designations, senior lateral appointment candidates, librarians, and those on research, teaching, practice, and clinical (RTPC) tracks. Finally, section 8 explains each of the dossier components, and section 9 includes templates for the external reviewer letters. The appendix includes an updated dossier checklist (a succinct reference listing of all the necessary dossier components) and the UCAPT dossier evaluation form.

1. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Process

1.1 Overview of Process

Appointment, promotion, and tenure processes involve multiple levels of review. An example of a path for a tenure case in a departmentalized school is: (1) review and vote on a recommendation by the tenured faculty in the candidate's department (after a report from a department faculty reviewing committee), (2) review and recommendation by the dean (after a report from a school level faculty reviewing committee), and (3) final decision by the Provost (advised by a recommendation from a UCAPT panel). Schools without departments employ a school-level faculty committee for the first recommendation. While details of the internal process may differ from one school to another, they all must be consistent with Faculty Handbook 4-H(2). Involvement of reviewers at multiple levels helps ensure that a dossier is thoroughly reviewed and that decisions are based on careful consideration of all the evidence.

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

If a candidate is not recommended by *both* the faculty at the first stage and the dean at the second stage, then promotion or tenure is denied; the case is not forwarded to the university level faculty committee and the denial is final.

The authority to grant tenure, as well as to promote to or appoint associate professors and professors with tenure or on the tenure track, is vested by the University Bylaws in the President, who has delegated responsibility to the Provost. The USC trustees do not have a role in this academic decision.

1.1.1 *Recusal*

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

Faculty who have co-authored publications or collaborated on grants with a candidate may not serve on a promotion committee that would provide an evaluation of the candidate's research because that would entail a review of the faculty member's own work. If the collaborative work comprises a material part of the candidate's record, the collaborating faculty member will not attend the faculty discussion in order to avoid influencing the discussion of the work by other faculty. (If the materiality of the collaborative work is in question, the dean will ask the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs to decide whether the collaborating faculty member should be exempt from this paragraph.) The collaborating faculty member may provide input into the deliberations by a memo included

in the dossier, including explanation of the candidate's contribution to the joint work. Because external reviewers may not be candid in evaluating the candidate's work if their comments will be read by the collaborating faculty member, the collaborating faculty member may not read the external letters and any portions of other documents that discuss the external assessments of the collaborative work. The collaborating faculty may vote in writing, after reviewing the other portions of the dossier.

1.2 UCAPT

UCAPT members are designated by the Provost after consultation with the Academic Senate leadership, on the basis of a record of distinguished scholarly or creative achievement and experience in evaluating dossiers, with consideration for the intellectual, disciplinary, and demographic diversity of the committee. UCAPT generally consists of at least six panels of five to eight faculty members in related disciplinary areas. UCAPT members are a rotating group of outstanding scholars, educators, and creative artists, diverse by field, intellectual approach, ethnicity, and gender. UCAPT membership has included colleagues whose achievements have been recognized by the Nobel Prize, University Professorships, Distinguished Professorships, National Academy memberships, and other marks of distinction. UCAPT also uses ad hoc members as needed to evaluate dossiers properly. At the end of each academic year, the University makes public the names of UCAPT members from the past two years.

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

UCAPT seeks to ensure that there is consistency in standards across units, that candidates' performance meets the standards of peer institutions, and that the quality of a school's faculty progresses over time.

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

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

1.3 Deadlines for Dossiers

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

UCAPT Deadlines

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

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

If there is a need for an early decision, the dean should let the Provost's Office know as much in advance as possible. The department or school should not prolong consideration and then request immediate UCAPT action. In exceptional situations, where expedited UCAPT consideration is necessitated by circumstances such as a competing offer, the dean must explain personally to the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs the reason for the urgency, why the dossier could not be submitted earlier, why the Provost should make an exception to the usual processes, and the date by which a decision is requested.

As an extremely late dossier submission to UCAPT risks being interpreted negatively, it is important that dossiers submitted with significant delay contain a clear explanation of the origins of the delay. A promotion dossier not involving tenure submitted long after the October 15 deadline may be returned for resubmission the following year.

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

If charges of misconduct arise while the tenure process is underway, such charges will not be investigated by UCAPT, but will be considered under the usual processes, such as, but not limited to, those outlined in chapter 6 of the Faculty Handbook or the policy on scientific misconduct (<http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct/>). The Provost may delay the tenure decision if needed to resolve the charges, and will decide whether to extend any terminal year appointment if the tenure decision is negative.

1.4 Confidentiality

Departments and schools must take all necessary steps to maintain confidentiality, including during the physical preparation of the dossier and dossier storage. Broad electronic distribution of the dossier must be avoided; instead, password-protected web sites can be used. All paper copies of the dossier should be shredded after use, while being sure to maintain in the electronic files the official copy of the record. Internal and external evaluations in the dossier are treated as confidential to the full extent the law permits. Only the voting faculty, the dean's office, and the provost's office, may read the dossier. This includes, for example, reviewer letters, reports prepared by committee members, and other ratings, reports, and records obtained in connection with the process of appointment or promotion to a higher rank or to tenured or continuing appointment status. The candidate's CV and publications are publicly available documents.

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

1.5 Policy and Communication

1.5.1 Adherence to Policy

All those participating in the review should take care to follow the policies stated in the Faculty Handbook and this Manual. The Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs may approve requests to extend deadlines, change the language of template letters, limit the number of expected letters for candidates of great distinction or authorize use of emails in appropriate cases, or abridge the process when considering an RTPC promotion or appointment of someone previously tenured at USC. The Provost, and only the Provost, may authorize other exceptions or waivers to this Manual or other policies, and before doing so in material matters will consult with the chair of UCAPT.

1.5.2 Changes in Editions of UCAPT Documents

The candidate may write to the dean before the start of the mid-probationary period review process, or before the start of preparation of the tenure dossier, requesting that the review be conducted under the UCAPT Manual guidelines in force when the individual was first appointed. The candidate should specify the difference between the current and former guidelines. The chair's memo should mention which edition of the UCAPT Manual pertains to the case if it is not the current one and the relevant difference. New editions of the UCAPT Manual are issued by the Provost after advice of a committee of UCAPT.

1.5.3 Predictions and Advice

Neither predictions, evaluations, nor advice from any USC official except the Provost is definitive. Even if colleagues give unalloyed praise in annual reviews, mid-probationary reviews, or mentoring, candidates for tenure and promotion should nevertheless be sure to seek constructive criticism, and to remember that external reviewers and UCAPT will eventually evaluate dossiers by national standards, and that the final decision is made by the Provost.

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

1.5.4 Communicating Decisions

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

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

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

1.5.5 Providing Fuller Explanation of a Negative Decision

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

1.6 Reconsideration of a Tenure Dossier

When tenure has been denied by the Provost (on behalf of the President), or was denied because both the faculty and dean were negative at the first and second stages of decision, that is a final action. In rare circumstances, however, where extraordinary and unexpected new evidence emerges in the months following a tenure decision, reconsideration of the decision may be requested. A reconsideration is not a re-adjudication of the judgment on the original evidence, but rather provides a process by which important new evidence can be considered.

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

Either the individual or dean may request reconsideration. If a candidate wishes to be reconsidered, he or she must submit a letter to the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs by September 15 of the terminal year, declaring this intention and the evidence to be

used as grounds for a reconsideration. The Vice Provost will then meet with the candidate to discuss the original dossier, the new evidence, and the timeline for submitting new materials to his or her dean.

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

A supplement to the original dossier will be prepared under direction of the dean that adds the new evidence, documenting the basis of the reconsideration. The supplement should indicate that the new evidence is unexpected, in the sense of not having been considered as part of the tenure decision. The new evidence may be either new information about the candidate's accomplishments or new accomplishments since the original tenure decision. The dean or the Provost may also request recommendations from external reviewers who were negative during the initial consideration, or from committees, reviewers, or others beyond what is provided in these guidelines (such as soliciting additional external reviewers on the full array of scholarship). The individual may submit a concise additional statement. All such material will be included in the supplement, which will be attached to the original dossier.

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

There are two other situations in which reconsideration may be requested: (1) the Provost gave permission during initial consideration to resubmit the dossier by the original Tenure Decision Date or by a revised Tenure Decision Date, as determined by the Provost (in such cases, the normal tenure standard applies rather than the extraordinary circumstances standard); or (2) there is a claim of procedural defects (see below, section 1.7).

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

If the candidate believes that his or her rights have been violated, he or she has a right to a grievance hearing, as detailed in Faculty Handbook, chapter 7. A grievance against the decision to deny tenure must be filed through the Academic Senate within nine months of that original decision; requesting reconsideration does not extend that deadline.

1.7 Interference and Procedural Irregularities

On occasion at various universities, groups of alumni, political figures, or internal or external faculty have attempted to use lobbying campaigns or petitions to affect a decision. It is unprofessional for faculty to participate in such campaigns or to involve students in a personnel decision. Such influences have no part in the personnel process and are excluded from the dossier. Volunteered letters or petitions suffer from a selection bias and often are based on mistakes about the facts of the dossier, the University's process, or the candidate's work. Both the confidentiality of the process and the prohibition against lobbying seek to provide protections against interference.

If the candidate believes there have been procedural irregularities, he or she should promptly write to the Provost. It is the Provost's responsibility to decide what remedy, if any, is appropriate for procedural defects. For example, the Provost may decide that procedural irregularities at earlier stages were fully remedied by the independent evaluation and recommendation provided by UCAPT, or that procedural irregularities did not have a material effect on the final decision given the weight of the evidence.

1.8 Equal Opportunity

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

Over the ten-year period from academic year 2006-2007 through academic year 2015-2016, 81% of the 300 tenure-track faculty who completed the UCAPT process were granted tenure. There were no statistically significant differences based on gender or ethnicity. The proportion of women receiving tenure was not different from that of men, and those who self-identified as an under-represented minority (Black, Latino, or Indigenous American) or as an Asian American did not have different tenure rates from those who identified as non-Hispanic white.

All UCAPT panels are diverse by gender and ethnicity.

1.9 Research, Teaching, Practitioner and Clinical Faculty

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

2. Standards and Evaluation

2.1 Expectations and Standards for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

The primary factors considered in appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions are

excellence and creativity in both scholarly research and teaching, as documented in the dossier, with outstanding performance required in one—almost always research—and strong performance in the other. The University values scholars who have made important and original contributions, who have had an impact on their field, and whose work shows a clear arc of intellectual and creative development.

Every appointment, promotion, and grant of tenure should meet the national and international standards of the leading institutions, as well as improve the overall stature of the academic unit. A candidate's scholarly or artistic work should be widely perceived among peers as outstanding, and the candidate should have a strong reputation in his or her field. The candidate should also be viewed as instrumental in advancing the academic needs of his/her unit.

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

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

Expectations for scholarship do not primarily concern quantity, although the University shares with other leading institutions expectations about productivity. Expectations and metrics for productivity vary by field. For example, candidates in fields that emphasize book production should have a book or books published or in press by a university press or press of equivalent standards and reputation (preferably with published reviews). Candidates in article-producing fields should have a sufficient mass of articles in high-impact journals. Candidates in grant-funded fields should have an independent research program as principal investigator with a sustained record of substantial peer-reviewed external funding from federal agencies. Schools and departments are expected to submit for Provost approval field-specific metrics (see Section 2.3.1).

2.1.1 Candidates for Tenure

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

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

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

for tenure will be judged.

2.1.2 Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor

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

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

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

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

Recognizing the University's support of interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarship, associate professors (and candidates for full professor) are encouraged to take advantage of the freedom afforded by tenure to pursue their scholarly interests whether they fall within or across traditional disciplinary boundaries. This freedom also allows for more risk-taking and creativity in scholarly activities. Although such innovative efforts are not required, they are considered a positive as the University seeks to encourage creative research.

2.2 Time Period

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

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

2.3 Assessing Research Quality and Impact

2.3.1 Overview

The most critical factor in appointment, promotion, and tenure cases is the quality and impact of a candidate's work. UCAPT and reviewers at other levels base their assessments of quality and impact on a variety of factors, including direct reading of the work, the quality of publication venues, the quantity of work, the influence shown by citations, the external peer

review expressed in scoring and funding decisions by Federal agencies and organizations known to have high standards, and confidential reviews by external scholars. Supplemental evidence can consist of editorial appointments or leadership in professional societies, awards and honors, and reviews published in scholarly outlets and important popular media. There is no formula by which these factors are combined, and assessments of quality and impact cannot be reduced to a number, such as number of publications or citations. Reviewers consider the record as a whole, giving weight to different factors as is appropriate to the case.

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

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

2.3.2 Quantity and Venue of Publications

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

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

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

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

2.3.3 *Citations*

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

2.3.4 *Artistic and Creative Work*

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

Additionally, the dossier should detail discipline-specific standards, practices, and measures of impact. Artistic exhibitions and cinema festivals, for instance, typically have their own forms of peer review; departments should supply detailed information about the peer review process.

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

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

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

2.3.5 *Honors and Awards*

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

2.3.6 *Conferences, Patents, and Other Forms of Scholarship*

The significance of conferences varies from discipline to discipline. Presenting papers at conferences can be useful in publicizing emerging research, establishing one's reputation in the field, and other worthwhile goals. Similarly, invitations to present talks to faculty groups at other universities indicate interest in the candidate's research by outside experts.

Computer science is recognized as a special case where many scholars regard published conference papers from top conferences as equivalent to journal articles, but most fields do not rate them as highly.

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

2.3.7 Impact on Practice and Society

In some disciplines, evaluation of the impact of publications and scholarly work can include not just the impact on other scholars, but also the impact on the practice of the profession, public policy, or the workings of institutions. Sometimes the candidate's work results in new organizations or new products and services. These activities are not a substitute for peer-reviewed publications, but they can be evaluated as additional measures of the impact of the candidate's scholarly contribution. That a candidate's research was featured or widely discussed in popular media may be documented in the dossier, but in itself may not be useful evidence of impact.

2.3.8 Grants and Fellowships

For faculty members in grant-funded fields, information on the type and amount of external funding can be a useful indicator of the quality of work. The number of dollars awarded in grants and the type of indirect cost recovery are not themselves significant. Rather, it is the rigor of the peer review of federal agencies and similar funding sources that is significant. Thus, it would be significant that a federal grant proposal received an excellent score, even if it was not funded because the agency appropriation was cut. On the other hand, even a very large grant that is awarded without equivalent peer review provides less useful information.

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

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

2.3.9 Peer Reviews

All dossiers contain confidential letters from external reviewers who are leading experts in the candidate's field. See Section 8.8 for information on how those reviewers are selected. These letters are a very important factor in assessing the quality and impact of a candidate's work, as well as the candidate's external reputation.

For books and creative work, published reviews in leading outlets can provide useful information on the quality and impact of work. The fact of being reviewed in a leading outlet itself can be an indicator of quality or importance, and the lack of reviews in leading outlets may suggest the work is of limited importance. Most important is the substance of the

review. If books appear late in the probationary period, there may not be enough time to obtain reviews.

2.3.10 Editorial Positions and Leadership in Professional Societies

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

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

Invitation to present at a Gordon Research Conference is, in many fields, a valuable indication of a candidate's scholarly reputation.

2.3.11 Digital Scholarship

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

UCAPT welcomes innovative approaches to scholarship and strives to evaluate digital scholarship through evidence of contribution, impact, peer review, and creativity. It reviews "born digital" scholarship by viewing the work in its context and taking into account the contribution of the work's medium or form. Mentors and those responsible for assembling dossiers should ensure that a faculty member's creativity and impact within the field are demonstrated within the context of the field. For venues where the peer review process and impact factor are not evident, departments should submit such explanatory information as the ratio of submissions to acceptances, the stature of others who publish in that venue, the stature of the reviewers or editors, and any other measures of the influence of the venue. If a digital publication is not itself peer-reviewed, its quality might be evaluated, for instance, through any peer-reviewed funding it receives or its connections with significant publications in peer-reviewed scholarly journals. Other evidence of the work's impact might be its inclusion in university syllabi, electronic archives, and recognition networks.

2.3.12 General Comment Regarding Explanatory Information in the Dossier

When the significance and impact of items in the candidate's dossier may not be immediately apparent to UCAPT, the department should supply additional information about these items. For instance, if a candidate's creative work is selected for a certain prize or festival, the

department should supply information as to the ratio of submissions to acceptances, the stature of the judges, and the stature of other winners or participants. If a candidate publishes in non-peer-reviewed venues, the department should detail the ratio of submissions to acceptances, the stature of the editors or reviewers, the stature of other authors in that venue, and measures of the venue's impact.

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

Those preparing the dossier should avoid any temptation to suppress unfavorable information out of concern that UCAPT will not understand it or give it too much weight. Instead, the information should be presented candidly along with an explanation.

2.4 Assessing Research Independence

Candidates for appointment, promotion, and tenure must demonstrate a program of scholarship independent from their Ph.D. supervisors or post-doctoral mentors, and their record must provide evidence of original intellectual contributions to collaborative projects. The University supports both independent and collaborative work. In some fields collaborative work is the norm. In evaluating a dossier with collaborative work, UCAPT looks to distinguish the intellectual contributions of the candidate.

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

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

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

For collaborative work in multidisciplinary teams, a candidate should demonstrate evidence of his or her unique and original contribution to multidisciplinary teams. The National Institutes of Health criteria state that participants in team research can demonstrate this evidence through "independent publication of methodological or seminal contributions to the candidate's specific research area; where possible, explicit in-print acknowledgment of unique creative contributions in multi-author publications and/or selection for presentation of team findings at national and international scientific conferences; members of research teams should demonstrate peer recognition of their specific contributions and some

publications should highlight their distinctive research; creative and unique contributions to team productivity should be documented.” A candidate who conducts collaborative research should make clear in the personal statement and on the CV what his or her specific contributions were to the collaborative work.

2.5 Assessing Research Trajectory

Another factor in appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions is the trajectory of a candidate’s research. The university seeks to appoint, promote, and tenure scholars who will continue to produce high quality and impactful research and maintain a strong professional reputation in the future. There is no required profile for work over time, but large gaps in the production of research may raise questions. A slowing of research activity over time, or a sudden burst just before the tenure decision, may also raise questions. A candidate should use the personal statement to anticipate and address any questions that might arise about his or her research trajectory.

2.6 Assessing Teaching and Mentoring

All candidates for appointment, promotion, and tenure are expected to be strong teachers. The candidate’s teaching must demonstrate commitment to students, and in some fields successful mentoring of doctoral candidates is expected. It is laudable if a candidate for tenure demonstrates excellence and creativity in teaching. On the other hand, devotion to teaching and mentoring should not be allowed to take away the time necessary to publish the expected scholarly work and obtain necessary funding. For appointments and promotion to full professor, evidence of excellence in teaching and mentoring is expected.

Teaching quality is assessed based on a number of factors. The best evidence comes from peer assessments, demonstration of students’ learning achievements, utilization of exemplary teaching methods, and inspection of syllabi and class materials. Other evidence may include when appropriate: student ratings from classes taught, teaching awards and honors, and the candidate’s personal statement. As with other assessments, no single factor is determinative, and assessment involves a thoughtful weighing of multiple factors as appropriate to the case.

2.7 Interdisciplinary Work

2.7.1 Candidates with Joint Appointments

The University welcomes work that spans traditional disciplines. For candidates with greater than zero-percent joint appointments, UCAPT will automatically consider their work to be interdisciplinary. However, assistant professors on the tenure track are discouraged from having joint appointments of more than zero percent.

It is desirable that the departmental and/or school committees for candidates with greater than zero-percent joint appointments should include one or more appropriate members from the secondary department or school. Similarly, it is desirable that advice be sought from these colleagues on the selection of reviewers from other disciplines, as well as reviewers who share the candidate’s interdisciplinary focus, and that in addition, one or more appropriate senior members in the other discipline be asked to provide letters of evaluation concerning the candidate’s interdisciplinary work. All evaluations from other departments or schools should be included in the dossier before its final consideration by the home

department.

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

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

2.7.2 Interdisciplinary Candidates without Joint Appointments

If a candidate wishes to be identified as interdisciplinary but does not have a greater than zero-percent joint appointment, either the individual or the home department may send a memo to the dean requesting that he or she be identified as interdisciplinary in the tenure, promotion, or appointment process. This memo should be sent before the beginning of preparation of the dossier. If the dean agrees, he or she should alert the Provost's Office that the dossier is interdisciplinary.

2.7.3 Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (Department and School Level)

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

2.7.4 Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (UCAPT)

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

2.7.5 Mentoring Interdisciplinary Faculty Members

It is desirable that an interdisciplinary candidate have mentors in all appropriate units, who work together to give the candidate a consistent message about research and publications, as well as guidance on how to avoid excessive burdens of teaching and service. For candidates with appointments in more than one unit, a Joint Appointment Checklist must be approved so that workload expectations are clear. It is also desirable that the ways interdisciplinary excellence will be evaluated (either as set out in the school clarifications or as individually agreed) are made available to the individual at the time of appointment, or early in the candidate's probationary period.

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

If interdisciplinary work requires a substantially longer start-up time than research in a single

discipline, a request may be made to the Provost, early in the probationary period, to consider an extension of that period (see section 3.4). Such a request should include the recommendations of each of the relevant department chairs and deans.

2.8 International Scholarship and Teaching

Department and school committees should consider faculty members' participation in significant international activities: teaching and research abroad, as well as service to distinguished foreign institutions and students. Work conducted overseas or in conjunction with overseas organizations may be less visible than work done on campus or domestically. Nevertheless, such efforts should be evaluated and accorded reasonable weight in promotion, tenure, and appointment decisions.

3. Information for Tenure-Track Assistant Professors

3.1 Standards for Tenure

Standards and expectations are discussed in Section 2.

3.2 Timeline for Tenure

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

3.3 Pre-Tenure Reviews

Tenure-track faculty members undergo regular performance reviews (concerning progress toward meeting tenure standards) and annual reappointment. Because they are appointed on a series of one-year contracts, tenure-track faculty members may be non-reappointed in any year with notice, as detailed in the Faculty Handbook sections 4-F(3) and 3-B(5). If it appears in any year that an individual is unlikely to meet the standards for tenure, not renewing the contract is fairer to the candidate and better for the department. Schools are asked to consider the question of non-reappointment especially carefully at the mid-probationary period review, as well as in the year before the tenure decision. No tenure review is conducted if the candidate is non-reappointed before or early in the academic year of the mandatory tenure decision (or fiscal year, for fiscal year appointments). If the candidate withdraws from consideration before the tenure decision, the process is not completed.

There is a particularly thorough review midway through the probationary period (in the third year for most schools). One purpose of this review is to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments to date and prospects for tenure, in order to determine if the candidate is making sufficient progress toward tenure to have his or her contract renewed through the mandatory Tenure Decision Date. This internal review is similar to the review completed at the time of tenure consideration. While it has not been customary to use external reviewers, a department may do so if this would be useful. By the time of the mid-probationary period review, the candidate should submit to the department a brief statement describing the intended focus or contribution of his or her research and scholarship, including any

substantive or methodological cross-disciplinary aspects. Departments and schools should forward the mid-probationary period review to the Provost's Office in May of the year in which it was conducted.

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

3.3.1 Year 5 or 6 Review

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

The school may decide the year before the tenure decision to issue a terminal year letter. Similarly, if the school decides to do so early in the tenure decision year, it may issue a letter that the following year is a terminal year. In either of these situations, there will be no full tenure review.

3.4 Revising the Tenure Decision Date

If a tenure-track faculty member believes the Tenure Decision Date was not properly set according to the Faculty Handbook, or if the individual believes there is justification for an extension or revision of the Tenure Decision Date (such as leaves of absence or special circumstances), it is important that the individual make a written request promptly, as soon as the reason arises. Such requests are submitted by the individual through the department chair and dean to the Provost, and they are considered by the Committee on Probationary Deadlines and Leaves, which advises the Provost. Only the Provost, on the President's behalf, has authority to change the Tenure Decision Date. See Faculty Handbook section 4-D(1.5).

A tenure-track faculty member may also apply for an extension of his or her Tenure Decision Date due to parenting or primary caregiver responsibilities. This request is submitted by the individual through the department chair and dean to the Provost. See Faculty Handbook section 9-D.

3.5 Early Tenure Review

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

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

in writing to his or her chair and dean. In the request, the candidate should also acknowledge that a negative decision will result in a terminal year letter. This memo must be submitted before the candidate's early review has begun. Rarely, the Provost may permit a case to be withdrawn and resubmitted by the Tenure Decision Date or another date as the Provost determines.

The Provost may decide on promotion to associate professor separately from the grant of tenure. When a promotion to associate professor is considered separately from the grant of tenure (either in an individual case or under school-specific policy), if the decision on promotion is negative, a terminal year letter will be issued.

4. Information for Full Professor Candidates

4.1 Standards for Promotion

Standards and expectations are discussed in Section 2.

4.2 Timeline for Promotion

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

4.3 Contents of the Dossier

See section 8 of this Manual for a detailed description of dossier contents.

4.4 Resubmission of a Dossier after a Negative Decision

A new recommendation for promotion may be submitted in a subsequent year, and the original denial will not stand in the way of a promotion if there is new evidence to consider.

5. Information for Clinical Scholar Candidates

The designation "Clinical Scholar" is awarded by the President of the University after a recommendation by UCAPT. It is intended to convey the same honor and dignity as tenured status, though without the employment guarantees of tenure. Faculty Handbook section 4-B provides that Clinical Scholar and similar titles are for individuals who have gained high scholarly distinction in their fields, primarily engaged in clinical, creative, or professional practice, teaching, or research, but whose effort profile or type of research differs from that of tenured faculty.

For Clinical Scholars, excellence in research, teaching, and clinical service, and at least strength in other areas of service, is required. A candidate for Clinical Scholar will have a different effort profile from a candidate for tenure (e.g., more effort devoted to clinical work and less to research) or will be undertaking different types of research (e.g., leadership of clinical trials rather than P.I. of R01s).

A candidate for a Clinical Scholar designation at the associate level should be recognized at the national level and esteemed by experts in his or her field for being an innovator of clinically important research. As an example, Clinical Scholars may have provided substantive intellectual input and leadership to large collaborative treatment or clinical trials groups. Candidates for full professor with a Clinical Scholar designation should be recognized not only at the national but also the international level. A candidate for Clinical Scholar should also have demonstrated expertise in a particular area (e.g., a long track record of developing treatments for a particular disease or developing new and novel procedures for specific surgical problems).

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

As provided in Faculty Handbook section 4-B, the Provost may approve similar titles for non-clinical disciplines.

6. Information for Senior Lateral Appointments

6.1 Timing and the UCAPT Process

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

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

The department should notify the office of the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs as soon as the appointment is in the pipeline, and the dossier should reach UCAPT by March 15, to ensure a decision by the end of the academic year.

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

Preferably, the school should submit the dossier to UCAPT before extending any letter of offer to the candidate. If time does not permit going through UCAPT first, a conditional offer may be made to the candidate. Such a letter must state that its terms are conditional on approval by the Provost, using the University's template language for such situations. Any conditional offer must be immediately followed by submission of a dossier to UCAPT. The conditional offer does not in itself authorize employment by USC.

In some cases, the Provost will have been consulted early about an appointment or its

funding. However, even in such cases, the Provost's decision on tenure is not made until the UCAPT process has been completed.

6.2 Contents of the Dossier

See section 8 of this Manual for a detailed description of dossier contents. For senior lateral appointments only, certain sections of the dossier may be modified as follows:

- **Administrative Assessments:** Department and school custom may allow the use of different committees for appointment than for promotion. Lateral appointments require documentation of the position posting or the pre-hire posting waiver from the Provost's Office. Assessments should describe the measures taken to ensure that there was proactive outreach and that searches were conducted in a manner consistent with USC policy.
- **Personal Statement:** This may or may not be available.
- **Teaching Record:** If the normal information is not available, an official or colleague at the candidate's current institution may be asked for an assessment of the individual as teacher and mentor.
- **Service:** Sufficient information may be available in the CV or from the public record.
- **External Reviewers:** If there is good reason to do so, and with the approval of the Vice Provost of Academic and Faculty Affairs, emails may be used for evaluation rather than letters. For scholars of great eminence, a somewhat smaller number of reviewers may suffice, and the evaluation may be more limited in focus. If the dean would like to include a smaller number of reviewers or deviate from the template, he or she should obtain approval from the Vice Provost in advance.

6.3 Internal Lateral Appointments

Under our longstanding practice, an abbreviated process is used when a faculty member currently holding a tenured appointment in one USC department or school is proposed for a tenured appointment in a different USC department or school.

In this case, the timing need not conform to the usual schedule. The contents of the dossier are abridged upon consultation with the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs. Generally, a current CV will be sufficient. External letters are not requested.

Recommendations from the new department or school's faculty and dean are required, as is the approval of the Provost. Generally, no consultation with UCAPT is necessary before the Provost makes a decision about the new appointment. The changed status will then be updated in the school's contract system.

When an individual formerly held a tenured appointment at USC but does not currently, the regular process for considering an external appointment is followed. However, the dossier can be abbreviated if approval in advance is obtained from the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs.

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

7. Information for Librarians and Research, Teaching, Practitioner, and Clinical Faculty

7.1 Information on Librarian Promotions and Appointments

For librarians, the President receives the advice of the University Committee on Librarian Appointments, Promotions and Continuing Appointments (see Faculty Handbook 4-H (1)). Librarians must possess a strong service commitment along with a theoretical, broadly-based understanding of how information is created, organized, disseminated, accessed, preserved, and recast to encourage new discoveries. The primary emphasis in promotions and the grant of continuing appointments to librarians is on excellent professional performance in discharging the librarian's responsibilities. Librarians demonstrate excellence by having a significant impact on the development and implementation of high quality collections and services. Unlike promotions for faculty on the tenure track, letters of evaluation should be sought from a collection of reviewers who are both external to and internal to USC, including faculty members and other librarians, to assess both excellence in librarianship and the impact that the candidate has had on the wider field of librarianship or information science.

7.2 Information on RTPC Promotions

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

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

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

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

8. The Dossier

8.1 Dossier Overview

A checklist for dossier preparation is provided in the appendix of this UCAPT Manual. Details about each section are provided in the materials that follow. Potential modifications for senior lateral appointment dossiers are noted in section 6.2. If questions arise in dossier preparation, the Provost's Office is available for consultation.

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

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

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

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

Candidate's portion of dossier evidence:

- Curriculum vitae
- Personal statement
- Teaching statement
- Teaching record (unless information is provided by department/school)
- Service statement (optional)
- Service record (unless information is provided by department/school)
- List of suggested reviewers or reviewers who may be biased (see section 8.7.2)
- Candidate's portion of appendix

Department/school's portion of dossier evidence:

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

Administrative and Faculty Assessments, and External Letters of Review

- Letters of review
- Reports prepared by committee members (these may include department committees, department faculty, school committee, etc.)

- Reports and ratings by department chair (if applicable) and dean

8.1.1 *Overview*

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

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

This Manual and any school- or department- specific measures and expectations of productivity, which have been approved by the Provost (see section 2.3), should be provided to each committee member, chair, and dean evaluating the dossier. Other discipline-specific standards and practices should be explained in the administrative assessments.

8.1.2 *The Importance of Candor*

Administrative reports should provide a balanced analysis of the case, rather than advocating for a certain decision. Departments and schools should not retake votes so that they appear unanimous, skew the selection of reviewers to achieve some desired outcome, or exclude from the dossier information they fear later levels may misinterpret. Instead, they should append explanations of what they believe is the appropriate significance of all the available information.

Administrative and faculty assessments are of greatest use to UCAPT if they analyze issues rather than argue for a conclusion. Those who support a candidate should realize that the greatest aid is provided by a balanced analysis. Negative evidence must be weighed as conscientiously as positive evidence.

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

8.1.3 *Documenting the Process Fully*

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

All committee reports, data on all votes, and all letters and summaries of conversations with those asked to be reviewers must be included in the dossier. If a committee votes twice, or a second committee is appointed, the earlier information should be included along with an explanation of the process. It is not necessary to discuss annual, mid-probationary or fifth/sixth year reviews unless the school believes it would help UCAPT understand the

candidate's progress.

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

If a dean or chair, or any individual faculty member involved in the process, has reason to question the accuracy or integrity of any of the information in the dossier, a memo explaining that conclusion may be included in the dossier at the time that level considers the case, but the questioned material should not be removed or altered.

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

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

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

8.1.4 The Departmental Committee Report and Chair's Memo

Schools with departments should provide assessments both from the department faculty (or a committee thereof) and the department chair. See Section 8.1.2 on the importance of candor.

The department report should address the following topics:

- The typical qualitative and quantitative standards (books, articles, grants, creative works, etc.) in the discipline.
- Whether the candidate's quantitative measures (see section 8.3) are consistent with the qualitative judgments provided.
- The quality of the journals and presses in which the candidate published, as well as the conferences at which he or she presented. For candidates in creative fields, the report should describe the quality of the venues in which the candidate performed, exhibited work, etc., as well as other appropriate metrics.
- The level and type of peer-reviewed external funding that is desirable in the discipline, and how the candidate compares to those recently promoted at peer and aspirational institutions.
- Whether citation frequency is important and how the candidate compares to those recently promoted at peer and aspirational institutions.
- The significance of co-authorships, and of first or last authorship, in the discipline.
- Analysis of doubts or qualifications contained in the reviewer letters.
- The candidate's next major project (a brief description is sufficient) and how it is expected to contribute to the field.

- The significance of the candidate's field within the broader discipline.

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

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

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

8.1.5 The School Committee Report

The school-level committee should present its independent analysis of the issues in the dossier, detailing pros and cons while setting forth the reasons for its recommendation. The school committee vote should be included in the report.

School-level committees will consider what has been said at the departmental level. If the committee disagrees with the department report, it should explain its reasons. (There is no need to summarize information already presented in the dossier at the department level.)

8.1.6 The Dean's Memo

Like all other levels of review, the dean is expected to provide an independent analysis, and one that gives a balanced assessment of strengths and weaknesses in the dossier. See section 8.1.2 on the importance of candor. The dean should consider what has been said at lower levels, and, if he or she agrees with the previous reasoning, need not summarize and repeat evidence already included in the dossier. If he or she disagrees with a lower-level committee, he or she should provide reasons for the disagreement.

The dean should include a statement specifying whether he or she approved the external reviewer list. If he or she modified the reviewer template letter (after approval by the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs), he or she should indicate this as well.

8.2 Quantitative Data (Section I-B)

UCAPT requests that discipline-appropriate quantitative data be included in all dossiers. Quantitative data can be valuable, though data cannot substitute for judgment. The department memo should discuss whether the candidate's quantitative measures are consistent with the qualitative judgments offered.

The following quantitative data are expected in the dossier (more detailed explanations of these items is given below). In all cases, a cohort analysis appropriate to the field is required.

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

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

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

Cohort analysis: UCAPT requests that all dossiers contain a cohort analysis. The cohort analysis should compare the candidate with an appropriate peer group, considering all measures applicable to the discipline, such as number of publications, citations, and journals where published. (In creative fields, the items for comparison will likely vary.) The appropriate peer group is about five to ten scholars who were recently granted a similar promotion or appointment (e.g., given tenure, promoted to full professor) at departments the University regards as of equal or greater stature. It is often advisable to include individuals from departments mentioned in the reviewer letters as leaders in the candidate's area. The department or school should state the definition of the comparison group (e.g., every person tenured in the last two years at departments rated higher than USC), and it should include all the individuals falling in that group. If the usual cohort analysis is inapplicable, the department or school should provide other information demonstrating how the candidate compares to others in the field.

Citation counts: Citation counts provide some evidence of the impact of the work (unless the department explains why it believes citation counts are inapplicable to the discipline). UCAPT suggests using whenever possible the data from Web of Science (e.g., Social Science Citation Index). Studies of the reliability of citation statistics have been completed using Web of Science only. If the discipline considers another citation index (such as Google Scholar) to be more inclusive of other citation practices, it may include those data as well, along with a statement detailing why the source is more accurate. The department should provide a summary of how it obtained the citation count results. The department or school should also do a careful analysis of the citations. (Are they survey articles? How and why is the work cited?) The external reviewers are asked to comment on the quality of the journals and this can facilitate the differentiation of the various citations. There should be a separate analysis of work since the candidate was appointed or last promoted. Self-citations should be excluded.

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

List of grants: For candidates in grant-funded fields, the dossier should include a list of all grants on which the candidate was P.I. or co-P.I., along with the granting agency, grant numbers, start and end dates, and monetary amounts. Portions of Center or Project grants, separately scored, on which the candidate was P.I. or co-P.I., can also be listed here, with amount of direct costs controlled by the candidate indicated. Please separate external grants from USC funding.

8.3 Curriculum Vitae (Section II)

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

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

Concerning publications:

- Articles in refereed journals should be separated from non-refereed publications (e.g., invited contributions to journals, non-refereed chapters in edited books). For articles, include first and last page numbers, as well as date. The most recent work should be listed first.
- Publications should be separated from conference and other presentations (invited lectures, seminars).
- Edited work should be differentiated from authored work; co-authored or co-edited work differentiated from solo work; mass market or author-subsidized book publishers differentiated from university or comparable presses.
- Correct titles of journals and publishers should be used.
- If there are joint authors of publications, the name of the senior author for each publication should be underlined, and the candidate's name should be boldfaced. If one of the co-authors is the candidate's student or post-doc, that name should be highlighted with an asterisk. Any special meaning to the candidate's location in a sequence of middle authors should be explained.
- A book or article can be listed as "published" when it is available for everyone to read, either in print or online. It can be listed as "in press" when the author has no more editorial work to do on the accepted work, and the publisher has assigned an ISBN number for a book or a DOI number (digital object identifier) for an article. The CV circulated to reviewers should be completely accurate as to the work that is actually published or in press. Other work can be listed separately as under contract, revise and resubmit, etc., and the candidate should realize that such work is not regarded as finished.

Concerning grants:

- The record of the candidate's financial support must include: the source and type of grant (e.g., R01), the duration of the grant (include dates), the candidate's role on the project (e.g., P.I., Investigator, etc.), the candidate's percentage of time, and the grant amount.
- If the candidate is responsible for part of a grant, please note the amount the

candidate managed and whether that portion of the grant was independently scored. Please also note if the granting agency recognized the candidate as an equal co-P.I.

Concerning service:

- The CV should list both internal and external service.

8.4 Personal Statement (Section III)

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

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

8.5 Teaching Record (Section IV)

8.5.1 Teaching Memo

This section should begin with a memo by the department or school's leadership that: (1) explains where the candidate's teaching fits within the unit's instructional mission, (2) compares the candidate's teaching to school and department norms, and (3) summarizes and analyzes the evidence of teaching effectiveness presented in the dossier, covering both strengths and weaknesses. (The recommended evidence of teaching effectiveness is detailed in sections 8.5.3 and 8.8.2) If a probationary faculty member has heavy teaching responsibilities, the teaching memo should explain the circumstances. For the benefit of those outside the subject, the department may also describe the typical students taking the candidate's courses.

8.5.2 Teaching Statement

The candidate is provided the opportunity to convey to others his or her approach to and accomplishments in teaching.

8.5.3 Teaching Record and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

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

- A chronological list of classes taught, with contact hours and enrollment size for each class. Include independent studies supervised. (For promotion to full professor, the list will generally go back to the grant of tenure.)
- Principal courses created, developed, or substantially revised.

- A list of graduate students and post-docs mentored (past and present), showing each person's next career position if available.

UCAPT asks that additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (syllabi, student evaluations, notes from classroom observations by senior colleagues, etc.) be included in section VII of the dossier (Appendix). See section 8.8.2.

8.6 Service Record (Section V)

8.6.1 Service Statement (optional)

The candidate may include a statement detailing his or her approach to service and service experience.

8.6.2 Service Record

The service record should include University, professional, and community service activity related to the candidate's field, such as journal editorial boards or federal grant review panels. It should assess the quality and the effectiveness of the candidate's service contributions.

8.7 External Reviewer Letters (Section VI)

8.7.1 Template Letter

Template letters to solicit reviewer evaluations are included in section 9. Please use the versions of the template letters included in this UCAPT Manual. If the department or school wishes to rephrase the letter, the dean must obtain approval in advance from the Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs and mention this approval in the dean's memo.

Requests for letters of evaluation must always include the question asking whether the candidate's work meets the standards of leading institutions for a similar position or award of tenure.

8.7.2 Selection of Reviewers

Reviewers' evaluation letters, like committee reports, are of greatest aid to the individual and to UCAPT if the writers see their task as analyzing issues rather than as advocating a position.

The great majority of reviewer letters in the dossier should be from reviewers who have not been suggested by the candidate and who are arms-length. (See notes below on arms-length reviewers.) Generally, it is desirable that the candidate suggest *no more than* two or three reviewers. (Some candidates regard it as advantageous not to suggest reviewers, as those they suggest will not be regarded as arms-length.) The candidate should also be given the opportunity to list individuals whom he/she believes would be biased. If letters are obtained

from any of those individuals, the candidate's belief will be taken into account.

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

The most useful external reviewers are academic leaders in tenure-granting major universities who are arms-length. UCAPT requests at least five such arms-length letters in the dossier. These five letters must include substantive evaluation and analysis of the candidate's work. Arms-length reviewers are not connected to the candidate by collaboration, friendship, commercial ties, or current or former collegueship at the same institution. These reviewers may have met the candidate at conferences and through other professional activities. (This is especially true for candidates for full professor.) However, arms-length reviewers have not, for instance, overlapped with the candidate at the same institution (even in graduate school); collaborated on a project, article, or grant with the candidate; or engaged in a mentoring relationship with the candidate.

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

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

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

Additional notes on reviewer selection:

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

length, external reviewers. Internal letters are desirable when they are from members of the secondary department in interdisciplinary cases (see section 2.7), or when they are from collaborators explaining the candidate's contribution to joint work. If there are internal letters, they are *in addition* to the expected number of external letters.

8.7.3 *Method of Contacting Reviewers*

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

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

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

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

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

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

8.7.4 *Organization of Reviewer Letter Section of Dossier*

The reviewer letter section of the dossier should be divided into: (1) the sample solicitation letter; (2) a reviewer chart; (3) arms-length letters meeting all the criteria stated in section 8.7.2 (section VI-A); and (4) other letters (section VI-B), as described below.

Reviewer chart: Preface the set of letters with a chart, showing for each reviewer: (1) who suggested the reviewer; (2) whether the reviewer is arms-length or has ties of friendship, collegueship, collaboration, etc. with the candidate; and (3) whether the reviewer answers all the questions in the letter of request in a substantive manner.

The chart should include ALL reviewers approached, including those who decline for lack of time or any other reason and those who were only communicated with by telephone. The reasons for declining should be included in the chart. Provide copies of all letters and e-mails received from reviewers (including reviewers who declined), as well as notes on any phone calls with them. Please explain if an unusual number of external reviewers decline to provide letters.

Explain why each reviewer was chosen, with a short bio of a few sentences summarizing the significance of the reviewer. Do not enclose a full CV or a directory listing.

Section VI-A: Arms-Length Letters: Arms-length letters meeting all of the criteria stated in section 8.7.2 (substantive, arms-length letters from academic leaders independent of the candidate) should be placed in part VI-A of the dossier. There should be a minimum of five such letters in this section.

Section VI-B: Collaborator and Other Letters: Letters from key collaborators and reviewers suggested by the candidate should be placed in section VI-B. In addition, letters that do not meet all of the criteria for the arms-length letters in section VI-A should be placed in section VI-B.

8.7.5 *Confidentiality*

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

8.7.6 *Unsolicited Letters*

Unsolicited letters are not part of the dossier, are not welcome, and are not considered significant. They have no appreciable weight because they are subject to selection bias. It is also generally not useful for the department to include letters from other USC faculty members outside of those provided for in this manual.

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

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

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

This section should also include:

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

8.8.2 *Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (Section VII-B)*

As noted in section 8.5, additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (beyond the material requested in the Teaching Record section of the dossier) should be included here.

- (a) UCAPT finds that the most useful evidence in evaluating teaching effectiveness is the following:
- Classroom observations by faculty colleagues close to the time of the candidate's consideration for promotion. These observations should comment on strengths and weaknesses in the candidate's presentation of course material and in classroom interactions with students. These reviews are even more valuable if they include classroom visitations over a period of time. (Some schools have each member of a committee visit at least two classes taught by the candidate; these individuals then submit written evaluations for inclusion in the promotion dossier or mid-year review.)
 - Demonstration that the candidate has applied teaching strategies whose effectiveness has been validated through research. The research may refer to the candidate's own teaching or be drawn from publications about teaching effectiveness. The research may rely on quantitative, ethnographic, or other methodologies that the candidate's field of scholarship values.
 - Other evidence that the candidate's teaching is effective such as protocols through which students demonstrate their mastery in a public forum or data on student learning outcomes compared to students of similarly situated teachers.

- Course syllabi or instructor's teaching materials provided to students for a few courses that the candidate considers most indicative of his or her approach to teaching.
- (b) UCAPT also expects to see this traditional evidence, though it is cognizant of the research questioning its usefulness:
- Summaries of student evaluations for all of the candidate's courses, as well as complete student evaluations for the candidate's most recent courses (approximately the last two years). All individual student evaluations should be readily available upon request. If summaries of evaluations are presented based on USC's standard questionnaire, UCAPT suggests that the candidate's average scores on questions rating the course and instructor should be compared to the distribution of departmental scores for comparable courses or faculty.
- (c) The following evidence may also be used if the department finds it helpful:
- Information on the candidate's (1) use and assessment of information technology or multi-media that promote student engagement and learning or that adapt course materials to students' needs; (2) the accommodation of different learning styles among students; (3) innovations to customary practices (dependence on lectures, standard semester length, constraints of disciplinary boundaries, etc.) aimed at increasing a course's benefits to students; and (4) the use and assessment of work produced by students in service-oriented or experiential settings outside classroom walls.
 - Letters from a sample of former students who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's teaching and how it affected them. These students may not be suggested nor solicited by the candidate. The department or committee chair or dean organizes the contacting of students whose opinions are solicited. Please explain the selection method and enclose the solicitation letter. A candidate's teaching assignments will suggest the distribution between undergraduates and graduate students contributing to this section.

9. Templates for Solicitation Letters for Reviewers

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

Dear [reviewer's title name]:

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

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

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

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

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

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. [**If applicable:** It will not be read by any member of our faculty who is [a collaborating

author][a co-investigator] with the candidate.] It will be studied closely by tenured faculty in the department and university promotion committees and officials, and it is intended to be read by no one else.

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

9.2 For promotion or appointment as a Clinical Scholar at the associate or full professor level.

Dear [reviewer's title and name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the [Department/School] of [] in a frank evaluation of the work of [candidate's name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [] with the designation of Clinical Scholar. If you are able to provide a letter of evaluation, please include a short biographical sketch about yourself, and describe any professional and personal relations you have had with the candidate.

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

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

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, our definition of "Clinical Scholar," and a sample of publications. Please note as well that we request an analytical evaluation, rather than general praise or advocacy.

Please understand that we seek your evaluation at an early stage in our process and that we have not yet made a decision. We seek your frank and candid assessment. Is [candidate's name] recognized at the national or international level for leadership in important translational or clinical research? (For instance, has [he/she] provided substantial intellectual input and leadership to large collaborative research efforts or clinical trials? Has [he/she] been a member of NIH study sections or advisory boards?) Are [candidate's name]'s scholarly peer-reviewed publications of appropriate quality and quantity for the proposed rank, and have they had an impact on the field? Has [candidate's name]'s clinical or translational research or have [his/her] clinical trials been recognized by significant funding support from appropriate sources over a period of years (e.g., pilot studies or large multicenter studies funded through peer-reviewed federal or non-federal sources)? Has [his/her] research funded by contract with companies resulted in significant publications in peer-reviewed journals? Has [candidate's name] demonstrated leadership at the national or international level in improvement of clinical care (e.g., has [he/she] established residencies or fellowships for advanced practice, or has [he/she] been a member of consensus panels, task forces, or the U.S. Public Health Service to establish and publish guidelines for patient care management, diagnostic criteria for new diseases, standards for clinical testing, etc.)?

[If the reviewer is a collaborator, the following item should be added:
As you have collaborated with [candidate's name], please help us to understand [his/her] particular contribution(s) to the collaborative work.]

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

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by school and University promotion committees and officials, and it is intended to be read by no one else. Please help us reach an informed decision about whether USC should offer [candidate's name] this [appointment/promotion].

Revised 2017

9.3 For use when the reviewer is a collaborator.

Dear [reviewer's title and name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the [Department/School] in a frank evaluation of the work of [candidate's name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [] [with/without tenure]. Please let me know as soon as possible by e-mail whether or not you are able to assist us by reviewing the enclosed materials and submitting a letter of evaluation by []. [*if appropriate*: Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes, we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$____.]

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae and personal statement. I am soliciting your input particularly because you are a collaborator with [candidate's name], and USC's promotion and appointment committees would like to understand [candidate's name]'s contributions to your joint work. Please describe the circumstances in which you know the candidate and came to work together, as well as any other professional or personal relationships you have had. Please help us to understand [candidate's name]'s contributions to collaborative work, in particular what contributions can be attributed to the candidate, and what leadership did the candidate provide to the work? Also, if any future collaborations are planned, please inform us of what those projects will be and how [he/she] will contribute to them. Finally, at times outside evaluators have direct knowledge about other aspects of a candidate's academic role—including teaching, professional service, public service. If you have this direct knowledge, please add your evaluations of [candidate's name]'s accomplishments in these areas.

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

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by school and USC promotion committees and officials, and it is intended to be read by no one else. We are grateful for your effort to help us reach an informed

decision about whether USC should [offer [candidate's name] a lifetime appointment] [offer [candidate's name] this appointment] [grant [candidate's name] this promotion].

Revised 2017

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 8.1). [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 faculty and/ or any 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 8.2). [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 8.3).
<input type="checkbox"/>	III. Personal Statement (see section 8.4).
<input type="checkbox"/>	IV. Teaching Record (see section 8.5). 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 8.6).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Service statement from candidate (optional).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Service record.
<input type="checkbox"/>	VI. External Reviewer Letters (see section 8.7).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sample solicitation letter.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Reviewer chart. <i>Chart should show who suggested the reviewer, the reviewer's relationship to the candidate, and whether the reviewer answered all of the questions. Include all individuals who declined to be reviewers, as well as reasons for declining. Explain the choice of any unusual reviewers.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reviewer bios. <i>Include a brief reviewer bio before each reviewer letter.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VI-A: Substantive letters from arms-length reviewers. <i>The dossier should include at least five substantive, arms-length letters.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VI-B: Other letters (collaborator, non-arms-length, non-substantive, etc.). <i>Include all correspondence to and from reviewers who declined.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	VII. Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship, Performance, and Teaching <i>(see section 8.8).</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VII-A: Evidence of Scholarship and Performance. <i>Include sample of candidate's recent publications and other scholarly or artistic works. Send books and accepted book manuscripts along with the dossier in digital and hard copies. 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.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Section VII-B: Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness. <i>Include selected course syllabi, student evaluations, classroom observations, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness.</i>

Updated 2017

**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
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Please rate this candidate on the scale by marking the appropriate box:											
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"/>	<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"/>	<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?											
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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:** _____

Overall assessment of the case, main strength and main weakness
Assessment of research
Assessment of teaching
Other considerations
Assessment of dean's letter
Assessment of lower level reviews
Assessment of external reviewers
Is the nature of the candidate's contributions adequately explained?
Other comments