


University Committee on  
Appointments, Promotions,  
and Tenure

UCAPT MANUAL  
March 2013





To: The Faculty  
From: Elizabeth Garrett   
Date: March 1, 2013  
Re: Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure

Decisions on appointments, promotions, and tenure are crucial to USC's commitment to academic excellence. We congratulate the departments that have already moved forward so vigorously by applying USC's longstanding principle that every grant of tenure should improve the average quality of the department. We are grateful to the committees who respect the integrity of the tenure process by giving a balanced analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of every candidate. And we thank the senior faculty who mentor junior colleagues.

The enclosed 2013 edition of the UCAPT Manual has several changes. In response to suggestions from faculty members and deans, the Manual has been reorganized. Additional information has been added in some sections, while other sections have been abbreviated. Changes include:

- USC's guidelines on reconsideration of a tenure dossier have been included.
- Recommendations from the Senate Provost Research Committee on evaluating digital scholarship have been incorporated.
- New policy concerning releasing the names of UCAPT members has been added.
- Additional information on contacting referees has been included.
- Two referee solicitation letter templates have been added: for candidates who produce digital scholarship and for candidates for Clinical Scholar titles.

UCAPT is a rotating committee. It is diverse by discipline and intellectual approach, and all panels are diverse by gender and ethnicity. UCAPT members are outstanding scholars and creative artists, including University, Distinguished, and Provost Professors. The President appoints members based on nominations from the Academic Senate leadership and deans, as well as self-nominations by faculty.

UCAPT welcomes excellent contributions made through all forms of research, whether solo or collaborative, interdisciplinary or within disciplinary cores, or using traditional or avant-garde methods. In our system of checks and balances, if either a department or a dean recommends a case, it goes to UCAPT. If UCAPT and the dean disagree, the dean has the opportunity to comment on UCAPT's recommendation. Both the notes on

UCAPT's deliberations and vote and the written analysis by each individual panel member go to the Provost with the full dossier.

If the decision is negative, the Provost always provides the reasons in writing to the dean to be conveyed to the individual. If the individual asks for a more detailed explanation, the Provost provides that to the dean to convey to the individual. Reconsideration of a tenure dossier is possible if there is new evidence. Politicizing the appointment or promotion process has no place in our procedures, which demand evaluation solely on merit. Thus, lobbying for or against a candidate does not affect decisions.

USC began publishing details about UCAPT procedures a decade ago to demystify the process. The UCAPT Manual explains the criteria and procedures for appointments, promotions, and tenure, and it outlines how to prepare a dossier to give a full picture of the candidate's work and its impact on the field.

We recommend that the UCAPT Manual be read by all candidates, mentors, promotion and tenure committees, and all other faculty members who wish to understand USC's process for making decisions on the appointments, promotions, and awards of tenure that are so vital for our university's academic stature.

Cc: C. L. Max Nikias  
Academic Deans

## Table of Contents

<b>1. UCAPT and the Dossier Review Process .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Appointment.....	2
1.2 UCAPT.....	3
1.3 Deadlines for Dossiers.....	4
1.4 Confidentiality.....	5
1.5 The Dossier Review Process.....	5
1.5(a) Adherence to Policy.....	5
1.5(b) Changes in Editions of UCAPT Documents.....	6
1.5(c) Multiple Levels of Review.....	6
1.5(d) Predictions and Advice.....	6
1.5(e) Communicating Decisions.....	7
1.6 Reconsideration of a Tenure Dossier.....	7
1.7 Interference and Procedural Irregularities.....	8
1.8 Equal Opportunity.....	9
1.9 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.....	9
<b>2. Dossier Evaluation Components.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Time Period.....	9
2.2 Publications.....	9
2.3 Artistic or Creative Work.....	10
2.4 Digital Scholarship.....	10
2.5 Conferences, Patents, and Other Forms of Scholarship.....	11
2.6 Grants and Fellowships.....	11
2.7 Teaching and Mentoring.....	12
2.8 Collaborative Work.....	12
2.9 Interdisciplinary Work.....	13
2.9(a) Candidates With Joint Appointments.....	13
2.9(b) Interdisciplinary Candidates Without Joint Appointments.....	13
2.9(c) Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (Department and School Level).....	13
2.9(d) Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (UCAPT).....	14
2.9(e) Mentoring Interdisciplinary Faculty Members.....	14
2.10 International Scholarship and Teaching.....	14
2.11 Explanatory Information and Metrics.....	14

<b>3. Information for Tenure-Track Assistant Professors</b> .....	<b>15</b>
3.1 Resources.....	15
3.2 The Tenure Process and Timeline .....	15
3.3 Standards for Tenure.....	15
3.4 Preparing for Tenure.....	16
3.5 Pre-Tenure Reviews.....	16
3.6 Revising the Tenure Decision Date .....	17
3.7 Early Tenure Review .....	18
<b>4. Information for Full Professor Candidates</b> .....	<b>18</b>
4.1 Timetable for Promotion.....	18
4.2 Standards for Promotion .....	18
4.3 Contents of the Dossier.....	19
4.4 Resubmission of a Dossier After a Negative Decision.....	19
<b>5. Information for Clinical Scholar Candidates</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>6. Information for Senior Lateral Appointments</b> .....	<b>20</b>
6.1 Timing and the UCAPT Process.....	20
6.2 Contents of the Dossier.....	21
6.3 Internal Lateral Appointments .....	21
<b>7. The Dossier</b> .....	<b>22</b>
7.1 Dossier Overview .....	22
7.2 Administrative and Faculty Assessments (Section I-A).....	23
7.2(a) Overview.....	23
7.2(b) The Importance of Candor .....	23
7.2(c) Documenting the Process Fully .....	24
7.2(d) The Departmental Committee Report and Chair’s Memo.....	24
7.2(e) The School Committee Report .....	25
7.2(f) The Dean’s Memo .....	26
7.3 Quantitative Data (Section I-B).....	26
7.4 Curriculum Vitae (Section II).....	27
7.5 Personal Statement (Section III) .....	28
7.6 Teaching Record (Section IV).....	29
7.6(a) Teaching Memo .....	29
7.6(b) Teaching Statement.....	29

7.6(c) Teaching Record and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness .....	29
7.6(d) Teaching as Scholarship .....	29
7.7 Service Record (Section V).....	30
7.7(a) Service Statement (optional) .....	30
7.7(b) Service Record.....	30
7.8 External Referee Letters (Section VI).....	30
7.8(a) Template Letter.....	30
7.8(b) Method of Selection of Referees .....	30
7.8(c) Method of Contacting Referees .....	32
7.8(d) Organization of Referee Letter Section of Dossier .....	33
7.8(e) Confidentiality.....	33
7.8(f) Unsolicited Letters.....	34
7.9 Appendix: Evidence of Scholarship, Performance, and Teaching (Section VII).....	34
7.9(a) Evidence of Scholarship and Performance (Section VII-A) .....	34
7.9(b) Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (Section VII-B) .....	34
<b>8. Templates for Solicitation Letters for Referees .....</b>	<b>36</b>
8.1 Standard Letter .....	36
8.2 Candidate in an Artistic Field.....	37
8.3 Candidate Who Produces Digital Scholarship .....	38
8.4 Clinical Scholar Candidate .....	40
8.5 Referee is a Collaborator.....	41
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>43</b>
Checklist for Dossier Preparation.....	43
UCAPT Appointments and Promotions Evaluation Form .....	45

---

---

# Manual of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure

March 2013

---

---

The University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (UCAPT) is the faculty committee that works to ensure consistency, fairness, and transparency in all tenure, promotion, and senior appointment decisions, as well as to maintain the upward trajectory of faculty excellence at the University. UCAPT serves as an advisory panel to the Provost, who retains final authority on behalf of the President.

Both the Faculty Handbook (<http://www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook>) and this UCAPT Manual are the definitive guidelines of the University's policies and procedures regarding appointments, promotions, and tenure. Faculty members should begin with the Faculty Handbook, which outlines the University's policies and practices. The UCAPT Manual supplements the Faculty Handbook by detailing the appointment, promotion, and tenure process in depth.

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 as transparent as possible.

This edition of the UCAPT Manual has been reorganized based on suggestions and feedback from faculty members and deans. Section 1 of the Manual gives an overview of the University's expectations for faculty members, and it explains when and by whom the dossier is reviewed. Section 2 then details how the dossier is reviewed, outlining the criteria for evaluation of the faculty member's research, teaching, and service. Section 2 describes the general criteria for dossier evaluation, while sections 3 through 6 describe criteria relevant to specific persons: assistant professors, candidates for full professor, candidates for Clinical Scholar and similar designations, and senior lateral appointment candidates. Finally, section 7 explains in depth each of the dossier components, and section 8 includes templates for the referee letters. An appendix at the back of the Manual includes an updated dossier checklist (a succinct reference listing of all the necessary dossier components) and the UCAPT dossier evaluation form.

### **Important deadlines**

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

## ***1. UCAPT and the Dossier Review Process***

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

Every promotion, appointment, and grant of tenure should meet the national and international standards of the leading institutions, as well as improve the overall stature of the academic unit.

The primary factors considered in tenure, promotion, and appointment 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 at least solid performance in the other. The University values scholars who have made important and original contributions, who have had an impact on the field, and whose work shows a clear arc of intellectual and creative development.

A candidate's scholarly or artistic work should be widely perceived among peers as outstanding and should be instrumental in advancing the academic needs of his or her unit. This can be demonstrated, for example, by the quality and selectivity of the candidate's publication venues, performance venues, and grant sources. The candidate should be recognized in the field through conferences, study sections, invited talks, shows, performances, editorial boards, and the like, as appropriate for the discipline. Citation counts, and variants such as the h-index, are crude metrics, which should be supplemented by analysis of how and why the work is cited. In fields where a book is expected, the book should be published or in press (see section 7.4 for UCAPT's definition of "in press") by a university press or a press of equivalent prestige in the discipline. If reviews of the book are available, they should be strong. In fields where external funding is expected, the candidate should be a P.I. on significant research proposals (such as R01s) that have been highly scored. In artistic fields, the candidate's creative products should gain recognition equivalent to the expectations of scholarship in other disciplines. To receive tenure, a candidate should also have achieved independence from his or her mentors and should demonstrate emerging leadership in his or her cohort. The University aims to tenure those individuals who show promise of becoming nationally and internationally recognized during their careers.



The University welcomes innovative approaches to scholarship and encourages faculty members to stay at the cutting edge in every field. It recognizes and supports a variety of styles of scholarship, both independent and collaborative. In all cases, the University looks to distinguish important and original contributions on the part of the candidate. Expectations for scholarship do not primarily concern quantity, although the University shares with other leading institutions expectations about productivity.

Each school or department is encouraged to propose school- or department-specific measures and expectations of productivity that should be taken into account in tenure, promotion, and appointment 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.

University and external service are supplemental, not primary, factors for tenure, promotion, and appointment. In addition, the academic needs of the unit are considered.

## **1.2 UCAPT**

UCAPT is appointed by the President on the basis of self-nominations and nominations by the Academic Senate leadership and deans. (See Faculty Handbook section 4-H(1), <http://www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook>.) 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. At the end of each academic year, the University makes public the names of UCAPT members from the past two years.

Both the Faculty Handbook and the University Bylaws vest the authority over granting promotion and tenure, as well as appointing associate professors and professors with or without tenure, in the President. The President has delegated responsibility to the Provost. See Faculty Handbook section 4-A.

UCAPT advises the Provost and President. For each dossier, written evaluations by individual UCAPT panel members, and notes on the panel's deliberation and vote, are reviewed by the Provost and 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 national 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: (1) candidates for Associate University Librarian, University Librarian, Librarian III and IV in the Health Sciences Library, Law Librarian III and IV, and the grant of continuing appointment; (2) candidates for Clinical Scholar and similar designations; and (3) candidates for appointment by the President to named professorships and chairs awarded on a university-wide basis (such as the Judge Widney Professor or Governor Downey Professor, reserved for eminent individuals from the arts, sciences, professions, business, and community leadership, and the Presidential Professor, which is a rare honor bestowed upon an individual who combines the highest academic recognition with landmark contributions to society). These appointments by the President are non-tenure-track; the length of appointment and effort profile are individually determined, and any specific school affiliations are by agreement with the schools.

UCAPT considers each candidate individually. Multiple candidates from the same department or similar disciplines are not compared to each other or evaluated together.

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***

Promotion dossiers not involving tenure (most often associate to full professor) should reach UCAPT by October 15. Dossiers of candidates for tenure should reach UCAPT by the February 1 before the Tenure Decision Date. Senior external appointment dossiers (associate or full professor) should reach UCAPT by March 15, if possible; these dossiers must be submitted for Provost's approval before a firm offer letter is issued. Any dossiers that miss 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 can be submitted to UCAPT 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 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 discussion of the origins of the delay. A promotion dossier not involving tenure submitted extremely long after the October 15 deadline may be returned for resubmission the following year.

If new dossier evidence (including 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 Faculty Affairs to submit the new evidence.

It is not permissible for a department or school to plan to submit a tenure dossier after the Tenure Decision Date. If it happens that charges of misconduct are brought to attention while the tenure process is underway, such charges will not be investigated by UCAPT but will be considered in the usual way. The Provost may delay the tenure decision if needed to resolve the charges.

#### **1.4 Confidentiality**

Departments and schools should take appropriate 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, except the official copy of record, should be shredded after use. All materials in the dossier are treated as confidential to the full extent the law permits. This includes, for example, letters of reference, reports prepared by committee members, and other ratings, reports, and records obtained in connection with the promotion and appointment process.

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 referees, the contents or tenor of discussions, and the contents of the dossier to anyone. Intentional or continuing breaches of confidentiality are considered to be serious misconduct.

#### **1.5 The Dossier Review Process**

##### **1.5(a) Adherence to Policy**

All those participating in the review should take care to follow the policies stated in the Faculty Handbook and this Manual. All information relied upon to make decisions must be documented in the dossier.

The Provost may authorize exceptions or waivers to this Manual or other policies, including approving requests to extend deadlines or change the language of template letters. Only the Provost has this authority.

#### *1.5(b) 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.

#### *1.5(c) Multiple Levels of Review*

The department chair, dean, and Provost, and the faculty groups at each level, all have important roles to play in promotion and tenure decisions. A typical path in a departmentalized school is: (1) vote by department tenured faculty (often advised by a subcommittee), (2) recommendation by dean (after advice of school committee), (3) decision by the Provost as the President's delegate (after advice of UCAPT). All reports of every appropriate committee should be included in the dossier. On department and school committees, see the Faculty Handbook section 4-H(2).

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

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

#### *1.5(d) Predictions and Advice*

Neither predictions nor advice from any USC official except the Provost is definitive. Even if colleagues are optimistic, candidates for tenure and promotion should seek constructive criticism, remembering that external referees and UCAPT will 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(e) 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 up by a memo. In case of a negative decision, the summary reasons stated in the Provost's memo can be conveyed to the candidate. The Provost also informs the UCAPT chair and panel of decisions, and the dean should give similar feedback to the school-level committee as well as informing the department.

Whether candidates have been successful or unsuccessful, it is often helpful if the dean or dean's representative passes on constructive advice, gathered from the school's review of the dossier, to improve the candidate's later work. While preserving the confidentiality of referees 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 is conveyed in writing, the memo should be approved by the Provost's Office prior to sending.

Upon request, candidates who received a negative decision will be provided in writing a fuller explanation of the reasons for the negative decision. The dean should consult with the Provost's Office on the preparation of this explanation, which should be provided to the candidate by the dean or dean's representative in a face-to-face meeting, followed up by a memo. The confidential advice to the Provost from the department chair and dean and the names and individual views of referees will not be disclosed.

#### *1.6 Reconsideration of a Tenure Dossier*

When tenure has been denied by the Provost (on behalf of the President), that is a final action. Reconsideration may be requested only if extraordinary circumstances warrant, on the basis of new evidence about the candidate's accomplishments during the probationary period. A reconsideration is not a readjudication of the judgment on the original evidence and does not trigger the complete tenure review process, but focuses on new evidence that addresses the deficiencies in the original dossier.

Either the individual or dean may request reconsideration. Requests for reconsideration on the basis of new evidence will always be considered first by the dean, who will include in the supplement of the dossier a recommendation as to whether extraordinary circumstances exist and tenure should be granted. The requests will be considered by the Provost 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 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 referees who were negative during the initial consideration, or from committees, referees, or others beyond what is provided in these guidelines (such as soliciting additional referees on the full array of scholarship). The individual may submit a concise additional statement. If the individual requests it of the dean, he or she has the right to an oral hearing before the dean or dean's designee, who will prepare a summary of the hearing. 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 referees, 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 described above); or (2) there is a claim of procedural defects sufficient to require corrective action. It is the Provost's responsibility to decide the remedy, if any, that is appropriate for procedural defects.

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 the Faculty Handbook section 7.

### ***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. If the candidate believes his or her rights have been violated, he or she has a right to a grievance hearing by the Committee on Tenure and Privileges Appeals. The candidate should file the grievance through the Academic Senate, as provided in the Faculty Handbook section 7.

### ***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 over time among candidates with different personal characteristics, such as race, gender, disability, age, and national origin.

From academic year 2006-2007 through academic year 2011-2012, 86% of the 164 tenure-track faculty who completed the UCAPT process were granted tenure. This six-year period coincides with the probationary period of those faculty who will be coming up for decision in 2013. The proportion of women receiving tenure was nearly identical to the rate for men (1.2% higher for women). The tenure rates for faculty who identified themselves as non-Hispanic whites and those who identified themselves as ethnic minorities also were essentially the same (1.2% lower for ethnic minorities). These inter-group differences are not statistically significant. All UCAPT panels are diverse by gender and ethnicity.

### ***1.9 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty***

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

## ***2. Dossier Evaluation Components***

### ***2.1 Time Period***

UCAPT considers all work, but it looks particularly at work completed since the individual was appointed at USC (or since the previous promotion at USC). The evidence for tenure must show demonstrated and significant additional attainments after a faculty member has been appointed. The evidence for promotion to full professor must show demonstrated and significant additional attainments since the previous promotion.

### ***2.2 Publications***

Meeting numerical expectations for scholarship is not the standard for tenure, promotion, and appointment decisions. Contribution and impact are matters of quality. Nevertheless,

they generally benefit from cumulative quantity; usually a series of published journal articles is more influential than just one article. The amount of intellectual output (and quantitative data like citation counts) 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.

Candidates should understand that the evidence of editorial peer review is highly salient and should try to publish in the most respected venues available to them. UCAPT considers the field and the quality of journals or publishers in developing a picture of the quality of the intellectual output of a candidate.

While 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, and they may not be the best use of the candidate's energies unless their significance is explained. Time devoted to publish in such venues should never detract from the expectations for peer-reviewed publications.

### **2.3 *Artistic or 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. 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 (see section 2.11).

### **2.4 *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; Web 2.0 collaborations; 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 appropriately, 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 referees 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.

Referee letters should be sought from individuals with experience in evaluating and/or producing digital scholarship. If the candidate's digital scholarship is collaborative, departments should seek additional referees from among the collaborators to explain the candidate's particular contribution to the collaborative work. Template referee letters for candidates engaging in digital scholarship and for collaborators may be found in the appendix.

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

The significance of conferences varies from discipline to discipline. Presenting papers at conferences can be a way of trying out ideas, establishing one's reputation in the field, and other worthwhile goals. However, overemphasis on conference presentations can take time away from more substantial work and publication. In computer science, 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.

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.

### ***2.6 Grants and Fellowships***

The number of dollars awarded in grants and the type of indirect cost recovery are not themselves significant.

For faculty members in grant-getting fields, the peer review information for highly selective grants is significant for tenure, promotion, and appointment consideration. Thus it would be highly significant that a federal grant proposal received an excellent score even 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 would not provide useful information.

There is no inherent quality difference in grants that are or are not accompanied by indirect cost recovery; rather, the rigor of the peer review of federal agencies and similar funding sources is what is significant.

In many fields, of course, grants are not relevant. For other areas, grants are necessary to provide the resources needed to conduct research. In medicine, for example, it is usual to consider such questions as: Has the candidate received an R01 as P.I. (or equivalent grant)? Has the grant been awarded a competitive renewal? Has there been 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.

## ***2.7 Teaching and Mentoring***

The candidate's teaching must meet an acceptable standard, and in some fields successful mentoring of doctoral candidates is expected. It is laudable if a candidate 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.

## ***2.8 Collaborative work***

As noted in section 1.1, the University supports both independent and collaborative work. UCAPT understands that in some fields collaborative work is the norm. In evaluating a dossier with collaborative work, UCAPT looks to distinguish the distinct intellectual contributions of the candidate. It is incumbent that the dossier show evidence of the candidate's specific contributions to all collaborative efforts.

Departments and schools can aid UCAPT by seeking referee letters from those who collaborate with the candidate. (These letters from collaborators would be in addition to the requested five to six arms-length referee letters, as detailed in section 7.8(b).) The request to collaborators should ask them to address the particular contribution of the candidate, as well as the significance of the sequence of authors on publications. (As detailed in section 2.11, the significance of the sequence of authors can vary by field.) There is an expectation that the candidate will be able to continue original, high-quality research following tenure, even if the earlier collaboration ends. The administrative reports should also address these topics, and the candidate should discuss his or her role in collaborative work in the personal statement and/or annotated CV.

Additionally, it is usually assumed on grants that the intellectual leadership is provided by the principal investigator (or, when 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. Again, it is very useful for the dossier to detail the particular contributions of the candidate on collaborative grants.

## **2.9 *Interdisciplinary work***

### *2.9(a) Candidates With Joint Appointments*

The University welcomes work that spans traditional disciplines. For candidates with joint appointments (which in this section means greater than 0%), UCAPT will automatically consider their work to be interdisciplinary.

The departmental and/or school committees for candidates with joint appointments should include one or more members from the appropriate other department or school. Advice should be sought from these colleagues on the selection of referees from other disciplines, as well as referees who share the candidate's interdisciplinary focus. In addition, one or more appropriate senior members in the other discipline should 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.

See also sections 2.9(c, d, and e) on evaluating and mentoring interdisciplinary candidates.

### *2.9(b) Interdisciplinary Candidates Without Joint Appointments*

If a candidate wishes to be identified as interdisciplinary but does not have a 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 or promotion 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.

See also sections 2.9(c, d, and e) on evaluating and mentoring interdisciplinary candidates.

### *2.9(c) Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (Department and School Level)*

Department and school committees evaluating interdisciplinary work should try 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.

### *2.9(d) Evaluating Interdisciplinary Work (UCAPT)*

UCAPT will use appropriate flexibility in reviewing interdisciplinary dossiers. UCAPT sits in disciplinary panels and can assign a dossier to a different panel or can use mixed panels, ad hoc committees, or special consultants as needed.

### *2.9(e) 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 the offer letter, or else made available early in the candidate's probationary period.

The mid-probationary period review committee for interdisciplinary candidates must include a member from the other discipline(s). (On mid-probationary reviews, see section 3.5.)

If interdisciplinary work requires substantially longer start-up time than research in a single discipline, a request may be made, early in the probationary period, to consider an extension of that period (see section 3.6). Such a request should include the recommendations of each of the relevant department chairs and deans.

## ***2.10 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.

## ***2.11 Explanatory Information and Metrics***

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 referees, 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 standards for the sequence of authors.

As noted in section 1.1, schools and departments are encouraged to propose discipline-specific metrics that should be taken into account in tenure, promotion, and appointment decisions. See section 1.1 for more details.

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

#### ***3.1 Resources***

Tenure-track faculty members should look to their department chairs and senior colleagues for guidance regarding field-specific standards for scholarly production, teaching, and criteria for tenure.

#### ***3.2 The Tenure Process and Timeline***

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

Typically, after three years, a faculty member's overall contribution will be considered by the home department to see whether he or she is on track for tenure (see section 3.5). The year before the tenure evaluation, the department or school will begin to build a tenure dossier. Depending on the practice of the department and school, the dossier may be routed, for example, first to a department subcommittee, then to the tenured departmental faculty, then to the department chair, then to any school-wide committees, then to the dean of the school, and then to UCAPT and the Provost. For the contents of the tenure dossier, see section 7.

#### ***3.3 Standards for Tenure***

While tenure-track assistant professors are expected to be good teachers and university citizens, it is primarily upon the significance and influence of their research, as well as their promise of continued productivity, that suitability for tenure will be judged. (See also section 1.1.) Those evaluating tenure dossier materials include not only the school, department, UCAPT, and the Provost, but also referees from around the world.

A candidate for tenure is expected to have produced significant and original scholarly contributions. He or she should have produced a substantive body of work that has a high impact on the field and is on par with the accomplishments at the tenure stage of the

discipline's leading scholars. He or she should also have a program of scholarship independent from his or her Ph.D. supervisor or post-doctoral mentor. It is understood that in some fields the new faculty member's early publications will be outgrowths of the Ph.D. dissertation, but even in such cases there should be publications that show the candidate's further intellectual growth. If the bulk of the candidate's research is done jointly with senior and more established scholars, it is particularly important that there be evidence of the candidate's important original contributions (see section 2.8 on collaborative work).

Expectations and metrics for scholarship vary by field. (Schools and departments are encouraged to submit to the Provost field-specific metrics; see section 1.1.) Candidates in fields that emphasize book production, for instance, should have a book or books published or in press (see section 7.4 for UCAPT's definition of "in press") by a university press or press of equivalent reputation (preferably with published reviews). Candidates in article-producing fields should have articles in high-impact journals. Candidates in grant-getting fields should have an independent research program as principal investigator with a sustained record of substantial peer-reviewed external funding from federal agencies. Candidates for tenure might also get an idea of national standards for tenure by looking at the online CVs of those who have been newly tenured at the leading national departments in the field.

### ***3.4 Preparing for Tenure***

The key advice for tenure-track assistant professors is to publish scholarly work that meets the expectations noted above. For additional information, please see the Essential Guide for Assistant Professors: <http://www.usc.edu/assistantprofessors>. The page contains links to many helpful resources and is well worth reading.

### ***3.5 Pre-Tenure Reviews***

- Tenure-track faculty members undergo annual 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 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. Annual merit reviews are discussed in the University policy on the evaluation of faculty (<http://www.usc.edu/policies>) and in school evaluation guidelines. There

should also be annual consultation between the faculty member and the dean or chair to establish the following year's activity profile. Annual merit and mid-probationary period reports may be included in the tenure dossier to show how the candidate has responded to suggestions for improvement.

- 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 referees, a department may utilize a few external referees 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.
- The year before the tenure decision (generally the fifth 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. 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 also decide to issue a terminal year letter; see the beginning of this section regarding annual reappointment for probationary faculty.
- In annual and mid-probationary period reviews, department chairs, deans, mid-probationary period and merit review committees, and other colleagues should always 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. Even if departmental and school colleagues are optimistic, candidates should seek advice on ways to improve their work throughout their probationary period, remembering that external referees and UCAPT will make an evaluation by national standards.

### ***3.6 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 any other reason that justifies 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, which advises the Provost. Only the Provost, on the President's

behalf, has authority to change the Tenure Decision Date. See the Faculty Handbook section 4-D(1)(a).

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

It is possible (though very rare) for the Provost, on the basis of UCAPT's consideration, to extend the Tenure Decision Date or to grant a two-year terminal appointment during which the candidate can submit specific needed evidence.

### ***3.7 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.

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 is 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 Timetable 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.

### ***4.2 Standards for Promotion***

The promotion to full professor is based on achievement rather than promise. The candidate should have made additional substantial contributions that have had a significant impact in the field, beyond the contribution that earned tenure. The scholarly contribution expected by



the time of promotion to full professor is sometimes expressed as at least twice that expected of a candidate for tenure. The post-tenure body of work should be 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 as an expert 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 completed.

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 have progressed as teachers and mentors of students, which in many fields includes success in mentoring 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. An associate professor may also have more opportunities for productive collaboration than a candidate for tenure, though it continues to be expected that the individual's contribution should be original and significant.

#### ***4.3 Contents of the Dossier***

See section 7 of this Manual for a detailed description of dossier contents. The dossier for candidates for full professor should follow the typical format and guidelines.

#### ***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. Both the original dossier and a supplement will be submitted.

### ***5. Information for Clinical Scholar Candidates***

The designation "Clinical Scholar" is awarded by the President of the University on the same timetable as tenure and after a recommendation by UCAPT. It is intended to convey the same honor and dignity as tenured status. The Faculty Handbook, section 4-B, provides that Clinical Scholar and similar titles are for individuals who have gained high scholarly or artistic distinction in their fields, primarily engaged in clinical, creative, or professional practice, teaching, or research, but whose effort profile or type of research or creative work 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). As provided in the Faculty Handbook section 4-B, the Provost may approve similar titles for non-clinical disciplines.

A candidate for a Clinical Scholar designation 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.

## ***6. Information for Senior Lateral Appointments***

### ***6.1 Timing and the UCAPT Process***

Senior lateral appointments basically use the same dossier format and UCAPT process as do 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. (Visiting, non-tenure-track, and assistant professor appointments are made by the dean, as detailed in the Faculty Handbook section 4-A.)

Appointment dossiers should be submitted to UCAPT as early as possible to allow due consideration. The department should notify UCAPT as soon as the appointment is in the pipeline, and the dossier should reach UCAPT by March 15, if possible.

If expedited UCAPT consideration is requested, the dean must personally explain to the Vice Provost for 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. It is imperative that such a letter state unequivocally 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. It is undesirable to use Visiting titles as a "pending" status when both sides already regard the appointment as intended to be a permanent one. The department or school should either submit the dossier to UCAPT before the offer or make a conditional offer followed by prompt submission to UCAPT.

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

- **Administrative Assessments:** Department and school custom may allow the use of different committees for appointment than for promotion. Lateral appointments require documentation of the position posting from <https://jobs.usc.edu> 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 as stated in the Provost memo "Casting the Net Widely."
- **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.
- **Referees' Letters of Evaluation:** If there is good reason to do so, and with the approval of the Provost's Office, emails may be used instead of hard copies. Deans must contact the Provost's Office in advance if the request to referees should be worded differently from the template because of the stature of the candidate or a similar reason. For scholars of great eminence, a somewhat smaller number of referees may suffice, perhaps focusing on the individual's current work, collegiality, teaching effectiveness, and future plans. If the dean would like to include a smaller number of referees, he or she should discuss the number in advance with the Provost's Office.
- **Appendix:** Evidence of scholarship may be available from the public record, and supporting evidence of teaching may not always be available.

## **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. (The same abbreviated process would apply if someone holding a tenured appointment in department A with a secondary appointment in department B were proposed for a tenured appointment in

department B with a secondary appointment in department A. Tenured appointments may be made in only one academic unit.)

In this case, the timing need not conform to the usual schedule. The contents of the dossier will be abridged upon consultation with the Provost's Office. 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. A new appointment letter will then be issued reflecting the changed status and title and incorporating by reference all unchanged terms.

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

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. *The Dossier***

### **7.1 *Dossier Overview***

A checklist for dossier preparation is provided in the appendix of this UCAPT Manual. Details about each section are provided in the materials that follow. Potential modifications for senior lateral appointment dossiers are noted in section 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 repeated requests, to provide dossier material will be regarded as having withdrawn from consideration.

Candidate's portion of dossier:

- 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 referees or referees who may be biased (see section 7.8(b))
- Candidate's portion of appendix

Department/school's portion of dossier:

- Administrative assessments
- 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
- Referee letters
- Department/school's portion of appendix

## **7.2 *Administrative and Faculty Assessments (Section I-A)***

### *7.2(a) 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 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 clarifications on criteria for evaluation approved by the Provost (see section 1.1) should be provided to each committee member, chair, and dean evaluating the dossier. Discipline-specific standards and practices should be explained in the administrative assessments.

### *7.2(b) The Importance of Candor*

Administrative reports should analyze issues in a balanced manner rather than advocating for a certain decision. Departments and schools should not retake votes so that they appear unanimous, skew the selection of referees 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 way to be of greatest aid is to provide a balanced analysis. Negative evidence must be weighed as conscientiously as positive evidence. Some schools have long done this in their reports, and this is a highly positive factor in decision-making, not a negative one.

The committees should try to foresee and discuss questions that may be raised later in the process, and they should particularly consider the least strong elements in the dossier. Split votes or dissenting views should never be suppressed. Explain the reasoning of both the majority and minority, and explain the committee's responses to negative views expressed in discussions or in the referees' letters. UCAPT expects to see a summary of all sides of the discussion, presenting pros and cons.

#### *7.2(c) Documenting the Process Fully*

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

Copies of all subcommittee reports, data on all votes, and all letters and summaries of conversations with those asked to be referees must be included in the dossier. If a dean or chair, or any individual faculty member involved in the process, has reason to question the usefulness, accuracy, or integrity of any of these items, memos explaining that conclusion may be included in the dossier at the time that level considers the case, but the questioned material should not be removed or altered.

If a committee votes twice, or a second subcommittee is appointed, the earlier information should be included along with an explanation of the process.

An individual faculty member in the department or on a school personnel 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. However, only individuals formally involved in the process (as committee members, etc.) will be allowed to vote on 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.

#### *7.2(d) The Departmental Committee Report and Chair's Memo*

Schools with departments should provide assessments both from the department faculty (or subcommittee) and the department chair.

The department report should address the following topics:

- The typical qualitative and quantitative standards (books, articles, grants, creative works, etc.) in the discipline.

- Whether the candidate's quantitative measures (see section 7.3) 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.
- 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 referee letters.
- The candidate's next major project (a brief description is sufficient) and how it is expected to contribute to the field.
- The usual timetable for promotion in the discipline, if different from other disciplines.
- The significance of the candidate's field within the broader discipline.

Sometimes, of course, after a department does its job of developing evidence in the dossier, analyzing weaknesses as well as strengths, and applying appropriate academic standards, it will recommend against the award of tenure. In such cases, and all other things being equal, deans should presume that the department will be permitted to conduct a new search to fill the position.

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.
- How the candidate's qualifications will advance the department's academic plan and fit into the unit's strategy for excellence.
- For appointments, the proactive outreach used to assure equal opportunity.
- For an interdisciplinary candidate, the standards for interdisciplinary excellence in the particular case. (If interdisciplinary work is addressed in other department- or school-specific documents, the appropriate documents should also be attached.)

#### *7.2(e) The School Committee Report*

The school-level committee should present its analysis of the issues in the dossier, detailing pros and cons while setting forth its 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.)

### *7.2(f) 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. 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. While the dean will consider carefully the advice of the lower-level reviews, he or she need not agree with them. Indeed, an honest and independent assessment by all the individuals and committees who participate in the process is central to a meaningful review.

The dean's memo should include a statement specifying whether he or she approved the referee list. (The dean should have reviewed the referee list in advance; see section 7.8(b).) If he or she modifies the referee template letter (after consulting with the Provost's Office), he or she should indicate this as well in the memo.

The dean's memo should contain a concise final paragraph summarizing the significance of the candidate's work and his or her contribution to the field.

### **7.3 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 (with more detailed explanations of the data 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.
- 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 often about five to ten scholars who were recently granted a similar promotion or appointment (given tenure, promoted to full professor, etc.) at departments the University regards as of equal or greater stature. It is often advisable to include individuals from departments mentioned in the referee letters as leaders in the candidate's area. The department 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 accurate, it may include those data as well, along with a statement detailing why the source is more accurate. The department should describe how it obtained the citation count results. (UCAPT does not need the actual data; a summary is sufficient.) The department should also do a careful analysis of the citations. (Are they survey articles? How and why is the work cited?) Citations of manuscripts published in the leading journals of the field should be distinguished from those of articles that appear in less important journals. The referees 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 need to 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.). See also section 2.11.

List of grants: For candidates in grant-getting 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.

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

The curriculum vitae needs to be complete, current, dated, and accurate. 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 [http://cet.usc.edu/resources/academic\\_resources/cvs.html](http://cet.usc.edu/resources/academic_resources/cvs.html)), with the most recent work coming first in order.

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. Preferably list the most recent first.
- Publications should be separated from conferences and presentations (invited lectures, seminars).
- 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 referees at the end of year five 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 equal co-P.I.s.

Concerning service:

- The CV should list both internal and external service.

### **7.5 *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 excitement and importance of his or her scholarly work thus far, as well as plans for the future. Approaches to and accomplishments in research, teaching, and service should be explained, and future work should be mapped out. (The candidate should include more detailed 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 to such 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.

The candidate's statement from his or her mid-probationary period review (as described in section 3.5) may also be attached to this personal statement, if desired.

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

### *7.6(a) Teaching Memo*

This section should begin with a memo by the department'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 7.6(c) and 7.9(b).) If a probationary faculty member has heavy teaching responsibilities, the teaching memo should explain the circumstances. For the benefit of those outside the subject, the department may also describe the typical students taking the candidate's courses.

### *7.6(b) Teaching Statement*

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

### *7.6(c) Teaching Record and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness*

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

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

UCAPT asks that additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (syllabi, student evaluations, notes from classroom observations by senior colleagues, etc.) be included in section VII of the dossier (Appendix). See section 7.9(b).

### *7.6(d) Teaching as Scholarship*

Teaching-related activity can sometimes be evaluated as scholarly work if it can be documented and peer-reviewed and if it makes use of a high level of expertise related to the

discipline or interdisciplinary field. Its quality can be shown if it breaks new ground, has significant impact on a scholarly field, or is the foundation for the work of others.

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

#### *7.7(a) Service Statement (optional)*

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

#### *7.7(b) Service Record*

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

### **7.8 External Referee Letters (Section VI)**

#### *7.8(a) Template Letter*

Template letters to solicit referee evaluations are included in section 8. Please use the versions of the template letters included in this UCAPT Manual. If the department (or school, for schools without departments) wishes to rephrase the letter, the dean must consult with the Provost's Office in advance and include this information 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; see section 7.8(c) for more information on this requirement.

#### *7.8(b) Method of Selection of Referees*

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

The great majority of referee letters in the dossier should be from referees who have not been suggested by the candidate and who are arms-length. (See notes below on arms-length referees.) Generally, it is desirable that the candidate suggest *no more than* two or three referees. The candidate should also be given the opportunity to list individuals whom the candidate believes to be biased.

The list of referees, 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 referees, if needed.

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

In order to receive the requested five or six substantive letters from arms-length referees, it is common to solicit at least ten such letters. This number makes it likely the department or school will receive five or six that meet all the criteria. There is no need to obtain a larger number of arms-length, substantive letters once there are five or six that meet 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 referee letters from these collaborators. The collaborator referees should be *in addition* to the five or six arm-length (and non-collaborating) referees. Letters from co-authoring referees 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, referees should be sought from the secondary discipline(s) as well. See section 2.9(a).

Additional notes on referee selection:

- Referees should be included from the broader discipline as well as the subspecialty. Seeking evidence from the broader discipline gives UCAPT a feel for the significance, impact, and originality of the work.
- If a referee is not a leading scholar at a major research university, the department should explain why the referee 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 to be leaders in the field.
- Some of the letters may be from non-academic referees when the candidate is from a non-academic background or works in an area that is performance-based, creative, or impacts public policy and practice. Nevertheless, such dossiers still require a minimum of five or six substantive letters from arms-length, academic referees, 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 referees. Internal letters are desirable when they are from members of the secondary department in interdisciplinary cases (see section 2.9), or when they are from collaborators explaining the candidate's contribution to joint work (see section 2.8).

#### *7.8(c) Method of Contacting Referees*

The candidate must not have access to the list of referees 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 referees whose opinions are solicited. Any contact made by individual committee members or others with solicited referees must be coordinated by the chair or dean. As noted in section 7.8(b), individual faculty colleagues may suggest to a department chair or dean a few potential referees; however, they should neither solicit evaluations nor contact those asked to be referees.

As stated in section 7.8(a), 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. If referee letters are submitted that do not address this question or do not provide reasons for the conclusion, a supplemental request must be made by mail or email, explaining that the University's committees find such information extremely useful.

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 referees when 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 Provost's Office or dean will contact the referees.

Phone calls to referees concerning candidates for promotion to tenure are discouraged. However, if a phone call is necessary, the dean should follow a similar process to that of soliciting written referee letters. After consulting the Provost's Office, the dean should e-mail or write to the referee to schedule an appointment for a phone conversation. If the referee agrees to the appointment, the dean should send the candidate's materials and solicitation letter, just as he or she would for a written referee letter. The questions included in the solicitation letter should then be the template and basis for the phone conversation. All parts of the conversation must be documented in the dossier.

If a dean, department, or the Provost consults with a referee by phone concerning a candidate for a lateral appointment or full professorship, all such communications must be fully 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 letters will be old, and the candidate will not have the benefit of having his or her most recent work considered by the referees. If the dossier is

delayed, at least some of the letters must be new enough to confirm the trajectory of the candidate's work. In this case, departments and schools may request that the referees update their previously submitted letters. 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.

A school may, if it wishes, offer an honorarium to referees in recognition that a thorough evaluation takes time and effort. Several units have found this practice helpful in obtaining thoughtful and substantive evaluations. Other deans prohibit such honorariums.

#### *7.8(d) Organization of Referee Letter Section of Dossier*

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

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

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

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

Section VI-A: Arms-Length Letters: Arms-length letters meeting all of the criteria stated in section 7.8(b) (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 to six such letters in this section.

Section VI-B: Collaborator and Other Letters: Letters from key collaborators and referees 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. This section may include letters from referees who are not arms-length, letters that do not give a substantive analysis, and letters that do not answer all the questions.

#### *7.8(e) Confidentiality*

To preserve the confidentiality of the referees' letters, the administrative assessments and reports should not quote verbatim from referees' letters or give their names. While such

letters are generally held confidential by California courts, that protection may be lost if reports or memos name the referees. The use of anonymous paraphrases is allowed, though the practice is not particularly helpful because it provides no additional information. What is helpful is an informed interpretation of key phrases and of ideas that run through the letters.

#### *7.8(f) 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. (Collaborator letters are already provided for in section 2.8 and 7.8(b).)

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

#### *7.9(a) 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. If the material will fit in a single volume, include all published scholarly work. If the selected material is lengthy, please use a second volume. (However, quantity is not a value in and of itself. The dossier should never be longer than two volumes.) Include along with the dossier a copy of each published book or accepted book manuscript.

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.
- "Pink sheets" of pending grants.
- Abstracts, samples, and photographs of creative work, with succinct descriptions of date, source, and significance.

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

As noted in section 7.6(c), additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (beyond the material requested in the Teaching Record section of the dossier) should be included here.

UCAPT requests:

- Course syllabi provided to students for a few courses that the candidate considers most indicative of his or her approach to teaching.
- 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 items 3, 4, and 5 for individual courses should be compared to the distribution of departmental scores for comparable courses or faculty.



- 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 also 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.)

UCAPT also values the following additional kinds of evidence:

- 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. Examples include: (1) protocols through which students demonstrate their mastery in a public forum; (2) the use and assessment of information technology or multi-media that promote student engagement and learning or that adapt course materials to students' needs; (3) the accommodation of different learning styles among students; (4) 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 (5) the use and assessment of work produced by students in service-oriented or experiential settings outside classroom walls.

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

- Letters from a sample of former students who have been asked to evaluate the candidate's teaching and how it affected them. These students may not be suggested nor solicited by the candidate. The department or committee chair or dean organizes the contacting of students whose opinions are solicited. Please explain the selection method and enclose the solicitation letter. A candidate's teaching assignments will suggest the distribution between undergraduates and graduate students contributing to this section.

## 8. *Templates for Solicitation Letters for Referees*

The template letters are for the following situations:

- I. Standard (non-collaborator) letter
- II. Candidate in an artistic field
- III. Candidate who produces digital scholarship
- IV. Clinical Scholar candidate
- V. Standard letter, when the referee is a collaborator

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

Dear [referee'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/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 [ ]. [***Add if appropriate:*** Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes, we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$\_\_\_\_. (Please supply your Social Security Number.)]

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, and sample of publications [or other scholarly product]. [***Add if appropriate:*** In evaluating [candidate's name]'s productivity, please take into account that [he/she] had [number] years excluded from the tenure clock, during which no research was expected.] If you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please send a short biographical sketch about yourself and address the following issues in your letter. Please note as well that we request an analytical evaluation, rather than general praise or advocacy.

1. Please briefly describe the circumstances in which you know [candidate's name], if applicable. Describe any professional or personal relationships you have had.
2. Please analyze [candidate's name]'s scholarly contributions. Has [he/she] had a significant impact on thinking in the field? Please give concrete examples of such impact and explain how the quality of [candidate's name]'s scholarship has been responsible for the effects you describe. If [candidate's name]'s scholarship has not been extraordinary, please state that candidly and offer your interpretation of its value.
3. Please specify the leading departments (with the most rigorous standards for scholarship) where scholars pursuing the same kinds of work as [candidate's name] are [appointed/promoted]. (These places may include your own institution.) In your judgment, does [candidate's name]'s scholarship meet the standards for [promotion/appointment] to a similar position in these departments [and the award of tenure] (assuming a vacancy existed and that teaching and service expectations were met)? What aspect of [candidate's name]'s scholarship leads you to this conclusion?

4. If you have not already covered the subject, we would appreciate your evaluation of the significance of the venues in which [candidate's name] has published [and the prizes/grants/awards [he/she] has received].

5. 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.

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] a lifetime appointment] [offer [candidate's name] this appointment] [grant [candidate's name] this promotion].

*Revised March 2013*

## **8.2 For use when the candidate is in an artistic field.**

Dear [referee'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/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 [ ]. [**Add if appropriate:** Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes, we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$ \_\_\_\_\_. (Please supply your Social Security Number.)]

I have enclosed a professional resume, personal statement, and [samples of/links to/descriptions of] some of [his/her] work. [**Add if appropriate:** In evaluating [candidate's name]'s productivity, please take into account that [he/she] had [number] years excluded from the tenure clock, during which no creative work was expected.] If you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please send a short biographical sketch about yourself and address the following issues in your letter. Please note as well that we request an analytical evaluation, rather than general praise or advocacy.

1. Please briefly describe the circumstances in which you know [candidate's name], if applicable. Describe any professional or personal relationships you have had. [**For collaborators:** Since you have worked together, our committee would appreciate what you can tell us about the nature and extent of [candidate's name]'s contributions to the joint work.]

2. Please analyze [candidate's name]'s creative [**comment to school:** *you may substitute "performance," "production," "design," "exhibition," or the like, as relevant*] contributions. Have they

had a significant impact on the field? Please give concrete examples of such impacts and explain how the quality of [candidate's name]'s work has been responsible for the effects you describe. If [candidate's name]'s work has not been significant and out of the ordinary, please state that candidly and offer your interpretation of its value.

3. Please specify the leading departments (with the most rigorous standards) where individuals pursuing the same kinds of work as [candidate's name] are [appointed/promoted]. (These places may include your own institution.) In your judgment, does [candidate's name]'s work meet the standards for [promotion/appointment] to a similar position in these departments [and the award of tenure] (assuming a vacancy existed and that teaching and service expectations were met)? What aspect of [candidate's name]'s work leads you to this conclusion?

4. If you have not already covered the subject, we would appreciate your evaluation of the significance of the venues in which [candidate's name]'s work has appeared [and the prizes/grants/awards [he/she] has received].

5. 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.

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] a lifetime appointment] [offer [candidate's name] this appointment] [grant [candidate's name] this promotion].

*Revised March 2013*

### ***8.3 For use when the candidate produces digital scholarship.***

Dear [referee'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/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 [ ]. [***Add if appropriate:*** Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes, we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$ \_\_\_\_\_. (Please supply your Social Security Number.)]

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, sample of publications, and the URLs of the digital projects on which [he/she] has worked. [***Add if appropriate:*** In evaluating [candidate's name]'s productivity, please take into account that [he/she] had [number] years excluded from the tenure clock, during which no research was expected.] If

you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please send a short biographical sketch about yourself and address the following issues in your letter. Please note as well that we request an analytical evaluation, rather than general praise or advocacy.

1. Please briefly describe the circumstances in which you know [candidate's name], if applicable. Describe any professional or personal relationships you have had. [***For collaborators:*** Since you have worked together, our committee would appreciate what you can tell us about the nature and extent of [candidate's name]'s contributions to the joint work.]
2. Please analyze [candidate's name]'s scholarly and creative contributions. 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. [***Add if appropriate:*** Please also comment on [candidate's name]'s contributions to collaborative digital scholarship.] If [candidate's name]'s scholarship and creative work has not been extraordinary, please state that candidly and offer your interpretation of its value.
3. Please specify the leading departments (with the most rigorous standards for scholarship) where scholars pursuing the same kinds of work as [candidate's name] are [appointed/promoted]. (These places may include your own institution.) In your judgment, does [candidate's name]'s scholarship meet the standards for [promotion/appointment] to a similar position in these departments [and the award of tenure] (assuming a vacancy existed and that teaching and service expectations were met)? What aspect of [candidate's name]'s scholarship leads you to this conclusion?
4. If you have not already covered the subject, we would appreciate your evaluation of the significance of the venues in which [candidate's name] has published or produced digital scholarship [and the prizes/grants/awards [he/she] has received].
5. 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.

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] a lifetime appointment] [offer [candidate's name] this appointment] [grant [candidate's name] this promotion].

*New March 2013*

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

Dear [referee'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.

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 by e-mail [ ] whether or not you are able to assist us by reviewing the enclosed materials and submitting a letter of evaluation by [ ]. [**Add if appropriate:** Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes, we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$\_\_\_\_. (Please supply your Social Security Number.)]

I have enclosed a curriculum vitae, personal statement, our definition of "Clinical Scholar," and a sample of publications. [**Add if appropriate:** In evaluating [candidate's name]'s productivity, please take into account that [he/she] had [number] years excluded from the tenure clock, during which no research was expected.] If you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please send a short biographical sketch about yourself and address the following issues in your letter. Please note as well that we request an analytical evaluation, rather than general praise or advocacy.

1. Please briefly describe the circumstances in which you know [candidate's name], if applicable. Describe any professional or personal relationships you have had.

Please evaluate the evidence for as many of the following as apply to [candidate's name]'s career:

2. 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?)

3. Is there a theme or focus to [candidate's name]'s research expertise that has had substantive national or international impact?

4. 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?

5. 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, such as the NIH, CDC, DOD, ACS, MS Society, March of Dimes,

Foundation for Physical Therapy, etc.)? Has [his/her] research funded by contract with companies resulted in significant publications in peer-reviewed journals?

6. 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.)?

[In the case of promotion to full professor with the designation Clinical Scholar, the following items should be added:

7. Has [candidate's name] made additional substantial contributions since [his/her] [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [ ]? Please elaborate.

8. Please provide any information you may have on [candidate's name]'s teaching inside or outside the University.]

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

[Number]. 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?

We value your frank and detailed judgments highly.

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].

*New March 2013*

### **8.5 For use when the referee is a collaborator.**

Dear [referee'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/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 [ ]. [**Add if appropriate:** Because we appreciate the effort such an evaluation takes, we will acknowledge your assistance with an honorarium of \$ \_\_\_\_\_. (Please supply your Social Security Number.)]

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. Because it may be awkward for you to comment on your own work, I am not seeking your overall assessment of the candidate's scholarship; rather, I would be grateful if you could address the following issues concerning your joint work with [candidate's name]:

1. 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.
2. Please help us to understand [candidate's name]'s contributions to collaborative work:
  - Please discuss the significance of the sequence of author names in your joint publications, as well as [candidate's name]'s own contributions.
  - What is or was [his/her] role in driving the project[s] forward?
  - Did [he/she] lead major efforts within the project[s] or make key contributions to [it/them]?
  - What accomplishments/achievements can be attributed to [him/her]?
  - Were [candidate's name]'s contributions essential for the overall success of the project[s]?
  - To what degree did these contributions influence the overall outcome or direction of the project[s]?
  - Were [candidate's name]'s contributions original rather than a reproduction of the work of others?
  - How are [candidate's name]'s contributions regarded in [his/her] field of research?
3. 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.

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 March 2013*



## CHECKLIST FOR DOSSIER PREPARATION

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

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

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

Updated March 2013

**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**

	<b>Adequate for Evaluation</b>	<b>Inadequate for Evaluation</b>
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**

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

**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:** \_\_\_\_\_

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