

# **Faculty Manual**

---

**Guidelines, Practices, and Procedures**

---

**University of Southern California  
Marshall School of Business  
2011**

**usc Marshall**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
	1.1	Definitions
	1.2	Changes from Previous Edition
<b>2</b>	<b>Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty</b>	<b>3</b>
	2.1	Appointment
	2.2	Designations
	2.3	Fourth-Year Review
	2.4	Tenure Clock Issues
	2.5	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure
	2.6	Promotion to (Full) Professor
	2.7	Outside Referees in Tenure and Promotion Cases
	2.8	Confidentiality in Fourth-Year Review, Tenure, and Promotion Cases
<b>3</b>	<b>Clinical and Other NTT Faculty</b>	<b>15</b>
	3.1	Appointment
	3.2	Designations
	3.3	Promotion
	3.4	Reappointment and Nonrenewal
<b>4</b>	<b>Workload Profiles</b>	<b>21</b>
	4.1	Standard Profiles for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
	4.2	Standard Profile for Clinical Faculty
	4.3	Expectations for Teaching
	4.4	Expectations for Research
	4.5	Expectations for Service
	4.6	Teaching Schedules
<b>5</b>	<b>Annual Performance Review</b>	<b>29</b>
	5.1	Materials Supplied by Faculty
	5.2	Departmental Evaluation
	5.3	Assignment of Scores
	5.4	Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching
	5.5	Guidelines for Evaluating Research
	5.6	Guidelines for Evaluating Service
	5.7	Feedback and Appeals
	5.8	Review of Department Chairs
	5.9	Salary Adjustments
<b>6</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>38</b>
	6.1	General Principles
	6.2	Overload Teaching
	6.3	Executive Education
	6.4	Teaching for Outside Institutions
<b>7</b>	<b>Committees</b>	<b>43</b>
	7.1	Committee on Clinical Faculty (CCF)
	7.2	Committee on Doctoral Programs (Ph.D.)
	7.3	Committee on Graduate Instruction
	7.4	Committee on Mentoring

---

7.5	Committee on Named Chairs and Professorships	
7.6	Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Personnel)	
7.7	Committee on Research and Faculty Recognition	
7.8	Committee on Undergraduate Programs	
7.9	Faculty Council	
<b>8</b>	<b>Leaves</b>	<b>47</b>
8.1	Family Leave	
8.2	Sabbaticals	
8.3	Unpaid Leave	
<b>9</b>	<b>Outside Consulting, Conflicts of Interest</b>	<b>49</b>
9.1	Outside Consulting	
9.2	Use of University Name and Affiliation	
9.3	Conflicts of Interest	
9.4	Reporting	
9.5	Part-Time Faculty	
<b>10</b>	<b>Named Chairs and Professorships</b>	<b>52</b>
10.1	New Appointments	
10.2	Renewals	
10.3	Perquisites Associated with Named Positions	
<b>11</b>	<b>External Funding</b>	<b>55</b>
11.1	Workload Adjustment	
11.2	Summer Research Funding	
<b>12</b>	<b>Mentoring</b>	<b>57</b>
12.1	Formal Mentoring Procedures	
12.2	Matching Mentors and Mentees	
12.3	Recommendations for Department Chairs	
12.4	Recommendations for Mentors and Mentees	
<b>Appendix A.</b>	<b>Calendars</b>	<b>62</b>
A1	Year at a Glance	
A2	Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion and Fourth-Year Review	
A3	Clinical Faculty Promotion	
<b>Appendix B.</b>	<b>Dossiers</b>	<b>65</b>
B1	Dossier Sample Title Page	
B2	Dossiers for Tenure-Track Faculty	
B3	Dossiers for Clinical Faculty	
B4	Template Invitation Letter for External Reviewers in Clinical Faculty Promotion Cases	
B5	Template for In-Class Teaching Evaluation	

---

# 1 Introduction

This Manual describes guidelines, practices, and procedures of the Marshall School of Business pertaining to faculty. The purpose of the Manual is to help faculty understand the guiding principles behind the School's practices, and to provide a handy reference for how the School works when it comes to faculty issues.

The Manual is intended to describe guidelines and practices, and does not establish policies, rights, or mandates. The Dean of the Marshall School may modify or waive these guidelines and procedures at his or her discretion, and the Provost may modify or waive University policies. Any case of concern that this Manual has not been followed should be brought to the attention of the Vice Dean for Faculty and Academic Affairs, or if concern persists, to the attention of the Dean or Provost, because it is their responsibility to decide what remedy if any is appropriate, or whether to approve a waiver.

Any conflicts between this Manual and the USC Faculty Handbook or other University policies are inadvertent, and University policies and procedures prevail in those instances. The USC Faculty Handbook and other University policies can be found at [www.usc.edu/policies](http://www.usc.edu/policies).

## 1.1 Definitions

Unless otherwise noted, the following definitions are used throughout.

- "Department" includes the Department of Finance and Business Economics (FBE), Department of Information and Operations Management (IOM), Department of Marketing (MKT), Department of Management and Organization (MOR), Center for Management Communication (CMC), Greif Center for Entrepreneurial Studies (ENT), and Leventhal School of Accounting (ACC).
  - "School" is the Marshall School of Business.
  - "Chair" includes the Chairs of FBE, IOM, MKT, MOR, the Directors of CMC
-

and ENT, and the Dean of the Leventhal School of Accounting.

- “Vice Dean” refers to the Vice Dean for Faculty and Academic Affairs.
- “USC Faculty Handbook” refers to the 2010 version. If there is a more recent edition, the most recent edition governs. See [www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook](http://www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook).
- “UCAPT Manual” refers to the *Manual on the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure*. All references in this Manual are to the 2009 version, but if there is a more recent edition, the most recent edition governs. See [www.usc.edu/policies](http://www.usc.edu/policies).

## 1.2 Changes from the Previous Edition

This version in most respects is the same as the previous version. The main changes from the 2009 version are:

- Tenured and tenure-track faculty. Additional material has been included on the fourth-year review.
- Clinical faculty. The promotion process has been modified and template documents have been added. The changes were developed in consultation with the Committee on Clinical Faculty.
- Annual Performance Review. The number of categories have been increased, the process by which scores are assigned has been clarified to better reflect school practice, and the importance of professionalism and collegiality for teaching and service performance is now explicitly recognized.
- A new section has been added on mentoring for tenured and tenure-track faculty. This section was developed in consultation with the Committee on Mentoring.

Revisions to this Manual are made periodically by the Dean, after consultation with the Faculty Council or other faculty groups, subject to approval by the President of the University. Please send suggestions for revision, expansion, or deletion to the Faculty Council or Vice Dean.

---

---

## 2 Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

“Tenured faculty” are faculty members with tenure, and “tenure-track faculty” are faculty members who are eligible for tenure but not yet tenured (“probationary” faculty). In most cases, tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to spend significant time producing and publishing scholarly research, in addition to teaching.

### 2.1 Appointment

Tenure-track (probationary) appointments are made by the Dean, under authority delegated by the Provost. Tenured appointments are made by the Provost, upon recommendation of the Dean. Faculty searches are authorized by the Vice Dean, follow practices and procedures established by the Department and School, and are national or international in scope. Some Departments hold formal votes on appointments, but other methods for consulting faculty may be used. Probationary appointments generally are made as one year renewable contracts, subject to non-reappointment as provided in the USC Faculty Handbook (Section 4-F(3)).

### 2.2 Designations

Marshall uses several titles to designate tenured and tenure-track faculty. The titles Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and (full) Professor are part of a career ladder.

- *Instructor in [Area]*. Untenured entry-level position, generally for those who have not completed their terminal degree. Typically, Instructor positions convert automatically to Assistant Professor when the degree is completed.
  - *Assistant Professor of [Area]*. Untenured entry-level position, generally for those who have completed their terminal degree. An Assistant Professor holds a full time appointment on a probationary basis, and must be considered for tenure no later than the contractually stipulated mandatory tenure decision date, as explained in the UCAPT Manual.
-

- *Associate Professor of [Area]*. Senior faculty position, usually with tenure.
- *Professor of [Area]*. Highest faculty rank, usually with tenure. Sometimes referred to as "full" Professor.

"[Area]" is Accounting, Entrepreneurship, Finance and Business Economics, Information and Operations Management, Management and Organization, Management Communication, or Marketing. Faculty appointed to named chairs or professorships with designations that differ from an "Area" retain their previous designation as well as the named title, for example, the E. Morgan Stanley Chair in Business Administration and Professor of Marketing.

### **2.3 Fourth-Year Review**

The fourth-year review, conducted in the fourth year of an assistant professor's probationary period, has several purposes: (i) to evaluate the candidate's scholarly and teaching contributions, (ii) to assess the candidate's prospects for satisfying the criteria for promotion and tenure, (iii) to provide suggestions to help the candidate develop as a scholar and teacher, and (iv) to determine whether to renew the candidate's contract. In the case of a favorable review, typically the candidate's contract is renewed through the mandatory tenure decision date (conditional on the candidate continuing to meet expectations). In the case of an unfavorable review, typically the candidate receives a one-year terminal contract.

In order to be renewed, a faculty member is expected to be producing and publishing research at a sufficient pace to have a reasonable prospect of meeting tenure standards by the mandatory tenure decision date. To have a reasonable prospect of tenure, in most cases the candidate should have published or had accepted research in a high quality refereed journal (typically from his or her dissertation) and also should have produced work that shows evidence of moving beyond the dissertation.

The review process parallels the promotion and tenure process except that external letters of reference usually are not solicited. Within the department, the process is supervised by a peer evaluation group (PEG) consisting of three or more tenured professors, at least one of whose primary appointment is in a different Department. The PEG is appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Vice Dean.

The process begins with the candidate submitting the following material: a personal statement of up to 10 pages, curriculum vitae, selection of no more than five published or working papers, annual performance review scores since the

---

candidate was appointed, sample of course materials, and student ratings for all courses taught. The personal statement should focus on research, but also discuss teaching and service contributions. The PEG assembles a dossier that includes the candidate's materials as well as a peer report based on classroom observation of teaching and other relevant information.

The PEG prepares a confidential report that addresses the four purposes of the review, itemized as (i)-(iv) above. In addition to evaluating past performance, assessing future prospects, and making suggestions to help the candidate develop, the PEG recommends whether or not to renew the candidate's contract. The Chair should hold a meeting of the tenured faculty in the Department and provide an opportunity for all tenured faculty members in the Department to comment on the PEG report, and those comments should be reflected in the report. The Chair prepares his or her own assessment, adds it and the PEG report to the dossier, and forwards the dossier to the Vice Dean.

Marshall's Personnel Committee reviews the dossier and, at its discretion, consults with the Chair and members of the PEG. The Committee votes whether to recommend renewal of the candidate's contract, and prepares its own report. A Personnel Committee member belonging to the candidate's Department should participate at the Departmental level, but should not vote or participate in the review of candidate at the School level. The Personnel Committee report should address the same set of issues as the previous reviewers and state the results of the vote on contract renewal. The Personnel Committee report is then added to the dossier, and the dossier is forwarded to the Vice Dean.

The Dean reviews the dossier and decides whether to renew the candidate's contract. The Vice Dean then prepares a memo for the candidate that (i) summarizes the findings of the review, (ii) offers recommendations, and (iii) indicates whether or not the contract will be renewed. The memo is copied to the Chair, members of the PEG, and members of the Personnel Committee. The entire dossier is submitted to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

The Vice Dean meets with the candidate to discuss the memo and any other information from the review process that may be helpful. *The Vice Dean's memo and discussion are intended to offer guidance for the development of the faculty member, but candidates who are proceeding on toward a tenure decision should understand that the memo and discussion are not contracts in any way. The memo and discussion are not intended to establish either necessary or sufficient conditions for promotion and tenure. The final decision on promotion and tenure is made at the University, not the School level, and includes evaluation by referees external to USC.*



The candidate is not permitted to view any of the other documents prepared during the review process, and all conversations in the various levels of review are considered confidential.

## 2.4 Tenure Clock Issues

Each probationary faculty member's Tenure Decision Date is indicated in his or her offer letter. The Tenure Decision Date is 12 months before the expiration of the probationary period, typically set at May 15. Because of the length of the tenure review process, candidates typically begin the tenure review process in the summer before the year of the Tenure Decision Date. For example, if the probationary period ended May 15, 2016, the Tenure Decision Date is May 15, 2015, and the tenure review process would begin in the summer of 2014.

Candidates may be considered for promotion before the Tenure Decision Date, but a negative decision on tenure results in issuance of a terminal year contract.

Marshall's standard probationary period is eight years. Individuals who held tenure-track appointments at another institution prior to joining Marshall may have a shorter probationary period. See USC Faculty Handbook (Section 4-D(1)).

Only the Provost may revise the Tenure Decision Date. The basic principle for extending the probationary period is that the faculty member has experienced unusual circumstances that interfere with the opportunity to do expected research and publication to an extent that threatens to undercut what would otherwise have been a meritorious tenure dossier. Requests for a tenure clock extension require a memo from the faculty member explaining the special circumstances, a copy of the offer letter showing the original tenure decision date, current vitae, and supporting documentation where appropriate. The request should be submitted to the Department Chair who adds a cover letter with his or her own recommendation and forwards the material to the Vice Dean. The Vice Dean prepares a memo commenting on the unusual circumstances and how much effect they are likely to have on the strength of the eventual tenure dossier. These materials are then forwarded to the University's Committee on Probationary Deadlines that advises the Provost. Extensions requested by a birth mother do not require a curriculum vitae or memo from the Dean.

Grounds for revising the Tenure Decision Date include but are not limited to:

- Family responsibilities. See USC Faculty Handbook (Section 9-D).

- Lengthy interdisciplinary research. See UCAPT Manual (Section 2.4).
- Leave of absence in a position that did not permit the continuation of research and publishing projects.

Extension requests connected with a leave should be made either prior to the leave or within six months after returning to regular activities. Otherwise, an extension request should be made within 12 months of the triggering event. Any request for an extension should be submitted at the latest by early in the fall semester of the academic year of the original tenure decision date.

## 2.5 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The most important document for understanding the tenure process is the UCAPT Manual, available at [www.usc.edu/policies](http://www.usc.edu/policies). All persons involved in the tenure process, including the candidate, Chair, and members of review committees are strongly encouraged to read the UCAPT Manual.

Although tenure decisions involve reviews at the Departmental and School level, the final decision is made by the Provost, under delegation of authority vested in the President of University. The Provost receives advice from the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (UCAPT). Candidates should keep in mind that their home department is only one part of the decision process, and not the ultimate decision maker.

### *Criteria*

The UCAPT Manual states (p. 3): “The primary criteria are excellence and creativity in both teaching and scholarly research, as documented in the dossier, with outstanding performance required in one (usually research) and at least solid performance in the other.” In practice, the critical factor in most tenure cases is the candidate’s research contribution. The UCAPT Manual states (p. 4): “Fundamentally, we want to know whether the candidate has made a real contribution, and whether that contribution has made an impact or shows high likelihood of impact on the field, and demonstrates focus and independence.” Marshall seeks to tenure scholars who are in the process of establishing national or international reputations as scholars, and are on track to become leaders in their fields. The UCAPT Manual (Section 2.4) contains additional specific provisions for candidates whose scholarship spans disciplinary or school boundaries.

The most important factor for promotion is a candidate’s contribution to

---

knowledge, and the various reviewers seek to determine the nature and impact of the candidate's work. One of the most important parts of the review is letters from leading experts outside USC that discuss in detail the nature and importance of the candidate's contribution. The faculty in the candidate's Department are also expected to read his or her work, and provide their independent assessment of its quality and impact. A tenure case should also be supported by quantitative metrics, such as the following:

- Quantity of publications and quality of outlets: the number of scholarly articles and books published, and the quality of the journals and presses that publish them.
- Citations: the number of times the research is cited by other scholars.
- Awards and honors: for example, "best paper" prizes awarded by journals or conferences; appointment to the editorial board of a journal; and articles reprinted in edited volumes.

Although quantitative metrics are considered as part of the promotion process, it should be kept in mind that what counts most in the end is the contribution made by the body of work, not the number of papers, count of citations, etc.

The candidate's research trajectory is another important factor in the promotion decision. The candidate should demonstrate a research trajectory that suggests continued productivity in the future, and a reasonable expectation of promotion to (full) Professor in three to five years.

The candidate must also demonstrate focus and independence. A successful candidate should demonstrate that he or she has advanced beyond the dissertation and become an independent scholar. If much of a candidate's research is co-authored with a dissertation advisor or senior colleagues, it may be difficult for reviewers to establish independence. Single-authored papers help demonstrate independence, but are neither required nor sufficient.

Teaching contributions are also relevant for the tenure decision. To evaluate teaching, it is traditional to consider student ratings, course materials, course innovation, and teaching awards. Course materials, such as syllabi, handouts, cases, slides, and assignments should indicate that the candidate has provided rigorous up-to-date courses, and attempted to bring a sense of innovation to the classroom. It is helpful to have information based on classroom observation of a candidate's teaching effectiveness.

---

Probationary faculty members are not expected to engage in significant service activities. However, it is expected that the candidate has shared and will continue to share faculty service responsibilities in the Department, School, University, and profession.

### *Process and Calendar*

A promotion calendar is established by the Vice Dean at the beginning of the academic year and communicated to the Chairs. The University requires dossiers to reach the Provost by February 1. A sample calendar is given in Appendix A.

Typically, in the summer the Chair, in consultation with the Vice Dean, appoints a Peer Evaluation Group (PEG) consisting of two senior faculty members in the candidate's Department, and one outside member. The candidate submits a personal statement, curriculum vitae, and selection of papers to the Chair. The PEG chair and Department Chair, in consultation with the Vice Dean and chair of Marshall's Personnel Committee, develop a list of outside referees. The Office of the Vice Dean requests letters from outside referees and handles all correspondence with them.

The candidate, in consultation with the PEG, prepares material for inclusion in the dossier that includes a personal statement no more than eight pages long (preferably about five pages), evidence of research and teaching accomplishment, and a selection of papers. The candidate should avoid excessive jargon or technical language in the personal statement, keeping in mind that many reviewers will not be experts in the area. The UCAPT Manual observes, "The personal statement is important, but often need not be more than two pages long. The candidate is provided this opportunity to convey to others the excitement and importance of his or her life's work." While the candidate is responsible for submitting certain documents, the PEG and Chair are responsible for preparation of the dossier and should assure that the dossier is complete and appropriately ordered. See Appendix B for preparation of the dossier. The PEG chair adds the external letters to the dossier, and includes a brief explanation of each referee's qualifications for assessing the candidate.

Early in Fall Semester, the PEG reviews the dossier, and prepares a draft report with a recommendation. The tenured members of the candidate's Department review the dossier, meet to discuss the case, and vote by secret ballot in favor or against promotion and tenure. Only tenured faculty members are eligible to participate, and each participant is expected to review the dossier before the meeting. Faculty members who do not attend the meeting (or join by conference call) are discouraged from voting. *The result of the Department vote may be*

*communicated to the tenured faculty in the Department, but may not be communicated to the candidate or any other persons inside or outside USC other than those in the decision chain.* The PEG report may be revised in light of the Departmental discussion. The Chair prepares a memo summarizing the Department's deliberations and vote as well as his or her own recommendation, and adds the memo to the dossier. If the Chair disagrees with the consensus view of the Department, this should be noted and explained. Any faculty member who wishes to add information may submit an independent letter to the Chair or the Vice Dean. The outside letters, PEG report, and Chair's memo are added to the dossier, which is forwarded to the Vice Dean.

Toward the middle of Fall Semester, the Personnel Committee considers the case. In addition to reviewing the dossier, the Personnel Committee may meet with the Department Chair and PEG chair. The Personnel Committee then votes in favor or against promotion and tenure, prepares a memo summarizing its deliberations, and adds it to the dossier. A committee member who belongs to the same Department as the candidate may vote in the Department, but should not vote in the Personnel Committee or participate in the committee's discussion of the case.

The Dean and Vice Dean review the dossier, the Dean decides whether to support the case, and no later than February 1 the Dean and Vice Dean send a memo to the Provost with a recommendation. If *both* the Department's vote and the Dean's recommendation are negative, tenure is denied and the case is closed. If either the Department vote or the Dean's recommendation is positive, the case is forwarded to the University. If forwarded, the case is reviewed by UCAPT and the Provost, who decides whether to grant tenure. The decision is communicated to the Dean, and the Vice Dean communicates the decision to the candidate.

### *PEG Report*

The PEG is charged with providing a detailed and careful evaluation of the candidate's academic record and accomplishments. The PEG report is a primary information source for various people in the School and University who participate in the promotion decision. *The PEG must not be an advocate for the candidate; its purpose is to evaluate.* According to the Provost, "Memos from committees, chairs, and deans are most useful to me and to UCAPT if they are candid, dealing with weaknesses and issues forthrightly, so that they are balanced rather than advocacy." All PEG members should sign the report.

The most useful report is organized around the stated criteria for promotion as discussed in the UCAPT Manual, and explicitly addresses the extent to which the candidate has met the criteria. See, for example, Section of 2.1 of the UCAPT

Manual on gauges of quality, and Section 2.2 on expectations for tenure and promotion. *In addition to summarizing the external reports and other materials in the dossier, PEG members are expected to read the candidate's work, and provide an expert evaluation of its quality, contribution, and impact.*

The PEG report should include the following specific information:

- A clear description of the candidate's major scholarly contributions, and why those contributions are important. The report should not merely describe what the candidate studies, but provide a statement of what the candidate has *discovered or added to knowledge* in the field. The report should contain a one-paragraph summary of the major contribution as well as a longer, more detailed description.
  - The main strengths and the main weaknesses of the case.
  - Referees: A short bio for each referee that explains why the referee was selected and appropriate, a list of all referees that were solicited, and a discussion of the response rate. Because subsequent evaluators are able to read the referee letters themselves, there is no need to provide an extensive review of the letters; rather, the PEG report should provide the committee's interpretation of the overall sense of the letters, and if appropriate offer context for understanding the letters that might not be obvious to subsequent evaluators.
  - Assessment of tenurability at peer institutions.
  - Benchmark comparison: number of publications and citations for a group of scholars recently tenured at peer institutions. The group should include at least 10 individuals, and should be a comprehensive (not selective) list of recently tenured scholars in the candidate's field at peer institutions (e.g. all scholars tenured at top-10 schools in the last three years.) Citations should be from the Social Science Citation Index as well as Google Scholar.
  - Research trajectory: the pattern of the candidate's productivity over time, quality and quantity of working papers, expected future trajectory of the candidate's research program.
  - Research collaboration: extent of the candidate's research collaboration and coauthorship, nature of the candidate's contribution to joint projects, significance of the ordering of names in coauthored work, frequency of coauthorship in the candidate's field.
-

- Research independence and focus: evidence that speaks to the candidate's independence and focus as a researcher.
- Teaching: assessment of teaching based on student ratings, course materials, and in-class evaluation when possible.
- Professional service: presentations and discussions at conferences, presentations at Department workshops and seminars, presentations at other schools, service as a referee or editor, organization of conferences and other scholarly events.
- Research funding (if appropriate for the field): assessment of external research funding and research grants generated by the candidate.
- Strategic considerations: If a candidate has some critical knowledge or skill that is essential to the Department's objectives or strategy, it should be identified and evidence provided.

### *Personnel Committee Report*

Marshall's Personnel Committee advises the Dean on tenure cases. The committee's memo should identify the primary strengths and weaknesses of the case and record the committee's vote for or against promotion. The report need not restate material in the PEG report, but may simply note concurrence where appropriate. If there are differences of opinion within the committee, that fact should be noted, and the points of contention explained. All members of the Committee should sign the report (excluding members from the candidate's Department, who do not vote or participate in discussion of the case).

## **2.6 Promotion to (Full) Professor**

Promotion to Professor is governed by the USC Faculty Handbook and UCAPT Manual. All persons involved in the promotion process are strongly encouraged to review those documents. Although promotion decisions involve reviews at the Departmental and School level, the final decision is made by the Provost. The Provost receives advice from the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure. Candidates should keep in mind that their home department plays a role in the decision, but is not the final decision maker.

The UCAPT Manual (Section 2.2) states: "The full professor rank requires a higher level of qualification, including important additional scholarship since the previous

---

promotion and achievement of national or international prominence. UCAPT also considers the following factors (though they may not be present in every case): evidence of interdisciplinary work, mentoring of junior faculty both within and outside the home department, and fulfillment of their [sic] responsibility to carry out the service functions of the University.” The UCAPT Manual also states that the most important time period to consider in promotion cases to Professor is the period since the last promotion.

A candidate for Professor is expected to have established a national or international reputation based on research, and to have made significant scholarly contributions since the last promotion. In many respects, the criteria for promotion to Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor, except a higher level of achievement is expected. Two criteria are unique:

- The candidate is expected to have mentored and enhanced the professional development of junior colleagues. Evidence in support of this might include coauthorship with junior colleagues and classroom observation,
- The candidate is expected to have taken on leadership roles in the Department, School, or University. Evidence in support of this might include membership on key committees with significant accomplishments.

The process for promotion to Professor in most respects is the same as for promotion to Associate Professor, except it takes place earlier in the year in order to meet the University deadline that is typically mid-October. A sample calendar is given in Appendix A. The main differences are: (i) only tenured faculty members with the rank of Professor may participate in the Departmental meeting and serve on review committees, (ii) the PEG report should address the candidate’s mentoring and leadership contributions.

## **2.7 Letters from Outside Referees in Tenure and Promotion Cases**

Section 9 of the UCAPT Manual discusses the role of outside referees in promotion cases. UCAPT requires a minimum of five or six letters from arms-length referees who provide a substantive analysis of the candidate’s work, whose judgment we have reason to value, and who evaluate the work in terms of tenure standards at leading departments. Marshall’s practice is to solicit approximately 15 letters from arms-length referees because some reviewers may not provide a report that engages the substance of the research (instead, simply summarizing the number of publications and quality of outlets) or decline to write. In addition, one or two letters may be requested from coauthors if a candidate frequently collaborates.

---



Referees should be eminent scholars with the expertise, stature, and judgment to provide a reliable assessment of the candidate's contributions, and preferably whose leadership is recognized in the discipline. The list of referees should be examined in light of the following questions:

- Are the referees arms-length, i.e. not coauthors, advisors, personal friends?
- Does the list include individuals who hold of major positions in the discipline (current or past presidents of major professional organizations, current or former editors of leading scholarly journals, past or present academic deans at leading schools)?
- Does the list include referees from leading departments internationally?
- Are the referees drawn from a variety of departments rather than concentrated in a small number of institutions?
- If a significant amount of the candidate's work is collaborative, have one or more coauthors been asked to comment on the nature of the collaboration?

The candidate may suggest referees, no more than three, but the fact that those referees were suggested by the candidate must be noted in the PEG report. The UCAPT Manual provides additional guidelines when the candidate's research is significantly interdisciplinary.

## **2.8 Confidentiality in Fourth-Year Review, Tenure, and Promotion Cases**

The PEG report, Chair's memo, Personnel Committee memo, Dean's letter, identity of referees, content of referee letters, votes in Department, votes in Personnel Committee, and discussions in Department meeting and Personnel Committee meeting are confidential. None of the dossier materials, votes, or contents of meetings may be discussed with the candidate or other individuals not involved in the decision. No information regarding decisions at any stage in the process should be revealed to the candidate or individuals outside the decision process. When the process is complete, the Vice Dean communicates the decision to the candidate and responds to questions. A favorable promotion or tenure decision is announced publicly. It is inappropriate for any individual involved in the process to reveal his or her own assessment, evaluation, or vote to the candidate at any time during or after the final decision.

---

---

## 3 Clinical and Other NTT Faculty

Clinical faculty members are full-time non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty members who focus primarily on teaching and service, although some also conduct scholarly research. Clinical faculty participate in the governance of the School and are eligible to participate in all committees except those involved in tenure and promotion of tenure-track faculty. Lecturers are full-time non-tenure-track faculty members with a short-term appointment. Adjunct Professors are part-time members of the faculty.

### 3.1 Appointment

Clinical faculty appointments are made by the Vice Dean on behalf of the Dean, after recommendation by the Department Chair. Faculty searches are authorized by the Vice Dean, follow practices and procedures established by the Department and School, and are national or international in scope. Some Departments hold votes on appointments, but other methods for consulting faculty may be used.

### 3.2 Designations

Marshall uses several titles to designate non-tenure-track faculty. The titles Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and (full) Professor form a career ladder.

- *Assistant Professor of Clinical [AREA]*. Entry-level position. An Assistant Professor holds a full time appointment on an annual basis with the possibility of renewal.
  - *Associate Professor of Clinical [AREA]*. An Associate Professor holds a full time appointment, typically for two years, with possibility of renewal.
  - *Professor of Clinical [AREA]*. Highest faculty rank. A Professor (sometimes "full professor") holds a full time appointment, typically for three years, with the possibility of renewal.
-

- *Lecturer in [AREA]*. Designates a full time appointment that is expected to be short-term and not continuing.
- *Adjunct Professor of [AREA]*. Designate a part-time appointment.

Marshall grants courtesy appointments to faculty members with primary appointments in other units of the University. These appointments do not confer tenure, and typically are granted only to senior scholars.

New hires on the clinical faculty track typically begin at the rank of Assistant Professor. If a new hire previously served as a faculty member at another academic institution, the time spent in that capacity may be considered in determining his or her initial rank at Marshall. Because time spent in non-academic and non-faculty positions does not normally develop the skills expected for senior clinical faculty members, time spent in such positions typically is not considered in determining initial rank.

### **3.3 Promotion**

Promotion recognizes the accomplishments of faculty members who have demonstrated excellence in teaching (and research, where relevant) and made significant service contributions. Promotion is not automatic, nor is it based on years of employment. Clinical faculty members are not eligible for tenure. The final decision on promotion of clinical faculty is made by the Dean, under authority delegated by the Provost. Promotion of clinical faculty is governed by the USC Faculty Handbook (Section 4-G) in addition to guidelines outlined here.

The amount of time spent at each rank for clinical faculty mirrors the practice for tenure track faculty. Typically, promotion to Associate Professor is considered after seven or more years of experience at USC or a similar institution; promotion to (full) Professor is considered after five years as an Associate Professor. In rare circumstances, credit for teaching and other relevant experience prior to joining the faculty at USC may be counted in determining the timing of promotion. Faculty members who are considered for but not granted promotion are expected to wait at least three years before being considered again for promotion.

#### *Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor*

A successful candidate for promotion is expected to have made a demonstrable contribution to the School's educational mission, and specifically:

- Made an ongoing effort to develop his or her abilities as a teacher;
- Employed learner-centered teaching methods;
- Offered courses that reflect current theory, practice, and empirical research on teaching effectiveness, and integrate research from the discipline;
- Maintained a consistent demand for his or her course offerings;
- Updated existing courses, developed new courses, contributed to the development of curricula, and demonstrated innovation in teaching;
- Met or exceeded departmental expectations for teaching and service;
- Received strong annual performance reviews.

A candidate is also expected to have made significant service contributions to the School, University, and/or profession. Long lists of assignments do not demonstrate service contribution without evidence of effort, performance, and impact. Evidence that the candidate has attempted to acquire grants for course or curriculum development is considered a positive contribution, even if the application was unsuccessful.

#### *Criteria for Promotion to (full) Professor*

In addition to satisfying the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, in the time since the last promotion a candidate for promotion to Professor should have:

- Served as a mentor and enhanced the teaching skills of colleagues;
- Developed a capability to teach a wide range of courses;
- Assumed leadership roles in the School or University. Full professors should demonstrate the ability and willingness to provide leadership service.

#### *Process and Calendar*

A promotion calendar is established by the Vice Dean at the beginning of the academic year and communicated to the Chairs. Appendix A contains a sample calendar. Prospective candidates should meet with the Department Chair in the summer to discuss the promotion process. During the summer, the candidate prepares material for a dossier that includes a personal statement of not more

---

than five pages, curriculum vitae, all annual performance review scores, sample of course materials, student ratings for all courses taught, evidence of service contributions, and (where relevant) a sample of published research. See Appendix B for more on dossiers.

During the summer, the Chair appoints a Peer Evaluation Group (PEG) in consultation with the Vice Dean. The PEG is comprised of two professors from the candidate's Department and one member from another Department, all of whom hold a rank higher than the candidate.

The PEG solicits letters from outside reviewers on the candidate's service contribution. The reviewers may include current or former Department Chairs, deans, program directors, or committee chairs, but should not include members of the candidate's Department. The candidate may identify potential reviewers that he or she believes would be inappropriate. The letters are confidential, and the identity of the reviewers and contents of the letter should not be revealed to the candidate. The PEG adds the letters to the dossier. No less than two substantive letters should be included in the dossier.

The PEG also adds a report from in-class observation of the faculty member's teaching, and arranges for preparation of such a report if necessary. See Appendix B for a template.

In the fall, the PEG reviews the dossier and prepares a report. The PEG report should contain a detailed evaluation of the candidate's record of teaching, service, and (where appropriate) research, and a recommendation on promotion. The PEG report should present a balanced analysis of the case, identifying both the strengths and weaknesses. The most useful report is organized around the stated criteria for promotion.

After a draft of the PEG report is prepared, the Department's faculty (tenured and clinical) meet to discuss the report and the promotion case. Only faculty members with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor may participate. Each participating faculty member is expected to review the dossier and PEG report before the meeting. After the meeting, the Chair takes a vote for or against promotion using a secret ballot. Faculty members who do not attend the meeting (or join by conference call) are discouraged from voting. The PEG report may be revised in light of the Department discussion, and is then added to the dossier.

After the Department meeting, the Chair prepares a memo for the Vice Dean summarizing the Department's discussion and reporting the outcome of the vote. If the Chair disagrees with the consensus view of the Department, this should be

noted and explained. The Chair's memo is added to the dossier and forwarded to the Vice Dean. Any faculty member who wishes to add information may submit a letter to the Chair or Vice Dean that becomes part of the dossier.

The dossier is then reviewed by a subcommittee of the Committee on Clinical Faculty comprised of members with a rank higher than the candidate, and additional members that the Vice Dean may appoint on an ad hoc basis (typically the subcommittee would have five members). The purpose of the subcommittee, called the "Promotion Committee," is to advise the Dean whether the candidate has met the promotion criteria, and ensure that promotion standards are consistent across the School. The Promotion Committee meets to discuss the case, may meet with the PEG chair and Department Chair, and votes for or against promotion. Committee members from the candidate's Department should not vote in the Promotion Committee or participate in its review of the case.

The Promotion Committee prepares a memo for the Vice Dean identifying the strongest and weakest elements of the case and recording the Committee's vote. The Committee's report should not restate material in the PEG report, but simply note concurrence where appropriate. If there are differences of opinion within the Committee, that fact should be noted, and the points of contention explained. If the Promotion Committee recommends against promotion, its letter should include an itemized list of the primary reasons against the promotion. If the Dean declines to promote the candidate, the substance of the list is verbally conveyed to the candidate by the Vice Dean. Because understanding the reasons for an unsuccessful case is important for a candidate's future development, the Committee should consider carefully this section of its memo. The Promotion Committee's memo is added to the dossier.

The Dean reviews the dossier, and decides whether or not to promote the candidate. The Vice Dean conveys the decision to the Chair, who conveys it to the candidate. If the individual believes the decision is flawed because of procedural errors, he or she may prepare an appeal letter to the Vice Dean.

### *Confidentiality*

The PEG report, Chair's memo, Promotion Committee's memo, votes in the Department and Promotion Committee, and discussions in Department and Promotion Committee meetings are confidential. None of the dossier materials, votes, or contents of meetings may be conveyed to or discussed with the candidate or other individuals within or outside the School, except those involved in the decision process.

### 3.4 Reappointment and Nonrenewal

Clinical faculty appointments generally expire on May 15, unless a different date is specified in the appointment or reappointment letter. The USC Faculty Handbook (Section 4-G) states that the "University has no obligation to renew a non-tenure track appointment" and nonrenewal does not require advance notice of nonrenewal.

Except when the Dean decides otherwise, Assistant Professors have a one-year appointment that is renewable on an annual basis, typically Associate Professors have a two-year appointment renewable on an annual basis, and typically (full) Professors have a three-year appointment renewable on an annual basis.

The Department Chair may recommend to the Vice Dean that a clinical faculty member's contract not be renewed. If the faculty member holds the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, the Chair sends a memo to the Vice Dean stating his or her recommendation and reasons, and including supplementary material such as recent annual performance review scores when appropriate. Consideration of non-reappointment may also be initiated by other school administrators exercising responsibilities delegated by the Dean.

The Vice Dean forwards the materials to a committee for their advice, in compliance with provisions of the USC Faculty Handbook. The Committee on Clinical Faculty usually serves in that role, sometimes supplemented by ad hoc members appointed by the Dean. The Committee's purpose is to monitor the integrity of the process, and advise the Dean on the renewal decision. The Committee may advise the Vice Dean to solicit a statement from the faculty member, notifies the Dean if it has concerns about the fairness of the case, and may recommend other procedural actions. After reviewing the materials, the Committee provides the Vice Dean with a written recommendation for or against reappointment. The Committee does not produce a report, simply a recommendation on reappointment. The decision whether or not to reappoint is made by the Dean, or the Vice Dean on the Dean's behalf.

When a clinical faculty member is considered for promotion and is not promoted, the Dean may decide to not reappoint the individual without further Committee consideration.

Cases involving nonrenewal of a clinical faculty member holding the rank of Lecturer are not reviewed by Committee. The title of Lecturer is given to full time faculty with the expectation that employment is for a short, fixed term and will not be renewed at the end of the term.

---

---

## 4 Workload Profiles

Each faculty member has a workload profile that apportions his or her effort during the year across teaching, research, and service. The workload profile is expressed as a nine-point allocation in which each point assigned to a category implies that approximately one-ninth of the faculty member's time will be engaged in that activity. Workload profiles allow faculty members to understand their responsibilities and how their performance will be evaluated, and align individual activities with the School's missions. Workload profiles for a given year normally are prepared in the spring of the preceding year, and codified in a Workload Profile Form that is approved in writing by the Vice Dean, and which the faculty member and Department Chair sign.

Workload profiles are sometimes stated in an abbreviated form, such as 6-0-3, which means 6 points of teaching, 0 points of research, and 3 points of service. The nine-point system offers faculty flexibility to design workloads that match their efforts to the School's mission, and allows for change over time as careers evolve. Each point of teaching generally represents one class, although some classes count for less than one point.

### 4.1 Standard Profiles for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the School's mission through teaching, research, and service. The default profile for tenured and tenure-track faculty is:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Teaching</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Research</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Service</b>	<b>1</b>

---



Exceptional researchers may have more weight on research and less weight on teaching. A common profile for research-active tenured and tenure-track faculty members is:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Teaching</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Research</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Service</b>	<b>1</b>

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members who reduce their research activity may have greater weight on teaching. One appropriate profile for tenured faculty members with reduced research intensity is:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Teaching</b>	<b>5-6</b>
<b>Research</b>	<b>0-2</b>
<b>Service</b>	<b>1</b>

For the purposes of assigning workload profiles, research means the creation of new knowledge resulting in scholarly articles published in refereed journals or scholarly books published by academic presses. Production of cases, textbooks, and so forth are valuable, but are included as "service" rather than "research" for the purposes of determining workload profiles.

A faculty member with a 4-4-1 profile should be actively engaged in research, and is exhibit a pattern of regular publication in high quality refereed journals. The faculty member should also exhibit significant activity refereeing for high quality journals and supervising doctoral students. Norms vary by field, but as a rule of thumb, "regular publication" means a minimum of one article per year, with at least one article in a high quality journal every two to three years. "High quality" journals include the leading journals in the profession as well as leading specialist journals. Faculty members whose publication patterns are near the minimum are expected to publish practitioner books or other scholarly work.

A faculty member with a 3-5-1 profile (less teaching and more research than a 4-4-1 profile) should be actively engaged in publishing in the *very best* journals and producing a continual flow of work directed to those outlets. Norms vary by field, but as a rule of thumb a “continual flow” is a minimum of one article in a peer-reviewed journal each year, with at least one article in a top journal every two to three years. The “top” journals include the leading three to five journals in the profession. A faculty member with a 3-5-1 profile is also expected to exhibit significant editing or reviewing for the very best journals, and spend significant time supervising doctoral students.

A key difference between profiles is that a faculty member with 3-5-1 would be regularly publishing in the profession’s flagship journals, while a faculty member with a 4-4-1 profile would be publishing less often in the flagship journals, but still publishing regularly in high quality area journals.

In some fields, scholarly books are a highly regarded alternative to publication in refereed journals. As with journals, each field has a ranking of academic presses. Textbooks and books published by popular presses are counted under the service category for the purposes of determining workloads.

Failure to publish in any given year is not necessarily a reason for adjusting a faculty member’s workload profile because an active researcher may have gaps in his or her record due to idiosyncratic issues associated with the editorial and publication process. In practice, workload decisions are usually made by examining activity over a three-to-five-year window. A pattern of low publication over time or of publishing in lower tier journals suggests the faculty member is reducing emphasis on research and may precipitate a change in workload profile.

Workload profiles may also take into account market conditions and standards within the field. Some faculty members may have contractually stipulated profiles at variance with these guidelines in order to meet market conditions. Such faculty are expected to maintain a level of productivity appropriate to their profiles.

These guidelines are meant to suggest the amount of scholarly output typically expected for purposes of determining the workload profile. For concreteness, some of the criteria are stated in terms of quantitative metrics. *It is important to keep in mind that these metrics in themselves do not indicate scholarly productivity. When evaluating an individual’s research performance for annual performance reviews, promotion cases, and so on, what matters most is the quality, contribution, and impact of the work, which may or may not be correlated with publication metrics.*

---

## 4.2 Standard Profile for Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members are expected to contribute to the School's mission through teaching and service, and in some cases, through research. The default profile for clinical faculty is:

Activity	Points
Teaching	6
Research	0
Service	3

Some clinical faculty members engaged in research may have 1-3 points apportioned to that category, if approved by the Chair and Vice Dean. The workload profile in such cases would be:

Activity	Points
Teaching	5-6
Research	1-2
Service	1-3

In most cases where clinical faculty members have points assigned to research, service expectations are reduced commensurately, but in rare instances teaching points may be reduced. For the purpose of assigning workload profiles and assessing performance, research is defined the same for clinical faculty as for tenured and tenure-track faculty: research means the creation of new knowledge resulting in scholarly articles published in refereed journals or scholarly books published by academic presses. Production of cases and textbooks are valuable, but are included as "service" for the purposes of determining workload profiles.

## 4.3 Expectations for Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the School and faculty members are expected to devote their energies to excellence and creativity in teaching.

“Teaching includes classroom and other instruction of undergraduate, graduate, and professional and post-graduate students, academic advising, preparation, . . . , and the direction of research. Faculty are expected to meet their classes, be accessible to their students through regularly scheduled and sufficient office hours, and provide grading of student work in a timely fashion. Each class is to be provided with a syllabus outlining goals, the course schedule, reading, requirements for research papers, a timetable for examinations, the method and criteria for grading, and the means by which students can contact the faculty member outside the classroom. . . . Faculty are expected to teach courses that have been assigned to them by the department chair, after consultation with department faculty, on the basis of departmental or school needs.” (USC Faculty Handbook, Section 3-B(2))

Because effective teaching involves more than classroom instruction, faculty members are expected to engage in teaching-related activities such as developing new or restructured courses, coordinating multiple-section courses, advising and mentoring students, coordinating student projects, directing independent studies, and advising honors theses. Development of new courses and updating existing courses is considered a routine responsibility associated with teaching and does not warrant special treatment in the workload profile, but should be recognized and rewarded through the annual performance review process.

Supervision of doctoral dissertations is another important teaching activity for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Workload profile points usually are not assigned to supervision of dissertations, but such activities are part of tenured and tenure-track faculty members’ workloads, and are considered in the annual review process. Some clinical faculty members also work with doctoral students.

#### **4.4 Expectations for Research**

Research is the production of scholarly articles and books. Publication of high quality articles in top refereed journals and publication of scholarly books by top academic presses is central to the mission of the School. Each Department is expected to maintain a list of journals that are considered top tier in their fields. Publication of text books, cases, and practitioner materials is considered as service contribution.

In addition to publication of scholarly research, other research-related activities are important and should be recognized as part of a faculty member’s workload

---

where appropriate. These might include obtaining external funds for research, publishing research-based exposition in practitioner journal and books, and publishing non-refereed articles in scholarly journals and as chapters in books.

#### **4.5 Expectations for Service**

Service supports the mission of the School and faculty members are expected to devote significant energies in this area, especially clinical faculty members. Service performance involves both effort and impact. In terms of effort, faculty members are expected to invest an amount of time in service commensurate with their workload profile. In terms of impact, faculty members are expected to choose activities that materially contribute to the mission of the School.

Service that is routine and expected of all faculty members includes maintaining a consistent presence on campus; participating in meetings and seminars; being accessible to colleagues; attending Commencement activities; acting as a resource or reference for current or former students as they apply for internships, jobs, or other academic and post-graduate programs; and advising students.

In addition to routine service, clinical faculty members and tenured faculty members are expected to engage in one or more non-routine service activities. These activities may involve service to academic programs, the School, the University, or professional organizations. To guide faculty members in planning their service activities, below is a sample of service activities valued by Marshall, grouped in terms of approximate impact.

- Highest Impact
  - Leading or participating in an important School or University committee.
  - Directing a School center;
  - Mentoring junior faculty;
  - Chairing an important Departmental committee, such as faculty recruiting;
  - Serving on an Annual Performance Review committee;
  - Planning and developing major curriculum changes;
  - Delivering keynote or major addresses at professional conferences;
  - Mentoring Marshall Ph.D. students in developing their teaching skills, preparing conference presentations, or revising a journal article;
  - Serving as a keynote speaker, coordinating, or playing a key role in support of student recruiting;
  - Publishing opinion pieces and other articles in major media outlets;

- 
- Serving as editor of a profession’s flagship journal;
  - Serving as an executive officer of a leading professional organization;
  - Organizing a scholarly conference.
- Very Good Impact
    - Coordinating co-curricular academic programs, multiple-section courses, or team-taught courses;
    - Publishing opinion pieces and other articles in secondary media outlets;
    - Serving as a judge for conferences or research symposiums;
    - Serving as primary advisor to a student club or organization;
    - Coordinating external speakers for programs and events;
    - Coordinating external engagements or projects for students;
    - Conducting School or University workshops or leading an educational roundtable;
    - Serving as a reviewer, referee, or editor for conferences;
    - Publishing textbooks, cases, and practitioner material;
    - Serving as editor of a high-quality journal or assistant editor of flagship journal;
    - Serving as a board member of a leading professional organization;
    - Serving as a discussant at a high quality scholarly conference;
    - Providing expert commentary to major media outlets;
    - Actively participating in faculty recruiting (reading papers, interviewing candidates, meeting candidates during campus visits and for meals);
    - Actively serving on Marshall committees;
    - Actively serving on the Faculty Council or the Academic Senate;
    - Actively serving on University committees.
  - Good Impact
    - Participating in departmental planning task forces and seminars;
    - Attending special events, awards ceremonies, or student presentations;
    - Attending and participating in professional conferences;
    - Attending School or University recruiting events;
    - Supporting admissions (e.g. scholarship interviewing);
    - Serving as a judge for student case competitions or presentations;
    - Attending student-sponsored events;
    - Supporting student clubs and organizations;
    - Advising, mentoring, and coaching students;
-

- Serving as a referee for high quality academic journals;
- Serving as a session chair at a high quality scholarly conference;
- Building connections to practitioner community.

These impact groupings are only rough guidelines. The level of participation and overall impact of particular activities depend on individual effort and abilities. While the School values time invested, impact and evidence of an actual contribution is more important. This is not a complete list of service opportunities, and faculty members may identify service contributions not listed here. Faculty members should consult with their Chair if they have questions about whether a particular opportunity is a valuable contribution.

While the School and University recognize and value community service, such as work with civic, charitable, political, and religious organizations, such service is not usually considered a part of the workload profile unless the work has a direct link to the teaching or research mission of the School or University.

Expected service contributions vary with rank. In most cases, junior faculty members are expected only to engage in lower impact activities early in their careers. Senior faculty members are expected to focus on higher-impact activities and to take on significant leadership roles.

#### **4.6 Teaching Schedules**

It is customary for Chairs to consult with faculty regarding teaching assignments and course schedules, including the particular classes, semester, time of day, and so on. *However, it should be recognized that teaching assignments are determined by the Chair, not the faculty member, in order to meet programmatic needs.* The baseline expectation is that faculty will teach both Fall and Spring semesters of the year, with classes distributed across the two semesters. The School seeks to design teaching schedules based on faculty requests to accommodate family needs, medical needs, research programs, and other good faith needs. For example, some research faculty members with 3-5-1 profiles prefer to teach all of their classes in the same semester, and the School may accommodate such requests.

---

## 5 Annual Performance Review

The Annual Performance Review (APR) has two main purposes: (1) to provide information to the Dean that is relevant for salary adjustments and merit pay, and (2) to provide feedback to faculty on their performance and future direction. The review process is governed by the Provost's *Policy on Evaluation of Department Chairs and Faculty* (August 17, 2000), unless superseded by a more recent policy posted at [www.usc.edu/policies](http://www.usc.edu/policies).

Performance in an academic environment is inherently a multiyear concept. Papers and books can take several years from initiation to publication, and there is a lag between preparation of a new course and concrete feedback on its performance. *It is therefore important that the Annual Performance Review does not focus exclusively on the current year's performance; it must also take into account the faculty member's overall achievements and be forward-looking.* In a general sense, the review process should be thought of as an *annual review of performance* not a *review of annual performance*.

### 5.1 Materials Supplied by Faculty

Each faculty member submits (i) a report of his or her activity during the previous calendar year (APR Report), (ii) curriculum vitae, and (iii) supplementary teaching materials. Instructions for completing the APR report, descriptions of supplementary materials requested, and deadlines are distributed by the Vice Dean early in the calendar year, with final submissions typically due in early February. The APR report itself is completed using the online Digital Measures system that faculty can update at any point during the year. *It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to fully document his or her performance when submitting the APR Report.*

### 5.2 Departmental Evaluation

Each Department evaluates the materials submitted by its faculty, and for internal purposes assigns a separate score for teaching, research (where appropriate), and

---



---

service. The scores may be an absolute number or a ranking. The Department scores are one factor considered in assigning final APR scores.

### *APR Committee*

The Department Chair appoints an APR Committee for peer evaluation consisting of faculty who are productive scholars and fine teachers, preferably tenured. In research departments, since part of the Committee's job is to evaluate research and provide advice on research, the members should be able to read the work under review. In most cases, junior faculty members would not be appropriate members of the APR Committee. Clinical faculty may be members for the purposes of evaluating other clinical faculty. A senior member of the faculty chairs the Committee. The Department Chair is not a member of the committee.

The APR Committee examines the materials submitted by each faculty member in light of the guidelines in this Manual in order to produce a peer assessment of each person's teaching, research, and service performance. The APR Committee members should arrive at their assessments through a process of discussion; they are expected to meet at least once to discuss their evaluations and when assessments differ, should try to understand the reason for the disagreement and attempt to achieve a consensus view. The Department Chair should not participate in the process that results in the Committee's initial recommendations.

The APR Committee produces a memo summarizing its assessments that is submitted to the Chair. The memo should contain the following information:

#### A. Procedures

- A description of the Committee's procedures, including when the Committee met to discuss the evaluations and the process by which the Committee arrived at its consensus view.
- For teaching, a brief description of the steps taken to ensure that no more than half of the teaching score was based on student ratings.
- For research, a description of what formulas, if any, were used to evaluate research, and a statement of how publications were adjusted for coauthorship.
- Description of how the Committee members evaluated each other.

#### B. Individual faculty

- For each faculty member, a numerical score for teaching, research (where appropriate), and service, as well as an overall score.
-

- 
- For each faculty member, a one-paragraph narrative describing the basis for the evaluation, and offering suggestions for improvement.
  - If Committee members differ in their assessment of any individual, the reason for the disagreement should be indicated. In most cases, committee members should be able to achieve a consensus view.

#### C. Identification of special cases

- Identification of faculty whose work meets the highest aspirations of the Department, in both qualitative and quantitative terms. For example, work that meets the highest aspirations might mean publication in the top journals at a rate that would be outstanding for departments outside USC that rank in the top 5 to top 10 internationally.
- The APR Committee should review each person's contributions over the last five years in light of his or her workload profile and this Manual's workload profile guidelines, and recommend workload profile changes where appropriate.
- Identification of faculty members whose performance is not meeting minimum expectations.

Scores should take into account the workload profile. A faculty member with 5 points assigned to research should have published more than a faculty member with 3 points assigned to research in order to receive the same score as the 3-point faculty member. Similarly, the final score for a faculty member with a heavy weight on teaching should depend significantly on teaching performance. *Final scores should not be constructed as a weighted average of separate teaching, research, and service scores, with weights equal to workload profile points, unless the workload weights have been used to determine the separate scores.*

#### *Role of the Department Chair*

The Department Chair reviews the APR Committee's memo and prepares his or her own assessments. The Chair's assessments may differ from the APR Committee for a variety of reasons, for example, because the Chair has information unavailable to the APR Committee, such as a faculty member's service effort and leadership contributions. If the Chair's assessment differs from the APR Committee's assessment, the Chair should discuss the disagreement with the Committee to see if a consensus emerges. This may result in a revision of the APR Committee's memo. In any case, the Chair forwards the APR Committee's memo together with a letter explaining his or her own assessments to the Vice Dean. The Chair's letter should provide an explanation when his or her assessments differ from those of the APR Committee.

---

### 5.3 Assignment of Final Scores

Final APR scores are assigned by the Dean, based on information generated at the Department and School level, and are reported to the University. Final scores are assigned by adjusting the initial scores produced by the departments so as to promote consistency across units, ensure fidelity with School guidelines, and incorporate information that may not have been available to department APR committees (such as service contributions at the School level). Each faculty member is assigned to one of nine performance categories: (5.0) meets highest aspirations, (4.0) very good, (3.0) meritorious/meets expectations, (2.0) below expectations, and (1.0) significantly below expectations; the intermediate scores 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, and 4.5 are also used.

The performance category 5.0, "meets highest aspiration," is reserved for work meeting the highest aspirations of the School. It is possible that in some years, no person may have performed in a way that meets the highest aspirations.

The performance category 3.0 is a baseline indicating that a person met the minimum (high) expectations for a Marshall faculty member. To achieve this, a faculty member should have met expectations in *all* activities: teaching, research, and service. A faculty member who failed to meet expectations in one activity (e.g. service) will not merit a score of 3.0 or higher even if his or her performance in another category (e.g. teaching or research) is exceptional.

Performance categories 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5 indicate the faculty member is not meeting expectations and his or her performance is unsatisfactory. A faculty member falling in these categories should meet with the Chair to formulate a development plan. Four consecutive evaluations in these categories suggests neglect of duty or incompetence, constituting grounds for dismissal for cause.

Aside from the reserved category 5.0, faculty performance scores that meet expectations are expected to be distributed across the remaining categories (3.0, 3.5, 4.0, 4.5). No more than half of a Department's members may be assigned to any single category, and typically no more than one third would be assigned to any number.

### 5.4 Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching

Student ratings are useful for evaluating some aspects of teaching performance, but on their own do not provide an adequate assessment of teaching effectiveness. As a rule of thumb, no more than half of an individual faculty

member's teaching assessment should be based on student ratings. Teaching assessment should consider the content of courses, based on syllabi and other course materials. Among the things to be encouraged: course innovation and rigor, relevance and applications to the real world, connections to other elements of the Marshall curriculum, course material that relates to strategic objectives, and attempts to bring cutting edge research into the classroom. The University values in-class assessment of teaching effectiveness by colleagues and the Chair or individual faculty members are encouraged to arrange such observations.

Teaching assessment should not mechanically give less weight to classes with relatively low enrollment if low enrollment is inherent to the class, such as a narrow elective or a Ph.D. class. Enrollment may be taken into account if it appears to have resulted from student satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the class.

Teaching also includes instruction outside the classroom such as serving on dissertation committees, advising undergraduates, and other form of mentoring. These activities can be time intensive and should be weighted appropriately.

Finally, teaching involves a set of professional behaviors that include treating faculty, staff, and students with dignity, courtesy, and respect; maintaining a presence on campus; contributing to the intellectual life and development of the department; behaving with integrity; adhering to policies, guidelines, and deadlines (e.g. submitting midterm evaluations when required, adhering to School grade targets, submitting final grades by University deadlines); being helpful, flexible, reliable, and willing to contribute to the school's teaching mission.

## **5.5 Guidelines for Evaluating Research**

Research assessment should consider both quality and quantity of scholarly work. Quantitative information should play a role in evaluating research, but should not be the sole basis for evaluation. In particular, assessments should not simply count publications or accepted papers. Qualitative evaluation is necessary, and reviewers should read a sample of recent research in order to assess its quality. For books, published reviews should be considered. Research prizes and awards should be taken into account. In most cases assessments of research productivity should be based on published and forthcoming work. However, assessments may include work in progress and working papers, especially for junior faculty with a short track record.

It is important to adopt a multiyear perspective when evaluating research productivity. Assessments that focus exclusively on the current year may

---

discourage faculty from undertaking projects with a long gestation period that are risky, in favor of small, safe projects that show a concrete achievement in each year. Projects with the largest potential upsides may take more than a year to move forward and entail significant risk.

As a rule of thumb, Marshall practice is to assess research productivity over the last three years. Each field has its own norms for the number and quality of publications that would constitute good, very good, and exceptional performance, but historically faculty members assigned to the 5.0 category have averaged at least one publication in a premier journal per year, with more than that expected if the work has many coauthors.

Coauthorship is increasingly common in many fields where Marshall faculty conduct research, and collaboration between scholars can lead to higher quality work. In most cases, research conducted by a Marshall faculty member as a single author or with a small number of coauthors contributes more to the School's reputation than work where the faculty member is part of a large team. Accordingly, assessment of research performance should take into account the degree of coauthorship, with "credit" for a given publication adjusted by the number of coauthors.

## **5.6 Guidelines for Evaluating Service**

Service is activities within the University and with professional and scholarly organizations that advance the mission of the University. The discussion of service expectations in Section 4.5 of this Manual provides a detailed discussion of specific service contributions. Service to the community and other non-University organizations (other than professional societies) is not generally considered part of a faculty member's service obligations. Such activities should be considered by reviewers only when the activities further the educational or research mission of the School. As discussed under Workload Profiles, service expectations vary with rank. Junior faculty are expected to contribute less service than senior faculty, so they can focus on their teaching and research.

Compensated activities are considered service for the purposes of the annual performance review only if they are explicitly incorporated into the normal workload profile. For example, service as Department Chair or director of a center is considered service and should be incorporated into the workload profile. Activities that are compensated on an overload basis, such as coaching a case competition, are not considered service for the purposes of the annual performance review. Likewise, externally compensated activities such as

consulting are not considered service.

As with all parts of the review process, performance should be evaluated using both quantitative and qualitative measures where possible. Thus, the number of committees, editorial boards, and so on, is relevant for evaluation, but information on effort is more important, and demonstrated accomplishment is most important. For example, membership in a committee is worth mentioning even if the faculty member's participation is limited to attending a monthly meeting, but the contribution is significant only if the faculty member takes an active role in the committee's business. As another example, a faculty member's contribution from serving on a journal's editorial board depends on his or her degree of involvement in the journal's editorial functions. If membership is primarily recognition of past accomplishment and its service contribution would be minimal.

To facilitate identification of service effort, APR Reports should indicate *membership* on committees, editorial boards, and so on, and also describe the *activities performed and accomplishments*. Faculty should also report the approximate number of hours spent on each service activity.

A faculty member's service contribution also depends on his or her professionalism and collegiality. Service includes treating faculty, staff, and students with dignity, courtesy, and respect; maintaining a presence on campus and contributing to the intellectual life and development of the department; behaving with integrity; being helpful, flexible, reliable, and willing to contribute to the school's missions.

## **5.7 Feedback and Appeals**

Once final APR scores are determined, the Chair communicates the outcome to the faculty. This may involve meeting with faculty members, but should include a written letter. For junior faculty members, the school recommends a face to face meeting. Since one purpose of the review is to provide guidance to the individual faculty member, it may be helpful to convey some of the underlying raw data to the faculty member. If the scores produced by the Department APR Committee are communicated, it should be noted that those scores are only one factor involved in assigning final scores.

The Chair's letter should provide information that enables the individual to see his or her performance in the context of the Department. For example, the individual could be told his or her ranking in the Department, or a distribution of scores could be provided. In cases where a faculty member is rated well above or below the department median, the Chair should provide an explanation.

---

To appeal an evaluation, a faculty member must submit a written request to the Chair within one week of receiving the Chair's letter. The request should state the basis for the appeal. The Chair forwards the faculty member's written appeal together with his or her own memo and recommendation to the Vice Dean, and the Dean decides what action to take, if any. The Vice Dean conveys the decision to the Chair, who conveys it to the faculty member.

## **5.8 Review of Department Chairs**

The Vice Dean may ask the APR Committee to prepare review the performance of the Chair. The review should consider the Chair's teaching and research accomplishments to the extent indicated in the workload profile, but its main task is to assess the Chair's performance as chair. The Chair may be invited to provide a self-evaluation. The APR Committee should invite all Department faculty members to provide an assessment of the Chair's performance, with specific examples that led to the assessment, notable accomplishments, and suggestions for improvement. The Committee summarizes responses, preserving anonymity when requested.

The Committee's memo should summarize faculty assessments, and provide its own assessment of the Chair's effectiveness in:

- Providing leadership in improving the Department's stature;
- Recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty members;
- Creating an environment that encourages scholarly activity and instructional innovation and effectiveness;
- Encouraging a climate of mentoring;
- Informing, seeking advice from, and encouraging the involvement of the Department's faculty in matters pertaining to the Department and School;
- Fairly and effectively managing Departmental staff;
- Managing the Department's budget including the fair and appropriate allocation of faculty STARS accounts and other resources;
- Safeguarding academic freedom.

## 5.9 Salary Adjustments

Salaries are adjusted each year, subject to budget constraints, to reward faculty based on performance and standing in the profession, create incentives, respond to prevailing market conditions, and maintain equity. The Provost determines salaries for all faculty, based on a proposal from the Dean.

The salary adjustment process varies in detail from year-to-year. Typically, once APR scores are finalized, each Department Chair is given a merit budget based on the APR scores of the Department's faculty. Each Chair then develops salary proposals by allocating the merit pool to faculty members based in part on APR scores. Because Chairs see more detailed information than the numerical APR score, they may make distinctions between faculty with a given score.

After allocating the merit pool, each Chair proposes market adjustments where appropriate. This is a particularly important part of the process. The University's guidelines state that "what is of primary importance is not the percent annual raise, but the total university salary. Deans have the responsibility to do an overall review of relative salary levels, not just the amount of raises." To determine market adjustments, each Chair is provided with benchmark information, such as survey data from the top 20 business schools.

Market adjustments are proposed with the goal of paying each faculty member an amount commensurate with his or her accomplishments and standing in light of prevailing market conditions. The School also seeks to maintain an ordering of salaries so that pay increases with rank for productive faculty, and to avoid salary inversion. A faculty member's standing in the profession may have increased significantly, causing his or her salary to lag what he or she could receive from peer institutions. The Provost's guidelines state, "There may be professors who, for historical reasons, are paid substantially below their value, and substantially below what comparable individuals earn at peer institutions. We should not wait for rival universities to discover the situation and offer to cure it."

Each Chair's salary proposals are forwarded to the Vice Dean and discussed by the Chair, Vice Dean, and Dean. The Dean makes final salary proposals, adjusting the Chair's recommendations at his discretion. The Dean's recommendations are then sent to the Provost, who makes the final decision on salaries.



---

## 6 Teaching

### 6.1 General Principles

Teaching is central to the University's mission, and takes a variety of forms including classroom instruction, supervision of projects and dissertations, and participation in executive education programs.

- USC policies. All faculty members are expected to read and be familiar with University policies on instruction, as described in the Course Catalog, SCampus, and other documents. Faculty should pay special attention to University guidelines concerning final exams and academic integrity. Faculty should also be familiar and comply with Marshall guidelines, including School grading guidelines.
  - Classroom instruction. Faculty members are expected to be in attendance and prepared for scheduled classes. In rare circumstances, scheduling conflicts within the School, professional responsibilities external to the School, or personal emergencies may necessitate an absence from class. In such circumstances faculty members should make suitable arrangements to ensure that instruction does not suffer. Given that USC is the primary employer of full-time faculty members, conflicts arising out of external employment opportunities are unacceptable unless approved in advance by the Vice Dean. *Faculty members who miss or expect to miss more than a single class should obtain approval from their Department Chair.* Substitute instructors should be approved by the Chair.
  - Non-USC personnel. Only persons with a USC faculty appointment or an authorized USC graduate student may teach classes, whether for pay or on a voluntary basis, unless permission is requested in writing by the Department Chair and approved by the Vice Dean. In order for a person who is not an employee or student at USC to assume teaching responsibilities on an unpaid basis, he or she should be appointed by the Dean as a voluntary faculty member. This rule does not apply to guest lecturers who speak to students when the instructor of record is present.
  - Teaching materials. Faculty members are encouraged to prepare textbooks,
-

lecture notes, and other pedagogical materials. Students may be required to purchase those materials, but only if they are important for the course of instruction, the price does not exceed the usual cost of such materials, and they are sold through the USC Bookstore or through the School. Faculty members are prohibited from selling materials directly to students. Students should not be asked to purchase books or other materials that are not germane to the course of instruction in which they are enrolled.

- Student privacy. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), also known as the Buckley Amendment, is federal legislation that governs the privacy of student records. It requires the University to keep student records private, with certain exceptions, and gives students the right to inspect records about themselves that are maintained by the University. If a faculty member is considering disclosing private student information (such as a grade) he or she should check with the University Registrar to make sure that FERPA will not be violated.

## 6.2 Overload Teaching

Full-time faculty members are expected to devote 100 percent of their work effort to teaching, research, and service, as indicated in their workload profiles. If a faculty member is asked to teach an additional class (that is, beyond the amount he or she normally teaches), the workload profile is adjusted to increase the points on teaching and decrease the points on research or service, to reflect the new apportionment of effort. Such an adjustment in the workload profile does not receive additional compensation because the faculty member is expected to maintain the same level of effort and contribution as before.

In exceptional circumstances, the School may request and a faculty member may agree to teach a class on an "overload" basis for *additional* compensation. When a class is taught on an overload basis, the understanding is that the faculty member is continuing to provide 100 percent effort on teaching, research, and service, as indicated in the workload profile, and that the time and effort invested in the overload class is *in addition to* the regular workload. Faculty members who teach on an overload basis may not reduce their teaching, research, or service effort indicated on the workload profile in order to perform the overload teaching.

It is difficult in practice to determine whether a faculty member teaching on an overload basis is putting in commensurate "extra" effort, or is instead reducing regular teaching, research, service effort. Therefore, *overload teaching is generally discouraged* except when it is clear that the additional teaching does not result in

reduced research or service effort, or to meet an emergency need. For example, a faculty member whose normal teaching assignment does not involve teaching, research, or service on the weekend, may teach a weekend class on an overload basis. Whether an overload teaching assignment is appropriate depends on the specifics of the situation, but several principles should be kept in mind:

- Overload teaching should be a last resort. To the extent possible, classes should be taught by faculty members as part of their regular workload profile. If a Chair determines that a Department temporarily lacks sufficient faculty to cover critical courses, the Chair and Vice Dean should seek to hire faculty on a short-term basis.
- The main acceptable reason for overload teaching assignments is in response to an emergency teaching need that cannot be addressed in other ways. Another acceptable reason for an overload teaching assignment is summer teaching for faculty with nine-month appointments.
- Faculty who receive summer research funding should not teach in the summer.
- Tenured and tenure-track faculty with reduced teaching loads associated with significant research programs (a workload profile of 3-5-1) should not teach on an overload basis at any time during the year. A 3-5-1 workload profile is designed to allow time for research, and additional teaching would be contrary to the spirit of the profile. Faculty who wish to teach more than three courses with a commensurate reduction in research effort should seek an appropriate workload profile, such as 4-4-1.
- Full-time faculty members should not teach more than one class on an overload basis in any Fall or Spring semester, and should not teach more than two classes on an overload basis in any Summer semester.

These guidelines apply to course instruction in the School's degree-granting programs. The principles may be different for non-teaching overload activities or for teaching in (non-degree) executive education programs.

Overload payments, like all compensation, must be approved in advance by the Provost. The School also requires overload payments to be approved in advance by the Department Chair and the Vice Dean. *Faculty members who perform work prior to approval of an overload payment accept the possibility that the overload payment will not be approved, and that the work will count as part of the teaching component of the full-time workload profile and not be otherwise compensated.*

---

### 6.3 Executive Education

Several Marshall units are engaged in executive education, including the Office of Executive Education, Center for Effective Organization, Center for Global Branding, Food Industry Management Program, Institute for Communication Technology Management, and Sports Business Institute. These programs generally offer short courses and do not grant degrees. In most cases, faculty teach in these programs on an overload basis. As with any overload activities, when a class is taught on an overload basis, the understanding is that the faculty is continuing to provide 100 percent effort on teaching, research, and service, as indicated in the workload profile, and that the time and effort invested in the overload class is in addition to the regular workload. Faculty members who wish to devote significant time in executive education should seek to have that incorporated into their workload profiles. General principles regarding executive education:

- Overload teaching is generally accepted as a way to staff executive education courses. However, faculty members should ensure that their executive education activities do not impinge on their other teaching, research, and service responsibilities.
- Executive education teaching assignments and overload compensation must be approved by the Chair, Vice Dean, and Provost in advance.
- Probationary faculty (Assistant Professors on the tenure track) should not teach in executive education programs.

At the conclusion of each semester, each unit that offers executive education classes should submit a report to the Vice Dean listing all faculty members who have participated or will be participating in their programs, the number of presentations (or other relevant work), the amount of time involved, and the total compensation for these faculty members.

### 6.4 Teaching for Outside Institutions

Teaching and course creation for other universities and organizations is governed by the USC Faculty Handbook (Section 3-I(4)). Full time faculty members are expected to concentrate their activities on teaching, research, and service to Marshall and USC. Since time spent teaching at another institution usually reduces a faculty member's time spent on USC-related activities, outside teaching is not encouraged in most cases. Exceptions and other conditions:

- Faculty members on leave (sabbatical or unpaid) may teach at the institutions where they are in residence, subject to University restrictions and approval by the Vice Dean.
- Occasionally, a sister institution may have an emergency or special need for a faculty member to teach a course. In the spirit of helping a sister educational institution, the School may make its faculty available to teach the course on an emergency basis. Such teaching assignments are subject to restrictions described in the USC Faculty Handbook (including that the assignment should “not detract from the prestige of the University”) and require a letter from an appropriate official at the other institution explaining the special circumstances or nature of the emergency.
- Outside teaching may be appropriate if it has a significant scholarly purpose for the faculty member.
- Teaching engagements at outside universities and organizations must be approved in advance by the Vice Dean. This includes teaching in degree-granting and non-degree-granting institutions.
- Section 3-I(3) of the USC Faculty Handbook discusses conditions under which faculty may work as outside consultants. To avoid confusion, note that none of the material in that section applies to outside teaching.

The USC Faculty Handbook requires the School to inform the Provost in a timely manner of faculty teaching for outside institutions. A faculty member whose outside teaching is approved by the Dean should submit a report of outside teaching activities as part of his or her APR Report. The report should include a program brochure, description of the topic coverage of the program, description of the sponsoring organization and audience, identity and affiliation of other participating faculty, the reporting faculty member’s total hourly participation, and the percentage of the program taught by the faculty member.

---

## 7 Committees

Marshall has several School-wide standing committees. Many Departments also have standing committees. Committee appointments typically last for one year, beginning July 1 and ending June 30. Members of Marshall committees are appointed by the vice deans, and serve at their pleasure, with the exception of the Faculty Council, whose members are elected by the faculty and serve fixed terms.

In many cases, there is one member from each Department on a committee, especially when members from different Departments are expected to bring a different perspective to the issues before the committee. However, there is no requirement that each committee have one and only one person from each Department (with the exception of the Faculty Council).

### 7.1 Committee on Clinical Faculty (CCF)

The CCF advises the Dean on School guidelines, procedures, and practices related to clinical faculty. Full-time clinical, tenured, and tenure-track faculty members are eligible to serve, but typically most members hold clinical appointments. Members are appointed by the Vice Dean in consultation with Chairs. The CCF is co-chaired by the Vice Dean and a member of the committee appointed by the Vice Dean. The CCF advises on issues raised by the Vice Dean, and may add its own items to the agenda. A subcommittee of the CCF advises the Dean on promotion cases involving clinical faculty. The CCF typically consults on cases involving nonrenewal or termination of a clinical faculty member's contract.

### 7.2 Committee on Doctoral Programs (Ph.D. Committee)

The Ph.D. Committee is chaired by the Vice Dean for Graduate Programs and includes Marshall's Academic Director for Doctoral Programs and the Ph.D. directors from each Department with a doctoral program. The committee advises the Dean on standards and procedures pertaining to the doctoral programs, including admissions and curriculum.

---

---

### **7.3 Committee on Graduate Instruction**

The Committee on Graduate Instruction advises the Dean on matters pertaining to curriculum of master's programs. The Committee reviews proposals for new courses and revisions of existing courses. The Committee is chaired by the Vice Dean for Graduate Programs, usually includes one member from each Department, and various assistant deans of masters programs are ex officio members.

### **7.4 Committee on Mentoring**

The Committee on Mentoring is the primary advisory group to the Dean, Chairs, and faculty on mentoring practices and strategies. The Committee organizes mentoring workshops, evaluates nominations for School mentoring awards, and may conduct surveys to gauge the effectiveness of Marshall mentoring activities. Committee members are available to meet with individual faculty members for advice on mentoring issues. The Committee is chaired by the Vice Dean for Research and Strategy.

### **7.5 Committee on Named Chairs and Professorships**

The Committee on Named Chairs and Professorships advises the Dean on new appointments and renewals to named chairs and professorships, and School procedures pertaining to named chairs and professorships. The Committee is typically comprised of a small number of faculty (3-5), all of whom are appointed to a named chair or professorship, or have been recognized as a Distinguished Professor, University Professor, or Provost Professor. The Vice Dean is an ex officio member of the committee.

### **7.6 Committee on Promotion and Tenure (Personnel Committee)**

The Personnel Committee advises the Dean on matters concerning tenure and promotion of tenure-track faculty, fourth-year reviews, and sabbatical leaves. The Committee usually consists of one member from each tenure-granting Department, with the Vice Dean as an ex officio member. Members typically serve nonrenewable three-year terms. The Committee is chaired by one of its members, appointed by the Vice Dean.

---

### **7.7 Committee on Research and Faculty Recognition**

The Committee on Research and Faculty Recognition advises the Dean on matters pertaining to research and faculty recognition. The Committee reviews proposals and makes recommendations for summer research funding and nominates and reviews candidates for School, University, and professional awards. The Committee is chaired by the Vice Dean for Research and Strategy and usually consists of one member from each Department.

The Committee oversees the School's annual Evan C. Thompson Awards:

- Awards for Faculty Mentoring and Leadership are given for excellence in mentoring and leadership, demonstrated by mentoring of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students, and by contributions to a culture of mentoring. Evidence of excellence in mentoring and leadership may include dedication of time, energy, and resources, and service as a role model for faculty and students.
- Awards for Research Excellence are given for research that meets the highest aspirations of the School and University. Indicators of such research include publication in premier academic journals, publication by premier academic presses, and external awards and honors. The Committee typically emphasizes research published and awards received during the previous three years. Because the impact of research may take time to become apparent, the Committee also considers work produced more than three years previously, the importance of which has only recently been recognized (e.g. by an award or high citation count). Awards are based on direct examination of faculty work as well as quantitative metrics.
- Awards for Teaching and Learning Innovation are given to recognize excellent and innovative teachers. Innovation by its nature takes many forms, not all of which can be envisioned, but in the past has included development of new courses, revision of existing courses, and development of new teaching materials or methods. In assessing teaching excellence, the committee considers quantitative metrics such as student ratings, but also peer reviews and course materials.

### **7.8 Committee on Undergraduate Programs**

The Committee on Undergraduate Programs advises the Dean on matters pertaining to the Schools undergraduate programs. The Committee is co-chaired

---



by the Vice Dean and the Academic Director of Undergraduate Programs. The Committee reviews proposals for new courses, course revisions, changes in degree requirements, and other curricular changes. The Committee also advises the Vice Dean on matters pertaining to the undergraduate student experience, including admissions, advising, internships, and career services.

## **7.9 Faculty Council**

The Faculty Council is an elected body that participates in the governance of the School and the University. It is established pursuant to the Academic Senate Constitution (Articles I, II, V, Bylaw 2) and USC Faculty Handbook (Section 2-2 (C)). The Faculty Council is a voice of the faculty in decisions concerning school procedures and academic issues, and advises the Dean on revisions of this Manual. The Faculty Council is a fact-finding, deliberative, and consultative body, with authority to make studies, reports, and recommendations on all matters bearing upon the work of the faculty.

The Faculty Council consists of one member from each Department. All full-time faculty members (including tenured, tenure-track, clinical, and research professors) are eligible for membership. Each Department selects its representative according to procedures determined by the faculty of the unit. In all cases, the selection procedure must involve: (i) an opportunity for open nominations, (ii) at least two candidates for every position, (iii) and secret, written ballots. Faculty Council members serve for a term of one year commencing July 1 and ending June 30.

The Faculty Council designates two Marshall School representatives to the Academic Senate. The President of the Faculty Council shall be one member, unless he or she declines. In selecting Academic Senate representatives other than the President of the Faculty Council, there must be (i) an opportunity for open nominations, (ii) at least two candidates for every seat, and (iii) secret, written ballots. The President of the Faculty Council shall provide the names, academic titles, terms, and officers of the Faculty Council and the names of the Marshall School representatives to the Academic Senate to the office of the Academic Senate by July 1 (start of term), and shall notify the Senate of any changes in a timely manner.

---

## 8 Leaves

Much of this section is intended to direct faculty members to the relevant sections of the USC Faculty Handbook, [www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook](http://www.usc.edu/facultyhandbook). As in the rest of this Manual, the provisions of the USC Faculty Handbook govern if they differ in any way from what is stated in this Manual.

### 8.1 Family Leave

The University seeks to assist faculty in balancing their academic commitments and family life. It is in the interest of both the University and society as a whole that demands of childbearing and childrearing not discourage talented women and men from pursuing academic careers. Section 9 of the USC Faculty Handbook discusses a variety of possible accommodations for family and child care, including paid and unpaid leaves.

### 8.2 Sabbaticals

A sabbatical leave is a privilege granted by the University to faculty members in order to pursue scholarly research. A sabbatical leave may be granted to faculty members after either six years or six semesters of accrued full-time service at the University. University policy on sabbatical leaves is described in the USC Faculty Handbook (Section 3-E). Clinical faculty members are eligible for a sabbatical to conduct research only if research is a normal part of their workload profile.

Applications for sabbatical leaves are solicited early in the calendar year. In most cases, the expectation is that the leave will result in scholarly research that is publishable in a high quality academic outlet. Faculty members considering a sabbatical leave should consult with the Chair to ensure that their absence will not cause a significant disruption to academic programs. Sabbatical proposals are reviewed by Marshall's Personnel Committee that advises the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost who makes the final decision.

A leave can be (i) for a full year at half pay, or (ii) for a half year at full pay. A

---

faculty member whose normal teaching load is three courses would teach one and a half courses if a half-year leave is taken.

A faculty member on sabbatical leave should not engage in other activities for remuneration that would intrude on his or her research. Pursuit of significant business or consulting activities during a sabbatical is inconsistent with the spirit of a sabbatical leave. This constraint does not prohibit faculty members from spending their sabbatical in business or government organizations provided they receive no remuneration or, in the case of a sabbatical lasting a full year, no remuneration significantly greater than the one-half of base income that would otherwise have been paid to the faculty member by USC had the faculty member not been on leave. The faculty member must return to the university for at least one academic year after the end of the sabbatical period.

Faculty members on sabbatical leave remain eligible for STARS and summer research support, under the normal conditions. However, faculty members on a one-year leave who receive income from another source, such as another university, government organization, or business entity typically will receive a smaller STARS allocation than faculty not on leave.

### **8.3 Unpaid Leave**

The Provost may grant an unpaid leave of absence for a variety of reasons. Medical leave may be granted to faculty who are unable to work because of a serious medical condition, and such faculty may qualify for disability benefits. See USC Faculty Handbook (Section 3-E) for more information.

---

## 9 Outside Consulting, Conflicts of Interest

### 9.1 Outside Consulting

Outside consulting is addressed in the USC Faculty Handbook (Section 3-I(3)). There is a maximum cap on the amount that may be permitted: “A full-time faculty member may not consult for more than thirty-nine days during an academic year. During summer months when a faculty member is supported by either the University or government contracts and grants, a prorated limit on the permissible number of consulting days applies.” Additional principles apply:

- “Consulting work should be evaluated in terms of its worth as a scholarly experience and should in no way detract from the prestige of the University or the professional statute of the faculty member.”
- “It should always be borne in mind that consulting is a conditional privilege granted by the University.”

The Dean reserves the right to prohibit outside consulting and other business activities. *Faculty members are required to notify the Vice Dean in advance if they wish to participate in outside consulting, business activities, or boards of directors. The Vice Dean will notify the faculty member if there is a decision to disapprove such activities. In addition, such activities should be included in the Annual Performance Report.*

Where a potential conflict of interest exists, or the appearance of a conflict of interest, the faculty member should identify these conflicts and how they will be managed, and request approval from the Dean in advance. Consult the University policies on Conflict of Interest and Ethics, and Conflict of Interest in Research, at [www.usc.edu/policies](http://www.usc.edu/policies). Timely reporting in advance is important so the School can help protect faculty members from potentially compromising situations.

Faculty members may be prohibited from outside consulting if they neglect their responsibilities to the School or University, engage in activities that create the appearance of a conflict of interest, or engage in professional activities that negatively impact the reputation of the School.

---

Outside teaching is discussed in Section 6 of this Manual, and a different set of University policies and School guidelines apply to this activity.

## 9.2 Use of University Name and Affiliation

In extramural engagements, use of the USC and Marshall names should be limited to a statement of the faculty member's exact title and school affiliation. For example, members of the clinical faculty should be specifically identified as such, and should not be portrayed as members of the tenure-track faculty or as otherwise unidentified members of the faculty. Part-time faculty may accurately state their engagement with USC but may not use business cards or letterhead that indicates an affiliation with USC nor may they use any other instruments that suggest or imply any relationship with USC other than the specific engagement involving USC. Private as opposed to USC letterhead should be used for all correspondence and reports related to outside work. The School's name should not be used in any way to suggest that it is sponsoring or otherwise associated with an independent extramural endeavor.

## 9.3 Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest are discussed in the USC Faculty Handbook (Section 3-I(1)), and in the University policies on Conflict of Interest and Ethics, and Conflict of Interest in Research, at [www.usc.edu/policies](http://www.usc.edu/policies). In addition:

- Consulting with current or future students. No faculty member should engage in compensated consulting based on a relationship with a current or foreseeable future student. The definition of compensated consulting includes any relationship that has the potential to produce monetary gain for the faculty member, including, but not restricted to direct compensation, warrants or stock options, among others.
- Intellectual property rights. Faculty members are frequently exposed to ideas, concepts, inventions, and other intellectual property that may have scholarly or commercial value. Such exposure may arise in a variety of contexts including the classroom, private tutorials and discussion with students, and interactions with outside business enterprises involved with the School's educational mission. It is the responsibility of faculty members to acknowledge and protect the rights of the originators of such property. The University policy on intellectual property is available at at [www.usc.edu/policies](http://www.usc.edu/policies).

## **9.4 Reporting**

On an annual basis, as part of the annual performance review process, all faculty members should report to the Dean each outside activity undertaken for compensation, with the number of days disclosed for each assignment. In addition, each faculty member should report any and all compensated engagements within the University and School community that are not covered within the faculty member's workload profile. This includes compensation related to executive education programs offered by any unit of the University and School. For purposes of reporting, "compensation" means direct compensation, buy-out of other responsibilities to the University such as teaching or service, or other payments that directly benefit the faculty member (such as contributions to the faculty member's STARS account).

## **9.5 Part-Time Faculty**

These guidelines are meant to apply to all full-time faculty members. Part-time faculty members are bound by the limitations on use of the University name and affiliation, and by the provisions that apply to USC teaching activities. Part-time faculty members may be asked to disclose affiliations with external organizations, but are not subject to the time and activity reporting requirements discussed above (except for those activities that represent direct conflicts of interest, such as teaching in degree programs offered by institutions other than USC and activities or affiliations that have the potential to negatively impact the reputation of the School or University).

---

## 10 Named Chairs and Professorships

Named (or “endowed”) chairs and professorships recognize faculty members who have made exceptional contributions to the School’s mission. Because appointment to a named chair or professorship represents one of the highest honors conferred upon a faculty member, the holder is expected to have demonstrated teaching, research, and/or service that meets the School’s highest aspirations. Such appointments are made by the President after a recommendation by the Dean and consultation with the faculty. Within Marshall, the primary faculty consultative body is the Committee on Named Chairs and Professorships.

### 10.1 New Appointments

Nominations for appointment to a named professorship or chair may be submitted to the Vice Dean by any faculty member at any point of time. At least once a year, the Vice Dean invites nominations from Department Chairs. At the request of the Vice Dean, a nominee submits a curriculum vitae and at least three years of APR information, and the Chair of the nominee’s Department submits a memo.

For each nominee, the Committee on Named Chairs prepares two memos to advise the Dean. The first memo recommends whether or not to appoint the nominee. The memo should evaluate the accomplishments and standing of the nominee, and discuss expectations for the future. This memo should also discuss the intent of the donor who established the chair or professorship. The second memo recommends what perquisites, if any, to associate with the appointment. After considering this advice, the Dean may recommend the nominee’s appointment to the Provost.

The appointment process for external hires follows a similar process when possible, but in some cases an expedited process is followed.

Certain chairs and professorships are associated with specific administrative positions (such as Dean of the Marshall School), and those appointments are made separately as part of the administrative appointment process.

---

## 10.2 Renewals

Appointments to named positions are subject to renewal. The practice of the School is to consider holders of named chairs and professorships for reappointment at five-year intervals, unless otherwise stated in the appointment letter. It is expected (but not guaranteed) that the School will recommend renewal for holders who continue to demonstrate research, teaching, and/or service that meets the School's highest aspirations.

The renewal review process has two main purposes: (i) to provide information and a recommendation to the Dean pertaining to the chair renewal, and (ii) to provide feedback to the holder of the chair or professorship. The assessment considers teaching, research, and service, and the holder's overall contribution to the School's mission, with emphasis on performance during the previous term.

The renewal process takes place during Spring Semester following a calendar established by the Vice Dean. Typically, the holder of the chair or professorship is asked to submit a current vitae, a report of his or her academic accomplishments since the last appointment (meaning, in most cases, over the previous five years), five years of APR information, and any other information he or she believes to be pertinent by mid-February of the last year of the term of appointment. At the request of the Vice Dean, the Chair of the holder's Department is asked to submit a recommendation. By mid-March, the Committee on Named Chairs submits two memos to advise the Dean. The first memo recommends whether or not to reappoint the holder, and the second memo recommends what perquisites, if any, to associate with the appointment. Based on this information, the Dean may recommend renewal to the Provost.

Renewals of named positions associated with administrative appointments (such as Dean of the Marshall School) are considered as part of the administrative reappointment process, and may or may not involve the Committee. If a named position is associated with an administrative position, the title is coterminous with the position and ends when the person's administrative appointment ends.

Named appointments may also be terminated as provided in University policy.

## 10.3 Perquisites Associated with Named Positions

Appointment to a named chair or professorship is an honorary appointment and may or may not be accompanied by perquisites. Any perquisites associated with a named position are approved by the Provost, after recommendation by the Dean.

---



Perquisites commonly associated with a named position include:

- Research (STARS) funds. Holders of named chairs and professorships may be awarded supplemental STARS funding. When additional STARS funding is awarded, it is normally a standard amount set by the School (most recently \$3,000 per year), but the amount can be more or less.
- Summer research stipends. Holders of named chairs and professorships may receive a summer research stipend. Typically, summer research stipends are awarded based on research accomplishments over the previous term, and the likelihood that the holder's future research will result in significant scholarly publications. When a summer research stipend is awarded, it is typically two-ninths or one-ninth of the holder's base salary, but the amount can be more or less.
- Teaching reduction. Holders of named chairs and professorships may receive a reduced teaching load to allow increased research effort. Teaching reduction is awarded based on research accomplishments over the previous term, and the likelihood that the holder's future research will result in significant scholarly publications. When a teaching reduction is awarded, it is typically a one course reduction from the holder's normal teaching load, but the reduction can be less or more.

---

## 11 External Funding

Obtaining external funds for research is an important research activity that helps promote the mission and visibility of the School. The following practices are intended to recognize and facilitate the research of faculty who seek and acquire significant outside grants.

### 11.1 Workload Adjustment

External grants may provide funds that allow a faculty member to increase the weight on research in his or her workload profile and decrease the weight on teaching. This is called “teaching reduction” for short — it should be understood that it is in fact a reallocation of workload into research and out of teaching, not a reduction in overall workload. As a rule of thumb, a teaching reduction of one course is associated with research effort through an external grant amounting to 25 percent of the faculty member’s total workload, and corresponding compensation (base salary plus benefits), which is roughly equal to 32 percent of core salary, is charged to the grant in accordance with government regulations.

Some external grantors as a matter of policy do not provide funds for teaching reduction during the regular school year. For the most prestigious such grants, the Dean may provide additional support for the grant research in the form of faculty time, or teaching reduction. This teaching reduction is based on direct costs of the grant and is a form of in-kind cost sharing to allow the research to be completed successfully. There is no formula for when teaching reduction is provided, and the amount of reduction is at the discretion of the Dean. No more than one course will be reduced per year, except in exceptional cases. As a rough guideline, typically teaching reduction would not be considered for a grant with direct costs less than \$200,000.

Faculty members who desire teaching reduction associated with externally funded research projects are expected to include their research effort as a budget item in their applications whenever the grantor permits, and if not possible, should discuss the grant with the Vice Dean for Research and Strategy before applying.

---

Teaching reduction is not guaranteed, and in all cases must be approved by the Vice Dean. Teaching reduction should not create significant problems for the School's academic programs. Faculty members who apply for grants should consult with their Department Chair to ensure that their proposed teaching reduction will not have an adverse impact on the School. Teaching reduction should take place during the period of the grant because the purpose is to free research time to conduct the research described in the grant. Generally, teaching reduction is limited to one course per semester.

### **11.2 Summer Research Funding**

Faculty members who receive external funding for research during the summer are also permitted to apply for funding from the Marshall Summer Research Fund. The total amount of funding for summer research is generally no more than two-ninths of core salary, and in no case may it exceed three-ninths of core salary.

---

## 12 Mentoring

Mentoring is an important activity that benefits the mentee, the mentor, and the School. Mentoring helps the mentee assimilate, enhances career success, and can lead to greater organizational commitment. Mentors gain a sense of contribution, personal satisfaction, and exposure to fresh ideas.

Mentoring takes many forms and a variety of individuals, including formal assigned mentors, senior faculty internal and external to the Department and School, peers, and Department Chairs. Mentors serve as professional role models and coaches, providing information, feedback, and guidance; they serve as protectors; they serve as counselors, providing support, advice, and coping strategies; and they serve as sponsors, opening doors and making introductions to foster visibility and entrée to career- and network-building activities such as journal and conference reviewing, and invited university talks.

### 12.1 Formal Mentoring Procedures

Marshall's mentoring strategy includes several formal procedures and practices:

- Department Chairs assign a mentor to each untenured, full-time faculty member at the beginning of each academic year. The list of mentors and mentees is communicated to the Vice Dean and distributed to the faculty early in the school year.
  - Faculty members report mentoring activities in their annual performance reports, and APR committees consider mentoring contributions when assessing performance.
  - Department Chairs provide feedback and guidance to junior faculty members following the Annual Performance Review. The feedback and guidance addresses the faculty member's development as a scholar and teacher, as well as his or her progress toward meeting promotion and tenure criteria.
-

- For tenure-track faculty, Department Chairs should monitor the burdens of service and new course preparation to ensure that junior faculty members have sufficient time to perform research required to achieve tenure.
- The Vice Dean and chair of the Personnel Committee meet yearly with Department Chairs to discuss what was learned from the past year's promotion and tenure processes and decisions, including developments at the University level. Chairs communicate this information to mentors.
- The Committee on Mentoring advises the Dean, Chairs, and individual faculty on mentoring practices and procedures, and organizes mentoring events.

Much mentoring is informal and faculty members are encouraged to form mentoring relations beyond those established by Marshall's formal program. None of the School's formal practices are intended to discourage or replace informal mentoring.

## **12.2 Matching Mentors and Mentees**

Chairs should consider the following criteria when selecting mentors: the fit between the mentor's and the mentee's research, the mentor's commitment to mentoring, the mentor's understanding of his or her role as mentor, and other time constraints or personal factors that may bear on the mentor's capacity to serve in a mentoring role. Successful mentors typically are experienced scholars and teachers who are familiar with the University system and recognized and respected in their field of expertise. Successful mentors are interested in the mentee's professional development, willing to devote time to the mentoring relationship, willing to share knowledge, and are capable of providing constructive and honest feedback.

Chairs may (i) assign different mentors as the mentee progresses through his or her probationary period or (ii) assign a single mentor throughout this period. The former exposes the mentee to a greater range of ideas and perspectives, and creates broader knowledge of and objectivity regarding the mentee among the faculty prior to a tenure decision. The latter provides an opportunity for a deeper mentoring relationship. Chairs may consider holding a year-end meeting with the mentee to discuss the current mentoring relationship and options for future years. Many junior faculty members will also establish one or more informal mentoring relationships.

Chairs can play a crucial role in ensuring that mentors and mentees understand the multiple roles that mentors can play, including roles as coach, protector, counselor, role model, and sponsor. Chairs should also support peer-to-peer mentoring that occurs when clusters of junior faculty connect over research and teaching issues.

### 12.3 Recommendations for Department Chairs

Chairs play a central role in the mentoring process. As an aid to Chairs, this section lists mentoring practices that have been successful across the University.

- Orientation programs. Chairs should encourage new faculty members to attend Marshall and University orientation sessions.
- Chairs should ensure that new faculty members receive copies of critical documents, including the USC Faculty Handbook, UCAPT Manual, Marshall Faculty Manual, and STARS Guidelines. Chairs should also provide department documents pertaining to tenure benchmarks, journal rankings, list of doctoral students, and so on.
- Chair orientation meetings. Chairs are encouraged to hold an orientation meeting at the beginning of the academic year with all new faculty members. Topics may include: examples of successful promotion candidates and why they were successful; criteria for annual performance review and fourth year review; expectations regarding teaching, seminar participation, grant writing, involvement with doctoral students, and service; role of the Chair in protecting faculty time and resources; and role of the Department coordinator and staff in supporting the faculty. Additional information is available at [www.usc.edu/academe/faculty](http://www.usc.edu/academe/faculty).
- Brownbag lunches. Brownbag lunches provide opportunities to discuss unfinished research projects, journal selection, and provide advice and feedback on editorial and reviewer comments.
- APR feedback. Chairs should provide yearly feedback and guidance to junior faculty regarding their progress toward promotion and tenure.
  - The Chair should discuss the progress to date and offer recommendations where appropriate. The meeting may also include the mentor.
  - Some mentees prefer interactions to be less “legalistic” and “formal” and more candid and developmental. They may value advice on project

portfolio management, co-authorship, journals, and gaining visibility.

– Goals for the subsequent year should be established.

- Ongoing activities. The Chair's ongoing mentoring contributions can include assigning appropriate mentors, protecting mentee time by minimizing course preps, helping the mentee gain research resources, advising on potential outlets, co-authorship, portfolio management, and serving as an advocate for the candidate externally.
- Special populations. Chairs should be attuned to the mentoring needs of women and minorities. Research shows that women and minorities are less likely to receive mentoring, less likely to find adequate mentors, and more likely to be perceived as weak when they seek mentoring. Mentoring is important for all faculty members and Chairs should strive to make mentoring opportunities available to all.

#### **12.4 Recommendations for Mentors and Mentees**

This section lists a variety of practices that have been successful for mentors and mentees across the University. Additional information for mentors and mentees is available at the University's faculty portal (<http://www.usc.edu/academe/faculty>).

- Orientation meeting. Mentors are encouraged to meet with new faculty members to facilitate their assimilation into the School and University. Possible topics for discussion include:
  - Culture of the Department and School, e.g. expectations for collegiality; attendance, preparation, and participation in seminars and workshops; importance of maintaining a presence on campus.
  - Discussion of undergraduate, MBA, and doctoral students, approaches to teaching, support available for teaching (such as syllabi, lecture notes, slides, cases), availability of classroom observation, and so on.
  - Doctoral students, how they are assigned, what is expected of them as research assistants.
  - Institutional Review Board Procedures (for researchers collecting primary data).
  - Information technology support including Blackboard, personal web pages, and library databases.
- Regular meetings. Mentors and mentees are encouraged to meet on a

---

regular basis. At least once per semester would be normal. Topics for discussion may include:

- University, School and Department procedures and practices.
  - Time management, setting priorities, balancing career and family.
  - Establishing a professional network and gaining visibility.
  - Identifying and developing research projects, working with co-authors, determining publication outlets, responding to reviewers.
  - Talks at conferences and other universities, professional etiquette.
  - Teaching strategies, effective course materials, dealing with difficult students, finding guest speakers.
- Proactive mentoring. Mentors should understand that some mentees may be hesitant to solicit help or advice. The best mentors take the initiative in helping the mentee flourish. Possible actions include:
- Helping the mentee acquire invitations to present at conferences and seminars at other schools. Many mentors have a network of professional contacts that can be used to generate invitations.
  - Reiterating the importance of regular internal research presentations.
  - Providing feedback on teaching based on in-class evaluation and review of course materials.
  - Offering to read papers before submission, and help analyze editor and referee letters for submitted papers.
  - Coauthoring.
  - Helping the mentee understand the importance of making and being able to articulate a research contribution, rather than simply building a curriculum vitae. It may be useful to ask the mentee to develop a short written statement of his or her research strategy, agenda, and goals.
-



**APPENDIX TABLE A1 Year at a Glance**

<b>August</b>	Most faculty contracts begin. Chairs assign mentors. New faculty orientation (usually Friday before start of semester). External letters solicited for tenure cases. Departments consider promotion cases to Professor (tenured). Clinical faculty promotion candidates submit dossier materials. Fall Semester classes begin.
<b>September</b>	Personnel Committee considers promotion cases to Professor (tenured). Candidates for tenure submit dossier materials. Departments submit recruiting proposals.
<b>October</b>	Departments consider tenure cases. Departments consider clinical faculty promotion cases. Dossiers for promotion to Professor (tenured) due at UCAPT (Oct. 15).
<b>November</b>	Personnel Committee considers tenure cases. Committee on Clinical Faculty considers clinical faculty promotion cases.
<b>December</b>	Faculty members submit sabbatical and other leave requests to Chair. PEG formed for 4th-year reviews (tenure-track), faculty submit materials. Fall Semester classes end.
<b>January</b>	Chairs submit sabbatical and other leave requests to Vice Dean. Holders of named chairs and professorships submit renewal materials. Faculty members submit summer research funding proposals. Spring Semester classes begin.
<b>February</b>	Dossiers for tenure and promotion to Associate Prof. due at UCAPT (Feb. 1). (Early Feb.) Individual APR reports and workload profiles submitted. (Late Feb.) Department APR reports completed. Departments submit 4th-year review dossiers to Vice Dean.
<b>March</b>	Personnel Committee considers 4th-year reviews (tenure-track). Annual Performance Review process completed. Chairs submit salary proposals.
<b>April</b>	(Early Apr.) Salary proposals due to Provost. Workload Profiles developed.
<b>May</b>	Most faculty contracts end. PEG formed for promotion cases to Professor (tenured). Spring Semester classes end.
<b>June</b>	Candidates for Professor (tenured) submit materials, letters solicited.
<b>July</b>	PEG formed for tenure cases, candidates submit statement and c.v. PEG formed for clinical faculty promotion cases. Vice Deans form committees for subsequent academic year.

## APPENDIX TABLE A2 Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion and Fourth-Year Review

The following calendars for the 2010-2011 academic year illustrate typical timing of events. Actual calendars are issued by the Vice Dean each year.

### *Fourth-Year Review*

Occurs in the fourth year of employment as an Assistant Professor.

December 2010	PEG formed
December 17, 2010	Faculty member submits dossier materials
January 14, 2011	PEG submits report to Chair
Jan-Feb 2010	Department considers case
February 11, 2010	Chair submits dossier to Personnel Committee
March 11, 2010	Personnel Committee submits memo to Vice Dean

### *Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure*

Occurs in the year ending with the candidate's Mandatory Tenure Decision Date.

July 2010	PEG formed, candidate submits statement and c.v.
August 2, 2010	Invitation letters sent to outside referees
September 2010	Candidate submits dossier materials
September 24, 2010	Deadline to receive letters from outside referees
October 2010	Department considers case
October 29, 2010	Deadline for Department to send dossier to Vice Dean
November 2010	Personnel Committee meets to consider dossiers
November 24, 2008	Personnel Committee memo due to Vice Dean
January 2011	Dean prepares memo for UCAPT
February 1, 2011	Deadline for dossiers to reach UCAPT

### *Promotion to Professor with Tenure*

May 2010	PEG formed
June 4, 2010	Deadline for candidate to submit dossier materials
June 18, 2010	Invitations sent to outside referees
July 30, 2010	Deadline to receive letters from outside referees
August 2010	Department considers case
September 17, 2010	Deadline for Department to send dossier to Vice Dean
October 1, 2010	Personnel Committee memo due to Vice Dean
October 15, 2010	Deadline for dossiers to reach UCAPT

**APPENDIX TABLE A3 Clinical Faculty Promotion**

The following calendar for the 2010-2011 academic year are intended to illustrate the typical timing of events. Actual calendars are issued by the Vice Dean each year.

*Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor*

Summer 2010	PEG formed
September 1, 2010	Invitation letters sent to outside reviewers
September 2010	Deadline for candidate to submit dossier materials
October 1, 2010	Deadline to receive letters from outside reviewers
October 2010	Department considers case
October 29, 2010	Deadline for Department to send dossier to Vice Dean
November 2010	Committee on Clinical Faculty considers case
December 3, 2010	Committee on Clinical Faculty memo due to Vice Dean

**APPENDIX PART B1    Dossier Sample Title Page**

DOSSIER

For

TYLER M. JONES

Candidate for

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

in the

Marshall School of Business

University of Southern California

Prepared

Fall 2011

---

---

## **APPENDIX PART B2     Dossier for Tenure-Track Faculty**

Instructions for preparation of the dossier are included in the UCAPT Manual. See especially Section 4.0 and the checklist for dossier preparation in the appendix.

The PEG chair is responsible for preparation and organization of the dossier, not the candidate. The candidate's responsibility is restricted to provision of the curriculum vitae, personal statement, and assembly of supporting documentation, such as summaries of teaching evaluations, specific course evaluations, publications, and working papers.

The dossier should consist of one or at most two three-ring binders with labeled tabs for each section in the order prescribed below. The candidate's name should appear both on the spine and front of the binder. If more than one binder is used, each should be labeled and identified as Volume 1 of #, Volume 2 of #. Contents should not be placed in plastic page coverings. One volume is preferable to two.

Following the UCAPT Manual, the dossier should be organized with the following section numbers and materials (dossiers for senior lateral appointments are different; see UCAPT Manual 11):

### Section I-A. Administrative and Faculty Assessments

- Statement by the Dean, Marshall School of Business (UCAPT Manual 4.1, 4.3, 4.5)
- Note whether Dean approved list of referees
- Memo from Personnel Committee (UCAPT Manual 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)
- Memo from Department Chair (UCAPT Manual 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)
- Peer Evaluation Group Report (UCAPT Manual 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

### Section I-B. Quantitative Data (UCAPT Manual 4.6)

### Section II. Curriculum Vitae (UCAPT Manual 5)

### Section III. Personal Statement (UCAPT Manual 6)

- Personal statement
- Personal statement from fourth-year review

### Section IV. Teaching Record (UCAPT Manual 7)

- Memo comparing candidate's teaching quality to Department and School norms (UCAPT Manual 7.1)
- Summary of evidence (UCAPT Manual 7)

### Section V. Service Record (UCAPT Manual 8)

---

---

Section VI. Background on Referees (UCAPT Manual 9.6)

- Chart of referees indicating who suggested referee, relationship to candidate, and whether all questions were answered, referees who declines
- Sample solicitation letter
- Explanation of choice of referees, with short bio explain referee's status

Section VI-A. Referee Letters

- Substantive letters from independent referees

Section VI-B. Additional Referee Letters

- Letters from collaborators, referees suggested by candidate, nonsubstantive letters

Section VII. Selected Evidence of Scholarship and Teaching (UCAPT Manual 10)

---

---

## **APPENDIX PART B3     Dossier for Clinical Faculty**

Guidelines for the promotion process are in Section 3.5 of this Manual. The PEG chair is responsible for the preparation and organization of the dossier, not the candidate. The candidate's responsibility is restricted to provision of the curriculum vitae, personal statement and assembly of supporting documentation, such as summaries of teaching evaluations, specific course evaluations, publications, and working papers.

The dossier should be included in one or at most two three-ring binders with labeled tabs for each section in the order prescribed below. The candidate's name should appear both on the spine and front of the binder. If more than one binder is used, each should be labeled and identified as Volume 1 of #, Volume 2 of #. One volume is preferable to two.

The dossier should be organized with the following section numbers and materials:

### Section I-A. Administrative and Faculty Assessments

- Memo from Committee on Clinical Faculty
- Memo from Department Chair
- Peer Evaluation Group Report

### Section II. Curriculum Vitae

### Section III. Personal Statement

- Personal statement
- Personal statement from third-year review

### Section IV. Teaching Record

- Memo comparing candidate's teaching quality to Department and School norms
- Summary of evidence (historical teaching responsibilities, new courses created, student ratings, comments from in-class observation by faculty colleague(s), evidence of innovation and effectiveness, teaching honors and awards)

### Section V. Service Record

### Section VI. Reference Letters

- Chart of referees indicating who suggested referee, relationship to candidate, and whether all questions were answered, referees who declined
- Sample solicitation letter
- Preface each letter with short bio explaining referee's stature, reason for selection

### Section VII. Selected Evidence of Scholarship and Teaching

---

---

## APPENDIX PART B4     **Template Invitation Letter for External Reviewers in Clinical Faculty Promotion Cases**

Dear [name]:

I am requesting your assistance on behalf of the [Department of AREA/Center for AREA] in a frank evaluation of the service contributions of [candidate's name], who is being considered for [appointment/promotion] to the rank of [ ]. Please let me know as soon as possible by e-mail [ ] whether or not you are able to assist us by submitting a letter of evaluation by [ ].

I have enclosed [relevant materials, for example, curriculum vitae, personal statement, course materials, cases]. If you agree to provide a letter of evaluation, please address the following issues in your letter:

- Please describe [candidate's name]'s service contributions. Has [candidate name] made a significant service effort that has led to material contributions? Please give concrete examples of such impacts and explain how the quality of [candidate's name]'s service has been responsible for the effects you describe. If [candidate's name]'s service has not been extraordinary, please state that candidly and offer your interpretation of its value. [For candidates to Professor only: Has [candidate's name] assumed leadership roles in Marshall or at USC?]
- Please briefly describe the circumstances in which you know [candidate's name]. Describe any professional or personal relationships you have had.
- Finally, sometimes outside evaluators have direct knowledge about other aspects of a candidate's academic role — such as professional or public service to education within the Marshall School of Business, the USC community at large, or the outside community in general. If you do, please add your evaluations of [candidate's name]'s accomplishments in these areas.

We value your **frank** and **detailed** judgments highly. We appreciate that an analytical evaluation requires greater effort than a letter of general praise and advocacy, or one that simply retraces [candidate's name]'s vitae.

Your letter will be treated as a confidential document to the full extent allowed by law. It will be studied closely by Department and Marshall promotion committees and officials, and is intended to be read by no one else. I would be grateful if you would help us reach an informed decision about whether USC should [offer [candidate's name] this appointment] [grant [candidate's name] this promotion.]

Sincerely,

[Chair]

---



## APPENDIX PART B5 Template for In-Class Teaching Evaluation

In-class teaching evaluation can be useful in promotion cases. The following approach is offered to faculty evaluators as a way to structure the evaluation. Reviewers should feel free to adapt or modify the structure as appropriate. The most useful evaluations have both quantitative and qualitative dimensions.

### 1. Quantitative Analysis

Rank the candidate's teaching effectiveness in the following dimensions on a scale of 1 – 5.

	<i>Very poor</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Can't evaluate</i>
Knowledge of subject matter	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Class management skills	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Ability to relate to students and handle questions	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Ability to make subject relevant and accessible to students	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Compared to other professors in similar fields, overall ability and teaching quality	1	2	3	4	5	NA

### 2. Qualitative Analysis

Please write an assessment of no more than two pages with your impressions of the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The following list is provided to give the reviewer some ideas of what to look for while observing the candidate's teaching. Please note that appropriate pedagogies vary with class size, subject matter, etc., so not all of the listed items will be relevant to any particular class.

#### A. Mechanics

- Begins and ends class on time
- Ensures that all students can hear questions and answers

- Calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers
- Invites alternative or additional answers
- Involves a large proportion of the class

**Scholarship/Rigor**

- Includes applications for problem solving and decision-making
- Distinguishes between fact and opinion, data and interpretation
- Emphasizes ways of solving problems rather than solutions
- Properly emphasizes important points

**Structure**

- Focuses student attention (by demonstration, activity, questions, etc.) before launching into lecture proper
- Presents broader framework within which day's topic can be placed and related
- States goals or objectives for class sessions
- Encourages students to examine a variety of points of view before drawing conclusions or making judgments
- Class moves at a comfortable pace for majority of students
- Summarizes discussion periodically
- Draws together contributions of various members of the group in the conclusion
- Summarizes and draws new conceptualizations at end

**Classroom Relationships/Interactions**

- Calls students by name
  - Gives motivational cues
  - Shifts easily from presentation mode to questioning or discussion mode
  - Provides opportunities for and encourages participation and questions
  - Checks to see whether answer has been understood
  - Treats questions seriously
  - General attentiveness
  - Prevents or terminates discussion monopolies
  - Encourages and guides critical thinking
  - Demonstrates a rapport with students
  - Makes it "safe" to speak or to be wrong
  - Allow students to respond to one another
  - Paraphrases student comments for his own or students' understanding
-

- 
- Pursues student ideas when they are not clearly expressed
  - Prompts with hints, rephrased, or simplified questions
  - Asks questions on matters of opinion, where any answer is right
  - Asks questions that relate to the experience of the student
  - Requires student to support answer with evidence or argument
  - Follows up short or inadequate answers with a probing response that requires student to extend or improve his answer
  - Accepts and acknowledges all answers (“I see what you mean”) or by reflecting, clarifying, or summarizing
  - Encourages students to evaluate their own or one another’s answers (what would happen if you did it that way?)
-